



# Amarillo College Planning and Evaluation Tracking (PET) Report

---

*2011-2012*

Division of Planning & Advancement  
Office of Outcomes Assessment

---

*Summer 2012 Data Compilation Based on 2011-2012 PET Forms*

## Table of Contents

<b>Overview</b> .....	<b><a href="#">1</a></b>
<b>Instructional PET Form Findings</b> .....	<b><a href="#">1</a></b>
Evaluation of Results and Areas for Improvement.....	<a href="#">1</a>
Highest Scoring Areas .....	<a href="#">1</a>
Lowest Scoring Areas .....	<a href="#">2</a>
Findings Based on Benchmark Data.....	<a href="#">2</a>
Dean’s Council Findings .....	<a href="#">2</a>
Instructional Plan of Action for 2012-2013 Year.....	<a href="#">3</a>
Supplementary Information: Instructional Data Compilation .....	<a href="#">3</a>
<b>Non-Instructional PET Form Findings</b> .....	<b><a href="#">6</a></b>
Evaluation of Results and Areas for Improvement.....	<a href="#">6</a>
Highest Scoring Areas .....	<a href="#">6</a>
Lowest Scoring Areas .....	<a href="#">6</a>
Findings Based on Benchmark Data.....	<a href="#">6</a>
Non-Instructional Assessment Committee Findings.....	<a href="#">7</a>
Non-Instructional Plan of Action for 2012-2013 Year.....	<a href="#">8</a>
Supplementary Information: Non-Instructional Data Compilation .....	<a href="#">8</a>
<b>Additional Breakout Report Findings</b> .....	<b><a href="#">10</a></b>
PET Form Connection to No Excuses Initiatives .....	<a href="#">10</a>
PET Form Connection to Strategic Plan Initiatives .....	<a href="#">10</a>
PET Form Connection to the Budget .....	<a href="#">11</a>
PET Response Forms .....	<a href="#">11</a>

---

## **Overview**

Each Amarillo College instructional and non-instructional program operates with the assistance of a Planning and Evaluation Tracking (PET) form. The PET process serves as a vehicle for programs to analyze results and create plans that will allow each program to achieve meaningful goals.

The purpose of this report is to compile and evaluate the findings from the 2011-2012 PET planning cycle and use the findings in a way that spurs institutional improvement.

The logistics that guide the PET process can be viewed by accessing Amarillo College's [PET methodology](#). Additionally, the data used to guide this report can be found on the [PET Data and Reports Web page](#) and in the [electronic archives](#).

## **Instructional Findings**

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

### **Evaluation of Results and Areas for Improvement**

#### **Highest Scoring Areas**

Overall, the instructional programs performed very well in their efforts to meet the minimum PET requirements by scoring above 90% in 7 of the 9 evaluated areas.

The highest scoring -instructional PET requirement areas (90% or higher) were as follows:

- Percent of PET Forms Submitted
- Percent that Included at Least 1 Goal and Objective/Outcome Linked to the Strategic Plan
- Percent that Included at Least 1 Direct Outcome
- Percent that Provided at Least 1 Set of Results
- Percent that Provided at Least 1 Analysis
- Percent that Provided at Least 1 Action Plan
- Percent that Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan

#### **Lowest Scoring Areas**

The only requirement areas that fell below the 90% mark are as follows:

- 1) Creating a Purpose Statement for the Program – 89% of the programs provided a purpose statement.
  - The purpose statement has since been integrated into the PowerPoint for the 2012-2013 PET Workshop Trainings.
- 2) Identifying Past Improvement Efforts – 84% of the programs identified past improvements.
  - The percentile of programs that have not made past improvements is indicative of the fact that many programs have added new objectives/outcomes based on new PET requirements (e.g. adding an outcome linked to the strategic plan) and have therefore not yet had the opportunity to make improvements.
  - It is also noteworthy that one division (CTE) had the lowest percentage in the improvement's area (69%) and that this percentage brought down the overall results.
  - Many of the PET forms, across the divisions, included very weak, vague evidence of improvements and action plans and it is apparent that more emphasis needs to be placed in future trainings on the cyclical nature of the PET form and on providing concrete examples of improvements and plans of action.

## Findings Based on Benchmark Data

Benchmark data is periodically reviewed to determine if program's who do not meet their intended benchmark are successfully forming action plans. This year's benchmark data reveals a high number (38 of 217) and percentage (18%) of new objectives/outcomes. The high percentage of new goals can likely be attributed to the new requirement that at least one goal link to the strategic plan.

