

# Amarillo College

## 2010-2011 Planning and Evaluation Tracking (PET) Report

### REPORT SECTIONS

#### [Introduction](#)

#### [Instructional Findings](#)

- [PET Requirements](#)
- [Average Number of Outcomes](#)
- [Meeting Goals](#)
- [Meeting Outcomes](#)
- [Further Analysis of Outcomes](#)
- [Top Measures Used](#)

#### [Non-Instructional Findings](#)

- [PET Requirements](#)
  - [Breakouts by PET Area Classification](#)
- [Average Number of Outcomes](#)
- [Meeting Goals](#)
- [Meeting Outcomes](#)
- [Further Analysis of Outcomes](#)
- [Top Measures Used](#)

#### [Conclusions](#)

### **Introduction**

This report contains information from the 2010-2011 PET forms. The 2010-2011 PET forms contain objective/outcome results from the 2009-2010 year and detailed action plans for the 2010-2011 year.

Please Note: This report contains information for both previous improvements and action plans. However, the template that the “Person Responsible” for each PET form was given for the 2010-2011 year did not require that past improvements be documented. Therefore, anything in this report that was counted as a “past improvement” was done so post-PET submission by the Assessments Coordinator based on the information provided in the form under the “Analysis” or “Use of Results” column.

Also, please note that it was not required during the 2010-2011 planning period that a goal/outcome be linked to the strategic plan. Because so few departments/divisions/programs included any mention of the strategic plan on their 2010-2011 report, Strategic Plan information is not included in this report.

The PET methodology and instructional and non-instructional PET form information and findings can be found on the “[PET Methodology, Data Analysis, and Reports](#)” section of the Assessment & Development PET page. Original PET forms can be found in the electronic archives ([2002-2008](#); [2009-Most Recent](#)).

### **Instructional Findings**

All Instructional PET forms are comprised of Amarillo College educational programs.

### **PET Requirements**

Few people documented past improvements in their PET form (42%). As a result, the 2011-2012 PET template was revised so that the "Use of Results" section was further divided into two separate "Improvements" and "Actions" sections. No PET requirement area aside from past improvements scored below 70%.

<b>Total # of Instructional PET Forms</b>	62	
<b>Total # and Percent of Instructional PET Forms Submitted</b>	58	94%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Direct Outcome)</b>	56	90%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Result)</b>	54	87%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Analysis)</b>	50	81%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Previous Improvement)</b>	26	42%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Action Plan)</b>	45	73%

### **Average Numbers of Outcomes**

The outcome numbers were slightly skewed as some programs included over 20 outcomes on their PET forms and some programs included only 1 outcome. However, the average program had at least 3 outcomes on their form and 2 of those outcomes were typically direct.

<b>Total Number of Outcomes (All Forms)</b>	228
<b>Average Number of Instructional Outcomes</b>	3.7

<b>Total Number of Direct Outcomes (All Forms)</b>	148
<b>Average Number of Direct Instructional Outcomes</b>	2.4

### **Meeting Goals**

The degree to which a program does/does not meet a single or multiple outcomes under a goal is used to determine whether or not the overall goal was met, partially met, or not met.

The high percentage of un-assessed goals makes it seem that more emphasis needs to be put on helping the PET person responsible clarify their goal statements and assure that their goal is measurable.

<b>Total Goals</b>	169	
<b>Goals Met</b>	77	46%
<b>Goals Partially Met (Includes partially met outcomes and goals that had one outcome that was met/partially met and one outcome that was not assessed)</b>	14	8%
<b>Goals Not Met</b>	25	15%
<b>Goals Not Assessed (No Results): 13 New Goals; 18 No benchmark; 22 No results/unclear results</b>	53	31%

### Meeting Outcomes

Since many goals have only one outcome, it is not surprising that an analysis of the outcomes yielded similar results and that again more emphasis needs to be put on helping the PET person responsible clarify that their outcome statement is clear and measurable.

<b>Total Outcomes</b>	228	
<b>Outcomes Met</b>	118	52%
<b>Outcomes Partially Met</b>	11	5%
<b>Outcomes Not Met</b>	33	14%
<b>Outcomes Not Assessed (No Results): 15 New Outcomes; 19 No Benchmark; 33 No results/unclear results</b>	66	29%

### Further Analysis of Outcomes

The below tables illustrate the relationship between programs that met, partially met, did not meet, or produced an outcome that could not be assessed and that program's past improvement plans and future action plans.

