

DRAFT B



Non-Instructional Program Review Guidelines (NIPR)

Academic Year 2008-09

Department:

Self Study Chair:

Date Submitted:

DRAFT B

Non-Instructional Program Review Guidelines, 2008-2009

FOREWORD

The primary aim of the Non-Instructional Program Review (NIPR) is to provide ACC staff in administrative and educational support service areas a framework for identifying vital services and intended outcomes and to create a plan for achieving and continually improving those services and outcomes.

The Non-Instructional Program Review is a representative, responsive form of self-regulation to ensure continued improvement in ACC's administrative and educational support service areas and, as such, is an instance of Servant Leadership in the shared governance of Austin Community College.

Additionally, Non-Instructional Program Review meets certain requirements of the Commission on Colleges and the Austin Community College Board of Trustees. The following SACS Principles of Accreditation and ACC Board Policy broadly address the need for and manner of assessment.

SACS Core Requirement 2.5: The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (Institutional Effectiveness)

SACS Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1: The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (Institutional Effectiveness)

- 3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
- 3.3.1.2 administrative support services
- 3.3.1.3 educational support services
- 3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate
- 3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate

ACC Board Policy E-4: The President shall ensure that all units of the College are evaluated annually by faculty, staff, and students for effectiveness, efficiency, and policy compliance.

DRAFT B

Austin Community College Non-Instructional Program Review Guidelines

Table of Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	2
<i>Introduction</i>	4
<i>Principles</i>	4
<i>Purpose</i>	5
<i>Five Review Questions</i>	5
<i>NIPR Process</i>	6
<i>Self-Study Chair and Committee</i>	6
<i>Goals</i>	6
<i>Outcomes</i>	7
<i>SWOT Analysis</i>	7
<i>Assessment</i>	8

DRAFT B

INTRODUCTION

Austin Community College often performs assessment in response to requests from external agencies like the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, and the U.S. Department of Education to name a few. ACC also performs assessment to measure critical administrative and educational support service areas to provide information on how we are meeting the needs and expectations of our students and other stakeholders. The Non-Instructional Program Review emphasizes this second use of assessment as a comprehensive, systematic, ongoing activity resulting in continuous improvement.

The products of the Non-Instructional Program Review are a written summary detailing goals, outcomes, a SWOT analysis, and a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) to target improvement of services and intended outcomes.

Not all improvements require additional fiscal, human, or physical resources. Some QIP improvements involve improved business practices and streamlining workflow to improve services and outcomes within the fixed limits of current resources. Non-Instructional Program Review and the resultant Quality Improvement Plan are intended to identify and implement these no-cost improvements.

On the other hand, some service area Quality Improvement Plans will require new fiscal, human, and physical resources to create or improve services and outcomes. When this is the case, QIP improvements that align with institutional priorities should be directed to appropriate cluster groups to be input into the Master Planning Database for review by institutional and budget authorities before adoption by college leadership. The benefit of dovetailing the NIPR and QIP with Master Planning is that approved initiatives may be funded for three years and not require annual budgetary renewal. For this reason, Non-Instructional Program Review is done on a three year cycle to coincide with rolling three year Master Planning / Budget cycles.

These Guidelines provide definitions of key terms and a step-by-step guide to the Non-Instructional Program Review process.

PRINCIPLES

- Non-Instructional Program Review is one component of ACC's institutional effectiveness and accountability processes
- Non-Instructional Program Review is an integral part of ACC's ongoing assessment, planning, and Master Planning processes
- Non-Instructional Program Review should not be burdensome to program review team members or to staff and administrators from areas under review
- Non-Instructional Program Review requires integrity for critical reflection, accurate assessment, and genuine follow-through

DRAFT B

PURPOSE

The purpose of the Non-Instructional Program Review process is to provide a common framework for administrators and staff as they

