**Amarillo College**

# M I N U T E S

## Institutional Effectiveness Committee
## 4/25/05
## Library 112

Attendees:   Danita McAnally (chair)    Rebecca Easton
             Jeff Doiron                Maureen Hood
             David Fike                 William Young
             Alan Kee                   Delton Moore
             Mark Hanna

Recording Secretary:  Brandy Hayes

Absent:     Richard Pullen      Gay Mills          Angela Allen

Call to order: 2:01pm

1. Minutes from April 14, 2005
        Verify page 2 PET Program Review

2. Program Review –  Discussion again as Danita agreed to compile and have reviewed by committee
        Goals:
   - Allow for similar focus to accreditation
   - Provide a structure for analysis rather than description
   - Be more concise
   - Provide documentation (Safari Reports) – analyze results in responding
   - Continue current five year rotation
   - Tie review items to documentation of outcomes and improvements based on PET form
        o Revises Proposal for instructional guidelines
        o New Proposal for non-instructional guidelines

# PROGRAM REVIEW PROCEDURE: SUMMARY

I. **OBJECTIVE:**        To assess program performance to make recommendations regarding program improvement and continuation of 32 credit transfer/developmental, 47 credit occupational, and 60 non-credit programs.

The **Program Review Committee (PRC)** evaluates instructional programs on the basis of performance indicators or at the request of the Vice President of Instruction or the Vice President of Student Services. Voting members of the committee do not vote on any recommendation pertaining to their programs.

**Which programs are reviewed:** A program is defined as an instructional course or group of courses for which students may or may not receive college credit upon completion. Credit courses are grouped as transfer/developmental or occupational courses. Non-credit courses include courses taken through the Americana Language Program, Workforce Development and other Continuing Education areas. Non-credit areas are grouped by discipline rather than by program. Imbedded and Enhanced Skills certificates are evaluated as part of the program. Programs are evaluated district-wide, rather than by campus, every year. Courses or sequences of courses are evaluated only if they appear in the College Catalog of the year during which the committee evaluates the programs and only if three consecutive years of data are available. Fields of Study and Areas of Concentration without program-specific courses (e.g. Pre-Nursing) are not evaluated.

**Which data are examined:** The PRC uses two kinds of measurements: **Viability Indicators**, measures that track the minimum performance levels required for program maintenance and **Quality indicators**, which encompass measures beyond minimal program performance. Data for the three academic years prior to the academic year in which the committee makes recommendations are evaluated to determine which indicators are met or not met. Indicators for which there is no supporting data are evaluated "Not Met." Data not applicable to a program are not evaluated. Data for credit programs exclude concurrent continuing education students. Power Pack (December) courses are included with the fall semester data. Indicators whose data are pending are ignored in calculating the overall performance score on a scale of 0-100% (e.g. determining that 80% of the Viability Indicators are met). Indicators have a title (e.g. Enrollment Trends), a measure (e.g. whether there is increasing enrollment), a data source (e.g. Master Class Schedule), and a standard (e.g. a numerical goal or a yes/no performance level).

## II. CALENDAR

**MAY:** The Program Review Committee (PRC) requests Institutional Research to provide data, by September, to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (IE), which produces, in September, the Program Review Report, which presents the data by program.

**SEPTEMBER:** IE sends the Program Review Report to the PRC and to Deans/Directors. The PRC meets to evaluate instructional programs based on the Viability and Quality Indicators or at the request of the Vice President of Instruction or the Vice President of Student Services. **Programs meeting fifty-percent (50%) or more of their Viability Indicators are not**

**scrutinized in depth**; however, Deans/Directors may submit a Program Review Data Discrepancy Form, if they think that some data are inaccurate. Planning strategies must be completed to address unmet indicators, under the auspices of the Planning Office.