The results show that the 58% who did not meet their goal did not make any improvements the previous year and that the 42% who did not meet their goal did not identify at least one concrete plan of action that would help them meet their goal. In other words, although there is no shame in not meeting a goal, more assistance needs to be given in assisting those responsible for PET forms in creating action plans that will generate different results.

# of Previous Improvements Made Per Outcome Type			# of Action Plans Scheduled for Next Academic Year By Outcome Type		
Met	16	14%	Met	42	36%
Partially Met	3	27%	Partially Met	7	64%
Not Met	14	42%	Not Met	19	58%
Not Assessed	11	16%	Not Assessed	27	40%

### Top Measures Used

The method that was used to assess the student learning and/or program objective could most easily be divided into the following categories:

<b>Top Ten Measures Used</b>		
<b>Measure</b>	<b># of Outcomes</b>	<b>% of Total Outcomes</b>
Exams (State, Capstone, or Locally Developed Exams)	45	20%
Surveys and Interviews	27	12%
Data: Enrollment, Retention, Transfer, and Graduate	24	11%
Employment	24	11%
Pre and Post Tests	20	9%
Program Goals (Add Classes, Attain Credentials, Etc.)	21	9%
Grades or Project Completion/Project Participation	18	8%
Juried Assessment/Appraisal	18	8%
Assignment Evaluated with Rubric, Tasklist, or Point Scale	15	7%
Embedded Questions/Exams/Quizzes	16	7%

### **Non-Instructional Findings**

All Non-Instructional PET forms are comprised of administrative support services, community/public service areas, educational programs, and academic and student support services.

### **PET Requirements**

No area was below 70% on the non-instructional PET requirements. However, it is important to note that some outcomes that were counted as direct outcomes were very weak. The weaker outcomes tended to be worded in a program-centered manner rather than a student or client-centered manner.

Also, although the non-instructional program PET improvement percentage was much higher than the instructional PET improvements percentage, the percentage difference is just as likely due to the fact that the Assessments Coordinator, who separated the Use of Results into the Improvements and Action fields, is more familiar with non-instructional programs than instructional programs and is therefore more easily able to deduce the past improvements that have been made for non-instructional programs.

<b>Total # of Non-Instructional (NI) PET Forms</b>	41	
<b>Total # and Percent of NI PET Forms Submitted</b>	37	90%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Direct Outcome)</b>	37	90%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Result)</b>	33	80%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Analysis)</b>	34	83%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Previous Improvement)</b>	31	76%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Action Plan)</b>	34	83%

### ***Breakouts by PET Area Classification (Improvements and Action Plans)***

The division of the non-instructional programs into the specific, breakout areas can be found on the [Assessment and Development website](#). The results show that the Educational Support Services have the greatest room to develop improvements and create action plans.

### **Administrative Support Services**

Total	14	
Number and Percent with Improvement	12	86%
Number and Percent with Action Plan	12	86%

### **Community/Public Service**

Total	8	
Number and Percent with Improvement	8	100%
Number and Percent with Action Plan	8	100%

### **Academic and Student Support Services**

Total	19	
Number and Percent with Improvement	11	58%
Number and Percent with Action Plan	14	74%

### Average Numbers of Outcomes

On average, each non-instructional PET area had 3 total outcomes and 2 of those outcomes were direct.

<b>Total Number of Outcomes (All Forms)</b>	124
<b>Average Number of Instructional Outcomes</b>	3.0

<b>Total Number of Direct Outcomes (All Forms)</b>	83
<b>Average Number of Direct Instructional Outcomes</b>	2.0

### Meeting Goals

The degree to which an area does/does not meet a single or multiple outcomes under a goal is used to determine whether or not the overall goal was met, partially met, or not met.

The high percentage of un-assessed goals makes it seem that more emphasis needs to be put on helping the PET person responsible clarify their goal statements and assure that their goal is measurable.