A few areas for further evaluation are as follows:

- 1) Deciding How to Handle Variations in Benchmarks
  - Some programs continually meet their benchmarks, but set low (e.g. 60%) benchmarks and some program do not meet their benchmark, but set extremely high (100%) benchmarks.
- 2) Deciding the Criteria for How Much Information in an Action Plan is Sufficient
- 3) Deciding How to Guide People With New Goals in the Creation of Action Plans
  - Currently, some people provide action plans for new goals and some people do not provide action plans for new goals. Although some people use the first year as a time to collect data so they can then effectively pick a benchmark of where they would like to be in comparison to their current status, some programs could still use assistance in forming clear objectives/outcomes that guide them as they in goals obtainment.

## Dean's Council Findings

### 2011-2012

The Dean's Council will meet and review the 2011-2012 PET form data in the 2012-2013 year. After the council has met, this report will be amended to include the Dean's Council's findings and a link to the council minutes will be included in this section.

### Status on 2010-2011 Dean Council Recommendations

After the [December 14, 2011 review](#) of the 2010-2011 PET forms, the Dean's Council made three primary recommendations. The table below shows each recommendation's status based on actions taken by the Office of Outcomes Assessment and based on 2011-2012 PET form findings.

Dean's Council 2010-2011 Primary Recommendations	Status
PET forms need to be functional and specific to institutional goals.	<b>Partially Complete (Scheduled to be Complete 2012-2013)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>For the 2011-2012 PET forms, each program was required to link at least one PET goal and objective/outcome to AC's strategic plan strategies/tactics.</li><li>For the 2012-2013 Year, each program will be required to link to at least one PET goal and objective/outcome to a No Excuse's goal and/or initiative.</li></ul>
PET plans should produce action.	<b>Incomplete (Scheduled to be Complete 2012-2013)</b> <p>Although the percentage of instructional programs that provided "action" plans is above 90%, many of the action plan remained extremely weak and vague for the 2011-2012 PET cycle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>For 2012-2013, sample action plan examples were added to the PET training PowerPoint.</li><li>For 2012-2013, the PET Response Forms will be returned to each individual who submits a PET form in a more timely manner so that vague, unclear, etc. action plans can be expanded upon and the final, submitted PET form will include much improved action plans.</li></ul>
There needs to be increased focus on integrating the <a href="#">5 No Excuses goals</a> into the PET forms.	<b>Incomplete (Scheduled to be Complete 2012-2013)</b> <p>Although, many programs did include a direct or indirect link to a No Excuses goal in the 2011-2012 PET form, it was not a requirement. For those who did include a link to a No Excuses goal/initiative, no action plan or a limited action plan was typically provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>For 2012-2013, it will be a requirement that all programs provide a link to a No Excuses goal or initiative within their PET form.</li><li>For 2012-2013, emphasis will be place on giving everyone the needed knowledge to produce strong action plans for a variety of objective/outcome types.</li></ul>

## Instructional Assessment Plan of Action for 2012-2013 Year

<b><u>Plan Based on Assessment Data Analysis</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use divisional breakout data to identify the PET requirement areas that need the most emphasis in the 2012-2013 PET Form Workshops.</li> <li>• Because the current year's action plan can be the following year's evidence of improvement, it is recommended that spot checking between annual PET forms should occur in order to determine whether or not programs are actually following through with their action plans.</li> <li>• Train the committees to use the response forms as a real guide in offering areas for improvement in the "Comments" section.</li> </ul>
<b><u>Plan Based on Dean's Council 2010-2011 Report</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrate "No Excuses" goals/initiatives into the 2012-2013 PET cycle.</li> <li>• While training the instructional assessment committee to evaluate PET forms, emphasize the need for clear, strong action plans. Request that the PET response forms include comments related to all areas (including weak or non-existent action plans) that need improvement.</li> <li>• Ensure that response forms are returned to each person responsible for a PET form in a timely manner so that each person is given ample opportunity to revise his/her PET form.</li> </ul>

## Supplementary Information: Instructional Data Compilation

More information on how each individual program met the PET requirements can be found in the [2011-2012 Instructional PET Form's workbook](#).