**OCTOBER-NOVEMBER: Programs meeting less than fifty-percent (50%) of their Viability Indicators:** Deans/Directors and Coordinator must appear before the PRC. If more than one Dean/Director and Program Coordinator are responsible for a program, they must confer amongst each other to prepare a joint, consolidated response to the committee. They may bring to the meeting a Program Review Data Discrepancy Form, if any data are thought to be inaccurate and/or a Program Review Justification Form, if it is thought that extenuating circumstances occasioned unmet indicators. The PRC addresses data discrepancies, if applicable, Viability and Quality Indicators not met, strengths of the program, contemplated corrective actions for unmet indicators, achievement of objectives of the previous year's planning strategies, and the program requirements in the latest College Catalog. Immediately after making a recommendation on the improvement and continuation of a program, the Chair informs the Dean(s)/Director(s) and Program Coordinator(s) of the recommendation.

If a program is recommended to **CONTINUE**, unmet indicators must be addressed by planning strategies, under the auspices of the Planning Office. If a program is **NOT** recommended to continue, a rationale is sent to the appropriate Vice President. The program continues to be evaluated until de-activation, if it occurs, is complete.

<div align="center">

**PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT: 2004-2005**

**Travel and Tourism**

</div>

Viability Indicators & Measure

1. **Contact/credit Hours per FT Faculty**   Sufficient contact/credit hours, District-wide, for FT faculty workload (per College policy), based on total no. of contact/credit hours for each course prefix in the discipline for last 3 years (Fall, Spring) and total no. of full-time faculty teaching during Fall and Spring of the last 3 years. (Excluding C.E. courses) (Unduplicated; all Deans must respond "Yes' to meet standard). (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Nursing, Criminal Justice, Educ./Child Dev., & Computer Science/Comp. Inf. Systems share the same results, respectively). Source: 32

2. **Class Fill Rate**   Percent of classes 75 % full (optimum fill tate) on census date (Excluding CE. students), based on no. of students in each section for last 3 years (Fall, ring, and Summer) on census date. Optimum (set by VP of Instruction): No. of students that can be a taught in a section of the course. (For information only, District average fill rate appears in comments column: Total number of seats filled divided by the total number of seats available). Room capacity (set by Physical Plant): No. of chairs/equipment in a room. If the room capacity is below the optimum, it is used to score the indicator. Source: 4

3. **Enrollment Trends**  Seat count is increasing or is level, or, if deceasing, does not decrease more than 5 percent from benchmark year (1st yr of the last 3 yrs, Fall, Spring, Summer). Seat counts for all the program-specific course prefixes are added together to determine the seat count. Source: 46

4. **Revenue Sufficiency**    For each of the 3 previous years (Fall, Spring, Summer), program credit hours x average fall tuition per credit hour [ $34.50, 03: 39.08, 04: 41.66] + state reimbursement (dollar reimbursement per contact hour by program x total contact hours per program x current reimbursement percentage rate) is greater than program budget + overhead costs (33% of entire program budget.) Excludes grant and external funding. When multiple programs are under the same budget, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Faculty salaries are included in expenses. (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Nursing, Criminal Justice, Educ./Child Dev., & Computer Science/Comp. Inf. Systems share the same results, respectively). Sources 26, 34, 44

5. **Full-Time Faculty in Discipline**    At least 1 FT instructor whose primary teaching load is in the discipline. (Sept. 1-May 1 of latest academic year) (Cred. Tran. & Cred. Occ. Nursing, Criminal Justice, Educ./Child Dev., & Computer Science/Comp. Inf. Systems share the same results, respectively) Sources: 4, 40

6. **No. of Graduates**    No. of graduates within latest 3-yeur period (Fall, Spring, Summer), bused on no. of graduates for each program. Source: 22

7. **Student Success**    Percent of students employed/transfer/enter military w/in 1 yr of grad , based on the no. of graduates for each program for last 3 years and the number of graduates who are employed, have transferred to another institution or have entered the military within one-year of graduation. (THECB standard of 90% to be effective for the 2005-2006 report, at which time 3 years of data subject to the 90% standard will be available) (Additional documentation may be provided by program coordinator.) Source: 22

## PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT: 2004-2005

### Travel and Tourism

1. **Student Satisfaction with Program**    Percent of satisfaction, based on fall/spring percent of students satisfied with labs & technology for the last 3 years. (Fall, Spring) (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the responses:  Excellent: 1, Good: 1, Acceptable: 1, Weak: 0, Unacceptable = 0. Average of l=Satisfaction). Source: 2

