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Amarillo College Goals and Curriculum Map Report

2015-2016 Methodology and Findings

Methodology

*Creating the Framework for Upcoming Expectations*

1. In the 2015SP term, the VPAA council set down and discussed [high-impact practices](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/564).  Based on a rubric the VPAA members were given, each division and branch campus, [provided an outline of their highest-impact practices](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/563). These high-impact practice outlines were evaluated with a [rubric.](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/565) The VPAA members were expected to use the knowledge gained from this exercise to ensure the programs in their areas increase in the usage and reporting of high-impact practices.

 *Forming Program Goals*

1. Each academic program and developmental education area were notified that they were expected to form program/developmental education goals over the summer and to submit these goals by the beginning of the 2016FA term. Each program was given [guidelines to assist them in creating goals](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/567) and a [rubric](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/566). The basic criteria laid out on the rubric was used to [provide the programs with feedback](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/568). Programs were all provided feedback and given the opportunity to update their goals/outcomes.

*Forming Curriculum Maps and Receiving Feedback*

1. Programs [received training](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/561) on how to create curriculum maps at the 8-9-15 all-faculty fall meeting. Following the meeting, programs/developmental education areas were sent [templates and trainings materials](https://www.actx.edu/ie/index.php?module=pagesmith&uop=view_page&id=80). Programs were asked to submit their curriculum maps by December 1, 2016.
2. Programs submitted their curriculum maps and [review teams made up of 2 reviewers](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/562) appointed by their academic deans reviewed each map that was submitted on time and [provided feedback](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/591). Programs were once again given the opportunity to provide updates to their maps based on the committee feedback and the [final versions](https://www.actx.edu/archives/index.php?module=pagesmith&uop=view_page&id=62) of their maps were posted to the AC Web site.

*Using Curriculum Maps to Lead Program Student Learning Outcome (PSLO) Assessment*

1. Deans were notified in February and programs shortly after that they would use their curriculum maps to [report out](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/576) their outcome assessment results. As with the goal and curriculum map processes, programs were also provided a [rubric template](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/577) to ensure they meet the institution’s standards. For the 2015-2016 year the focus at AC is on the outcomes that most align with the communication, critical thinking, and empirical and quantitative skills general education competencies. For the 2016-2017 year, the focus at AC will be on the outcomes that most align with the personal responsibility, social responsibility, and teamwork competencies. If an outcome touches on multiple competencies or if a program is heavy on a certain set of competencies, the program will just select a 2-year cycle on which to report that outcome data.

The Program Student Learning Outcome report findings will be provided and analyzed in a follow-up report.

Goal Findings

All instructional programs except for one technical education area submitted program-level goals. After the programs received feedback on their goals and/or began to form their curriculum map and really began to consider what constitutes an appropriate program-level goal versus what truly serves as more of a course-level goal that is not truly appropriate for all-program assessment, almost every program made at least some edits to their original goals/outcomes.

As a results of the large number of goal/outcome changes that occurred between the goal draft stage and finalized curriculum map process stage, the focus in this report will be on how programs met the institution’s expectations during the curriculum map stage as opposed to the earliest, initial goal/outcome development stage.

Mapping of Degree Codes to Program Names
Each Amarillo College degree code and developmental education area needed to be addressed in the curriculum map. As a result, 130 total degree codes were mapped to 69 program areas. Each degree code’s courses are represented on the program maps. The number of program areas is so few as compared to the number of degree codes because many of AC’s programs are comprised of stackable credentials where one set of courses leads into another program and related courses. Also, in some cases, the program coordinator for one program is responsible for other programs and as a result, they opted to include maps for each of their program areas in one form. In either case, the mapping process and individual evaluations of each area can be reviewed on the [CM Records document](https://www.actx.edu/ie/filecabinet/592).

Curriculum Map Findings

As referenced above, many programs began to edit their goals/outcomes prior to receiving the “official” feedback form the committee. However, during the official and final feedback periods, data was tallied to identify which programs met the minimum expectation of “good” (3 rating) on the rubric criteria.

|  |
| --- |
| 2015-2016 Curriculum Map Findings |
|  | Yes | No |
| Submitted Curriculum Map\* | 68 of 72 Areas (94%)or 98% of expected major codes | 4 (6%) |
| Received All “3” Rankings Based on Initial Committee Review | 27 (40%) | 41 (61%) |
| Submitted Purpose Statement Update | 65 (96%) | 3 (4%) |
| Chose to Submit Edits to their Maps (Other than Purpose Statement) Based on Committee Feedback | 22 (32%) | 46 (53%) |
| Received All “3” Rankings At Conclusion of Process | 62 (91%) | 6 (9%) |

\*Of those areas expected to submit curriculum maps (only general studies was not expected to submit a map due to the fact that their curriculum literally crosses every program), the only areas to not submit were two areas that actually requested program deactivation during the 2015-2016 year, a program that plans to deactivate in the 2016-2017 year, and a program that changes curriculum (moved from a level-2 to a level-1 certificate) in the 2015-2016 year.

As programs continued to refine their goals, outcomes, and curriculum maps, throughout this process they greatly improved the quality of their product. Even in the final map formation stages, many program chose to continue to edit their maps to ensure that it was evident that their curriculum is coherent and that they included quality, assessable goals and outcomes on their curriculum maps.

Next Steps Current Year

1. Programs will submit their 2015-2016 goal/outcome assessment data, findings, and improvements made/plans for improvement.
2. Programs will receive feedback on their 2015-2016 reports.

Next Steps Next Year

1. Existing Programs: Existing programs will need to review their curriculum maps from 2015-2016 and make any needed/desired updates.
2. New Programs: New programs will need to form goals and outcomes and create their own curriculum map and plan for assessment.