### **Minimum PET Requirement Data and Benchmark Data**

#### *Degree to Which Instructional Programs Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of Instructional PET Forms</b>	61	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	59	97%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	54	89%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	59	97%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	55	90%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	56	92%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	55	90%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	51	84%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	57	93%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	57	93%

#### *Degree to Which Academic Success Division Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of Academic Success Division PET Forms</b>	4	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	4	100%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	3	75%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	4	100%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	3	75%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	4	100%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	4	100%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	3	75%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	4	100%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	4	100%



*Degree to Which Arts & Sciences Division Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of Arts &amp; Sciences Division PET Forms</b>	24	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	23	96%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	20	83%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	23	96%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	23	96%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	22	92%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	22	92%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	23	96%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	23	96%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	23	96%

*Degree to Which Career & Technical Education (CTE) Division Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of CTE Division PET Forms</b>	16	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	16	100%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	15	94%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	16	100%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	13	81%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	14	88%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	13	81%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	11	69%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	14	88%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	14	88%

*Degree to Which Health Sciences Division Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of CTE Division PET Forms</b>	17	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	16	94%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	16	94%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	16	94%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	16	94%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	16	94%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	16	94%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	14	82%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	16	94%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	16	94%

### **Benchmark-Related Data**

The following data shows the degree (numbers and percentages) to which objectives/outcomes achieved their intended benchmark.

<b>Total 2011-2012 Instructional PET Objectives/Outcomes</b>	217	
<b>Met</b>	100	46%
<b>Partially Met</b>	11	5%
<b>Not Met</b>	45	21%
<b>Unable to Determine if Benchmark Met</b>	61	28%

#### *Met Objective/Outcome Benchmarks:*

The following data breakdown shows the degree to which programs who met an intended objective/outcome's benchmark have formed action plans and/or discontinued that objective/outcome.

<b>Total "MET" Benchmarks</b>	100	
<b>Total that Met Benchmark and Have an Action Plan</b>	64	64%
<b>Total that Met Benchmark and Do Not Have an Action Plan</b>	30	30%
<b>Total that Met Benchmark and are Discontinuing their Objective/Outcome</b>	6	6%

#### *Partially Met Objective/Outcome Benchmarks:*

The following data breakdown shows the degree to which programs who partially met an intended objective/outcome's benchmark have formed action plans and/or discontinued that objective/outcome.

<b>Total "PARTIALLY MET" Benchmarks</b>	11	
<b>Total that Partially Met Benchmark and Have an Action Plan</b>	10	91%
<b>Total that Partially Met Benchmark and Do Not Have an Action Plan</b>	1	9%

#### *Not Met Objective/Outcome Benchmarks:*

The following data breakdown shows the degree to which programs who did not meet an intended objective/outcome's benchmark have formed action plans and/or discontinued that objective/outcome.

<b>Total "Not MET" Benchmarks</b>	45	
<b>Total that Did Not Meet Benchmark and Have an Action Plan</b>	34	76%
<b>Total that Did Not Meet Benchmark and Do Not Have an Action Plan</b>	7	16%
<b>Total that Did Not Meet Benchmark, but Have Discontinued their Objective/Outcome</b>	4	9%

#### *Unable to Determine if Objective/Outcome Benchmarks Met:*

The following data breakdown shows the degree to which programs who have not provided information sufficient to determining whether or not an objective/outcome's benchmark was met have formed action plans and/or discontinued that objective/outcome. In some instances (e.g. new objectives/outcomes), data would not yet be available so the below table breaks the "unable to determine" section into further subsections.

<b>Total "Unable to Determine" Benchmarks</b>	61	
<b>Unable to Determine (UTD) Because New Objective/Outcome (Data Not Yet Available)</b>		
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Have an Action Plan</b>	26	43%
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Do Not Have an Action Plan</b>	12	20%
<b>Unable to Determine (UTD) Because No Data/Insufficient/Unclear Data Provided (Additional Notes Provided for this Categorization in <a href="#">Excel Workbook</a>)</b>		
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Have an Action Plan</b>	14	23%
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Do Not Have an Action Plan</b>	3	5%
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Have Discontinued their Objective/Outcome</b>	6	10%

## **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.

### **Evaluation of Results and Areas for Improvement**

#### **Highest Scoring Areas**

Overall, the non-instructional programs scored at or above 90% in 4 of the 9 evaluated areas.