2. **Student Evaluation of Faculty**    Percent of satisfaction, based on fall/spring overall instructor performance averaged percent of student satisfaction with instructor overall performance for last 2 years. based on question: Would you recommend instructor?" Source: 2

3. **Faculty Credentials** Percent of qualified, based on no. of instructors and no. of qualified instructors for the most recent year. Source: 18

4. **Full-Time Faculty Development**    Percent of FT Faculty at 2 prof. development activities during Fac. Development Week for most recent year. If FT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: 8

5. **Part-Time Faculty Development**    Percent of PT Faculty at 1 prof. Development activity during Fac. Development Week for most recent year. If PT faculty teach in 2 or more programs, their attendance is credited to all the programs. Source: 8

6. **Sections Taught by Full-Time Faculty** Percent of sections taught by FT Faculty for last 3 years. (Fall, Spring). Sources: 4, 40

7. **Course Syllabus** Reviewed/revised within the last 3 years, based on no. of course syllabi in the program and the revision date of each syllabus. Source: 12

8. **Graduate Satisfaction with Program** Percent of satisfaction, based on percent of cumulative fall, spring, & summer graduates satisfied with class availability, courses helped in Occupational Area, Technology, and Curriculum, for previous 3 years. (Combined average of all four responses). Source: 28

9. **Employer Satisfaction** Percent of employer satisfaction with EPCC graduates, based on no. of employers responding to a survey and the no. of employers satisfied with EPCC graduates for last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eight responses: Excellent = 1, Good = 1, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction). Source: 38

10. **Advisory Committee Satisfaction with Program** Percent of satisfaction, based on the overall averaged percent of satisfaction of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. (Each survey shall be scored 1 or 0 based on the combined average of the eleven responses: Excellent = 1, Good = l, Acceptable = 1, Weak = 0, Unacceptable = 0. An average of 1 indicates satisfaction.). When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: 14

11. **Advisory Committee Meetings** Held at least once annually, based on the meeting date(s) of each program advisory committee for the last 3 years. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Sources: 14, 32

12. **DACUM** Completion within last 5 years, based on the completion date of each program DACUM. Source: 10

13. **DACUM findings** Incorporated, as appropriate, into curriculum, based on the most recent DACUM Audit for each program. Source: 10

14. **Secondary Articulation Agreements, as appropriate** Percent of ISD requests for articulation addressed through analysis of EPCC course objectives for last 3 years. Source: 30

15. **Post-Secondary Articulation Agreements, as appropriate** Written evidence of attempted or revised articulation within the last 3 years. Source. 32

16. **Student Licensure/Certification, as Applicable** Percent of graduates/completers receiving licensure/certification, based on annual pass rate for the most recent year. Source: 32

17. **Program Accreditation, as Applicable** Maintains/actively seeking voluntary accreditation, based on documentation of accreditation or application for accreditation for last 3 years. Source: 32

18. **Workforce Demand** Jobs available in El Paso to meet graduate demands for each CIP code program for last 3 years. Source: 32

19. **Program Need**       Percent of employers acknowledging that the program is needed for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of employers indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program is needed. Source: 38

20. **Community Benefit/Service**        Percent of advisory members acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of advisory members indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that the program is meeting community needs. When multiple programs are under the same advisory committee, the same data shall be applied to all the programs. Source: 14

21. **Competitive Advantage: Quality** Percent of respondents acknowledging EPCC meets/exceeds quality of proprietary schools for each of the last 3 years, based on a survey of the business community indicating the percentage of respondents acknowledging that each program's quality meets or exceeds that of proprietary schools. (Combined average of responses on both the Advisory Committee Survey and the Employer Survey). Sources: 14, 38

**Review/edit proposals**
**Recommendation regarding proposals**
**Emailed Comments:**

Rebecca Easton:
>>> Rebecca Easton 04/14/05 04:02PM >>>

Hi, Danita.