<b>Total Goals</b>	93	
<b>Goals Met</b>	29	31%
<b>Goals Partially Met</b>	5	5%
<b>Goals Not Met</b>	21	23%
<b>Goals Not Assessed (No Results/Unclear Results): 10 New Goals; 2 No benchmark; 26 No results/unclear results/Closed</b>	38	41%

### Meeting Outcomes

Since many goals have only one outcome, it is not surprising that an analysis of the outcomes yielded similar results and that again more emphasis needs to be put on helping the PET person responsible clarify that their outcome statement is clear and measurable.

<b>Total Outcomes</b>	124	
<b>Outcomes Met</b>	40	32%
<b>Outcomes Partially Met</b>	0	0%
<b>Outcomes Not Met</b>	31	25%
<b>Outcomes Not Assessed (No Results): 13 New Outcomes; 2 No Benchmark; 38 No results/unclear/closed results</b>	53	43%

### Further Analysis of Outcomes

The below tables illustrate the relationship between programs that met, partially met, did not meet, or produced an outcome that could not be assessed and that program's past improvement plans and future action plans.

The results for the "Not Met" Outcomes are identical to the Instructional results and show that the 58% who did not meet their goal did not make any improvements the previous year and that the 42% who did not meet their goal did not identify at least one concrete plan of action that would help them meet their goal. In other words, although there is no shame in not meeting a goal, more assistance needs to be given in assisting those responsible for PET forms in creating action plans that will generate different results.

# of Previous Improvements Made Per Outcome Type			# of Action Plans Scheduled for Next Academic Year By Outcome Type		
Met	26	65%	Met	20	50%
Partially Met	0	0%	Partially Met	0	0%
Not Met	13	42%	Not Met	18	58%
Not Assessed	14	26%	Not Assessed	16	30%

### Top Measures Used

The measures used for the non-instructional programs differed quite a bit from the instructional programs. As a result, brief definitions that describe the measure used are described below the table.

Top Five Measures Used		
Measure	# of Outcomes	% of Total Outcomes
Procedure Measure	49	40%
Training Measure	28	23%
Public Service Measure	27	22%
Student Success Measure	13	10%
Satisfaction Survey	7	6%

#### Non-Instructional Measures

1. Procedure Measure—
  - a. Change in what the department does to increase efficiency or to reach a department-centered goal.
  - b. Change in procedure to serve client/student that increases the client's/student's knowledge, skill, expertise, attitude, or behavior.
2. Training Measure— Training given to increase client/student knowledge. Tutoring practices and pre-test/post-test exercises were included in these measures. On appropriate occasions, receiving rather than giving training was also included under this category.
3. Public Service Measure—Change by the department that affects the client/student knowledge, skill, expertise, attitude, or behavior through information sharing or changing the way that information is shared to benefit the student/client.
4. Student Success Measure — Increase some aspect of student performance as a result of intervention.
5. Satisfaction Survey— Gauging the student/client's satisfaction level.

## **Conclusions**

The Instructional and Non-Instructional PET forms show similar strengths and weaknesses. The overall PET findings do not differ greatly from the individual PET Areas. Please view the table below to see overall Instructional and Non-Instructional PET performance data.

<b>Total # of PET Forms</b>	103	
<b>Total # and Percent of PET Forms Submitted</b>	95	92%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Direct Outcome)</b>	93	90%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Result)</b>	87	84%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Analysis)</b>	84	82%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Previous Improvement)</b>	57	55%
<b>Total PET forms (at least 1 Action Plan)</b>	79	77%

The Dean's council also met on December 14, 2011 and reviewed each 2010-2011 Instructional PET form. The [Dean's Council report](#) included the following conclusions:

- PET forms need to be functional and specific to institutional goals
- PET plans should produce action
- There needs to be increased focus on integrating the [5 No Excuses goals](#) into the PET forms

Based on all the findings, future PET trainings should highlight the following areas:

- Making measurable goals/outcomes
- Using outcomes that can be tracked for longer than a 1-year time frame so that at least one outcome has results
- How to document what you have already done (improvements)
- How to create an outcome statement that is student/client centered rather than program/division centered
- How to create a plan of action when you are already doing well and more importantly how to create a plan of action when you are not meeting your goals
- How to better integrate the No Excuses goals into the PET process