The highest scoring non-instructional PET requirement areas (90% or higher) were as follows:

- Percent of PET Forms Submitted
- Percent that Included at Least 1 Goal and Objective/Outcome Linked to the Strategic Plan
- Percent that Provided at Least 1 Action Plan
- Percent that Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan

#### **Lowest Scoring Areas**

The requirement areas that fell below the 90% mark are as follows:

1. Creating a Purpose Statement for the Program – 86% of the programs provided a purpose statement.
  - The purpose statement has since been integrated into the PowerPoint for the 2012-2013 PET Workshop Trainings.
2. Including Direct Outcomes – 79% of the programs provided a direct outcome.
  - Examples of direct outcomes have since been integrated into the PowerPoint for the 2012-2013 PET Workshop Trainings.
3. Including a Sufficient Set of Results and also Including a Sufficient Analysis of the Results – 76% of the programs included a set of results and analyzed those results.
  - Examples of quantitative and qualitative results and analysis have since been integrated into the PowerPoint for the 2012-2013 PET Workshop Trainings.
4. Identifying Past Improvement Efforts – 72% of the programs identified past improvements.
  - The percentile of programs that have not made past improvements is indicative of the fact that many programs have added new objectives/outcomes based on new PET requirements (e.g. adding an outcome linked to the strategic plan) and have therefore not yet had the opportunity to make improvements.
  - Many of the PET forms, across the programs, included very weak, vague evidence of improvements and action plans and it is apparent that more emphasis needs to be placed in future trainings on the cyclical nature of the PET form and on providing concrete examples of improvements and plans of action.

#### **Findings Based on Benchmark Data**

Benchmark data is periodically reviewed to determine if program's who do not meet their intended benchmark are successfully forming action plans. This year's benchmark data reveals a high number (37 of 116) and percentage (32%) of new objectives/outcomes. The high percentage of new goals can likely be attributed to the new requirement that at least one goal link to the strategic plan.

A few areas for further evaluation are as follows:

- 1) Deciding How to Handle Variations in Benchmarks
  - Some programs continually meet their benchmarks, but set low (e.g. 60%) benchmarks and some program do not meet their benchmark, but set extremely high (100%) benchmarks.



- 2) Deciding How to Put More Emphasis on Creating Meaningful Goals or Not Giving Up on Goals
  - 21% of those who did not meet their benchmarks discontinued their objective/outcome without citing a reason.
  - 33% of those who only partially met their benchmarks discontinued their objective/outcome without citing a reason.
- 3) Deciding How to Guide People With New Goals in the Creation of Action Plans
  - Currently, some people provide action plans for new goals and some people do not provide action plans for new goals. Although some people use the first year as a time to collect data to see where they are so they can effectively pick a benchmark of where they would like to be, some programs could probably still use assistance in forming clear objectives/outcomes that will guide them as they attempt to obtain their goals.
- 4) Deciding how to aid in plan implementation and data gathering.
  - 5% of the total objectives/outcomes were discontinued because the person responsible for the PET form felt as though they did not have the needed endorsement to follow through on their objectives/outcomes.
  - Data that was not readily available was requested from IR and therefore not provided to the program. IR has developed a request process so that programs sure receive a response and/or any work around methods or other options to programs who request data that is no supplied.

## Non-Instructional Assessment Committee Findings

### **Status on 2011-2012 Non-Instructional Assessment Committee Recommendations**

The Non-Instructional Assessment Committee reviewed all of the PET forms for the first time on [June 27, 2012](#). As a result of that review, recommendations were made for the 2012-2013 academic year.

<b>Non-Instructional Assessment Committee Primary Recommendations</b>	<b>Status</b>
PET plans need to contain more explicit information and have less ambiguous action plans.	<b>Incomplete (Scheduled to be Re-emphasized 2012-2013)</b> Although the percentage of non-instructional programs that provided “action” plans is right at 90%, many of the action plans were weak and vague. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 2012-2013, sample action plan examples were added to the PET training PowerPoint.</li> <li>• For 2012-2013, the PET Response Forms will be returned to each individual who submits a PET form in a more timely manner so that vague, unclear, etc. action plans can be expanded upon and the final, submitted PET form will include much improved action plans.</li> </ul>
Everything in the PET forms needs to tie together	<b>Incomplete (Scheduled to be Re-emphasized 2012-2013)</b> For 2012-2013, programs will be encouraged, in the revamped trainings, to ask themselves a series of questions before submitting their PET form. Sample Questions: could an external reviewer tell if I met my objective/outcome based on the data provided in my results and analysis? Do my improvements clearly relate to my objective/outcome? Etc.
The budgetary information needs to be included, as much as possible, in the PET forms.	<b>Incomplete (Scheduled to be Re-emphasized 2012-2013)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For 2012-2013, the wording on the budget portion of the PET template will be reworded to request any budget implications.</li> <li>• The Non-Instructional Assessment Committee will continue to look for a “success story” so that we can show that there is a purpose to including budgetary ties in the PET form.</li> </ul>