You asked for possible grammatical revisions in the meeting this afternoon, and I only saw one statement whose grammar might benefit from a little reworking. I refer to item 8 under "Program's/Department's Improvements Based on Planning, Evaluation, and Assessment." It reads,

"For general education and/or core curriculum relevant to this program/department, identify the appropriate competencies approved by Academic Affairs and document how to outcomes for the competencies have been assessed and achieved or the plan for correcting any weaknesses."

I can read this sentence two ways. Does it mean to identify the competencies or the plan for correcting weaknesses, or does it mean to document the outcomes or the plan for correcting weaknesses? Could the sentence be divided to make the distinction clear? Here is one possible revision:

For general education and/or core curriculum relevant to this program/department, identify the appropriate competencies approved by Academic Affairs. Document how to outcomes for the competencies have been assessed and achieved, or outline a plan for correcting any weaknesses.

If I have missed the point of the directive and some other wording works better, go for it. This is the only suggestion I have for revising the program review.

David Fike:
>>> David Fike 04/14/05 04:08PM >>>

I think you are doing a great job with the proposed revision. Using SACS criteria as the framework provides a good basis for the inclusion/exclusion of questions, and it provides efficiency since it meets two needs (SACS review and Program review).

I think it is prudent to have a section on the Budget, but am still not comfortable with a Cost Benefit analysis. The cost side is easy to determine, since programs have budgets. However, the benefit side is hard to quantify, so it would be really easy to get into abstract descriptions (like, the program enhances the communities awareness of, and appreciation for, dance). How does one quantify that benefit? The Dance program here was cancelled because it lost money, but the Music program is sustained even though it loses money. Perhaps we could at least identify some specific metrics that will help assess how programs manage and use their budgets, but doesn't make the "unprofitable" programs look bad. (For what it is worth, S&E is one of the most profitable divisions at AC, so this isn't self-serving.)

I hope we can discuss this at the next meeting.


>>> Danita McAnally 4/14/2005 4:31:59 PM >>>

Your thoughts make sense to me. Any ideas on the metrics? May we could skip budget completely - since it is program/department but I believe we should discuss this at the next meeting.
Thanks


>>> David Fike 04/22/05 12:00AM >>>

Here are a couple of thoughts. Note that I'm not recommending them, but they might help us start thinking of others.

1) We should make sure that there are controls in place to assure that funds are properly spent. This may be covered at an institutional level; I'm not sure about that.

2) We get a report listing contact hours per faculty FTE. This is an efficiency measure. If this is trending downwards, we might want to implement changes. For example, if student enrollments are going down and yet faculty levels remain constant, we might want to do recruiting or introduce new programs to increase enrollments. So, the Program Review might say something like "Analyze trends in contact hours per faculty FTE and describe any actions taken as a result". Of course, this might be covered in PETS. This is a type of cost/benefit analysis, but it really isn't based on profit/loss; it more an assessment of "how am I doing this year vs. last year"

3) We could ask how the program budget director assures that necessary resources are provided. For example, does a director just unilateraly ask for 5% more of everything each year vs. conducting planning sessions to identify and scope needs.

4) We could ask how budget directors track their expenditures vs. budget.  If they have a systematic process, this should keep them from noticing a problem before it gets out of hand (like running out of funds halfway through the year.)

I wish I had better ideas for this topic, but I need to think more about it.  My guess is that some of the committee members will come up with some good ideas.

Thanks for letting me share my thoughts.


Maureen Hood:
>>> Maureen Hood 04/20/05 1:06PM >>>

Some thoughts on the Non-Instructional Programs:

In addition to a program review, there should be:
  ➢ a (job?) position review,
  ➢ an assessment of staffing levels, and
  ➢ an assessment of need.
These would be based on increased technological advances and improvements made according to the PET form results.

3. Next meeting – TBD this Summer?
   ➢ Those who are <u>not on 12 month</u> contracts, email Brandy with dates you are available.
   ➢ Those who <u>are on 12 month</u> contracts, email Brandy with dates you are NOT available (e.g. vacation dates).