## Non-Instructional Assessment Plan of Action for 2012-2013 Year

<b><u>Plan Based on Assessment Data Analysis</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use categorical breakout data to identify the PET requirement areas that need the most emphasis in the 2012-2013 PET Form Workshops.</li> <li>• Because the current year's action plan can be the following year's evidence of improvement, it is recommended that spot checking between annual PET forms should occur in order to determine whether or not programs are actually following through with their action plans.</li> <li>• It is recommended that programs who do not achieve, but discontinue their goals be asked to provide a brief explanation on their PET forms.</li> <li>• Train the committees to use the response forms as a real guide in offering areas for improvement in the "Comments" section.</li> </ul>
<b><u>Plan Based on Non-Instructional Assessment Committee Report</u></b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tweak the budgetary section of the PET template.</li> <li>• While training the instructional assessment committee to evaluate PET forms, emphasize the need for clear, strong action plans. Request that the PET response forms include comments related to all areas (including weak or non-existent action plans) that need improvement.</li> <li>• Emphasize the importance of critical thinking questioning to those who complete a PET form (Does it make sense? Does it all tie together?)</li> <li>• Ensure that response forms are returned to each person responsible for a PET form in a timely manner so that each person is given ample opportunity to revise his/her PET form.</li> </ul>

## Supplementary Information: Non-Instructional Data Compilation

More information on how each individual program met the PET requirements can be found in the [2011-2012 Non-Instructional PET Form's workbook](#).

### Minimum PET Requirement Data and Benchmark Data

#### *Degree to Which Non-Instructional Programs Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of Non-Instructional PET Forms</b>	29	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	26	90%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	25	86%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	26	90%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	23	79%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	22	76%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	22	76%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	21	72%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	26	90%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	26	90%

#### *Degree to Which Academic and Student Support Areas Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of Academic and Student Support Area PET Forms</b>	15	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	13	87%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	13	87%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	13	87%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	13	87%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	12	80%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	12	80%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	11	73%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	13	87%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	13	87%

*Degree to Which Administrative Support Areas Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of Administrative Support Area PET Forms</b>	9	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	8	89%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	8	89%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	8	89%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	6	67%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	6	67%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	6	67%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	6	67%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	8	89%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	8	89%

*Degree to Which Community and Public Service Areas Met Minimum PET Requirements*

<b>Total # of Community and Public Service Area PET Forms</b>	5	
<b>PET Forms Submitted</b>	5	100%
<b>Provided Program Purpose Statement</b>	4	80%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Goal and Outcome that Link to Strategic Plan</b>	5	100%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Direct Outcome</b>	4	80%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Set of Results</b>	4	80%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Analysis</b>	4	80%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement</b>	4	80%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Action Plan</b>	5	100%
<b>Provided at Least 1 Past Improvement or Action Plan</b>	5	100%

**Benchmark-Related Data**

The following data shows the degree (numbers and percentages) to which objectives/outcomes achieved their intended benchmark.

<b>Total 2011-2012 Non-Instructional PET Objectives/Outcomes</b>	116	
<b>Met</b>	34	29%
<b>Partially Met</b>	9	8%
<b>Not Met</b>	24	21%
<b>Unable to Determine if Benchmark Met</b>	49	42%

*Met Objective/Outcome Benchmarks:*

The following data breakdown shows the degree to which programs who met an intended objective/outcome's benchmark have formed action plans and/or discontinued that objective/outcome.

<b>Total "MET" Benchmarks</b>	34	
<b>Total that Met Benchmark and Have an Action Plan</b>	20	59%
<b>Total that Met Benchmark and Do Not Have an Action Plan</b>	5	15%
<b>Total that Met Benchmark and are Discontinuing their Objective/Outcome</b>	9	26%

*Partially Met Objective/Outcome Benchmarks:*

The following data breakdown shows the degree to which programs who partially met an intended objective/outcome's benchmark have formed action plans and/or discontinued that objective/outcome.

<b>Total "PARTIALLY MET" Benchmarks</b>	9	
<b>Total that Partially Met Benchmark and Have an Action Plan</b>	4	44%
<b>Total that Partially Met Benchmark and Do Not Have an Action Plan</b>	2	22%
<b>Total that Partially Met Benchmark and are Discontinuing their Objective/Outcome</b>	3	33%

#### *Not Met Objective/Outcome Benchmarks:*

The following data breakdown shows the degree to which programs who did not meet an intended objective/outcome's benchmark have formed action plans and/or discontinued that objective/outcome.

<b>Total "Not MET" Benchmarks</b>	24	
<b>Total that Did Not Meet Benchmark and Have an Action Plan</b>	18	75%
<b>Total that Did Not Meet Benchmark, but Have Discontinued their Objective/Outcome</b>	5	21%
<b>Total that Did Not Meet Benchmark, but Have Discontinued their Objective/Outcome because Lacked Endorsement to Implement Action Plan</b>	1	4%

#### *Unable to Determine if Objective/Outcome Benchmarks Met:*

The following data breakdown shows the degree to which programs who have not provided information sufficient to determining whether or not an objective/outcome's benchmark was met have formed action plans and/or discontinued that objective/outcome. In some instances (e.g. new objectives/outcomes), data would not yet be available so the below table breaks the "unable to determine" section into further subsections.

<b>Total "Unable to Determine" Benchmarks</b>	49	
<b>Unable to Determine (UTD) Because New Objective/Outcome (Data Not Yet Available)</b>		
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Did Have an Action Plan</b>	31	69%
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Did Not Have an Action Plan</b>	6	12%
<b>Unable to Determine (UTD) and Discontinued Because Lack Endorsement</b>		
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Have Discontinued their Objective/Outcome</b>	4	8%
<b>Unable to Determine (UTD) Because No Data/Insufficient/Unclear Data Provided (Additional Notes Provided for this Categorization in Excel Workbook)</b>		
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Did Have an Action Plan</b>	6	12%
<b>UTD if Met Benchmark and Did Not Have an Action Plan</b>	2	4%

## **Additional Breakout Report Findings**

### **PET Form Connection to No Excuses Initiatives**

Although it was not an official PET requirement for the 2011-2012 PET form, 64 out of 90 (71%) instructional and non-instructional programs provided at least one objective/outcome on their PET form that directly or indirectly related to a No Excuse's initiative.

To view more information about No Excuses, more findings, and the categorized PET information, please view the [Planning and Evaluation Tracking Form Connection to No Excuses Initiatives](#) document.

### **PET Form Connection to Strategic Plan Initiatives**

For 2011-2012 it was required that each instructional and non-instructional program contain at least one link to a strategic plan strategy and tactic in their PET form.

To view the various sections of the *AC Strategic Plan through 2015* that were addressed through the PET forms, please view the [Planning and Evaluation Tracking Form Connection to Institutional Strategic Plans](#) document.

## PET Form Connection to the Budget

It has been expected that programs connect their planning to the budget. However, the PET form was reworked in 2010 (2011-2012 planning year) to include a specific space for budgetary information. Although it is not yet a PET requirement, many more programs successfully demonstrated a connection to the budget in the 2011-2012 PET forms as compared to the 2010-2011 PET forms.

### **Instructional Programs to Provide Budgetary Information:**

Year	2011-2012	2010-2011
Percentage	48%	16%

### **Non-Instructional Programs to Provide Budgetary Information:**

Year	2011-2012	2010-2011
Percentage	69%	39%

To view how instructional and non-instructional programs have been connecting to the budget, please view the 2010-2012 [Planning and Evaluation Tracking Budget Information](#) document.

## PET Response Forms

Each instructional and non-instructional program that submits a PET form will receive a response form that will aid in future objective/outcome and programmatic improvements. Upon receiving the response form, each program has the opportunity to make any needed adjustments to their PET form.

To view more information about the PET response form process or to view the response forms and/or communication between the program and Division of Planning and Advancement please view the [2011-2012 Planning and Evaluation Tracking Form Response Form Compilation](#) document.

Each of the additional breakout reports helps the information be analyzed in a way that supports Planning & Advancement's desire to create a culture of continuous improvement.