- Conduct a Non-Instructional Program Review, a critical assessment of administrative and educational support service areas and their contribution to the College's mission, and
- Create a three-year Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) that promotes each unit's continued improvement and that is incorporated into College's Master Planning process

Five Review Questions

1. What are the goals and primary services or outcomes provided by your administrative support service area or academic support service area and what is the impact of those services and outcomes on students and other key stakeholders? (Limit to the 5 most important services or outcomes)

Identify self-study chair and committee

- The appropriate administrative unit head will designate a self-study chair.
- The chair will appoint a self-study committee comprised of service area employees and key personnel or stakeholders from other areas to bring a broad range of perspectives and expertise to carry out the program review and to implement the improvement plan.

Identify administrative or educational support service area goals

- Goals are broad statements that describe what service area staff members are trying to accomplish collectively
- Goals align service area efforts with the college's larger Mission and Intended Outcomes
- Good goal statements may already appear in catalog descriptions, accreditation documents, in the job descriptions of unit staff members, or goal statements of other units or colleges.

DRAFT B

Identify the primary services or outcomes of the service area.

- Services and outcomes describe specific desired performance of services, processes, products, or other outcome that the service unit directly provides to students or other stakeholders.
 - Outcomes are results-oriented, often stated using explicit action verbs with specific criteria for success such as *increase by 10%*, *provide ten opportunities*, *5% improvement*, and so on
 - Depending on the scope of the support service area, one or two outcomes per goal is sufficient. Limit your outcomes to the *5 most important services or intended outcomes* you provide.
2. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats present that enhance or hinder your ability to provide those services and/or outcomes during the next three years? (This step requires a SWOT analysis as described below)

Identify Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT Analysis)

- For each identified service or outcome, the self-study team will perform a facilitated SWOT analysis to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that enhance or hinder the service area's ability to provide specified services and/or outcomes during the three-year program review cycle
- SWOT strengths and weaknesses describe the service area's internal capacities, while SWOT opportunities and threats are presented by the external environment
- For each service or outcome the committee should identify how to
 1. Use their Strength(s) to best advantage
 2. How to compensate for identified Weaknesses
 3. How to take advantage of each Opportunity
 4. How to minimize each Threat

- A matrix such as the following can be helpful identifying strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats

DRAFT B

	Helpful to achieving the outcome	Harmful to achieving the outcome
Internal Origin organizational	Strengths	Weaknesses
External Origin environmental	Opportunities	Threats

3. Using the answers to the first two questions, how will you improve primary services and/or intended outcomes during the next three years? (Identify proposed Master Planning initiatives or budgetary estimates necessary to improve services and outcomes)

Create a Quality Enhancement Plan to implement the improvements and how the improvements

- Document how you intend to improve business practices and streamline workflow to improve services and outcomes within the fixed limits of current resources
- Improvements requiring new fiscal, human, and physical resources to create or improve services and outcomes that align with institutional priorities should be documented in the QIP and be directed to appropriate cluster groups to be input into the Master Planning Database for review by institutional and budget authorities before adoption by college leadership.

4. How will you measure the extent to which planned improvements have resulted in better service or intended outcomes for students or other key stakeholders? (Identify at least 2 measures for each of the services or intended outcomes in item 1 above)

The primary purpose for assessment is to establish the extent to which the service area achieves improvement. Whether using existing measure or creating new ones

- Assessment should yield results that are valid and reliable

DRAFT B

- Provide information that is easily interpreted and communicated; can be timely completed within available resources
 - Arise out of participation and process ownership of the service area staff
 - Clearly illustrates continuous improvement in the service area.
5. How do your planned improvements align with and contribute to the Mission and Intended Outcomes of Austin Community College? (Mission and Intended Outcomes are outlined in Board Policy A-1)
- The QIP should tie service area improvements to the college's Mission and Intended Outcomes

The products of the Non-Instructional Program Review are a written summary detailing goals, outcomes, a SWOT analysis, and a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) to target improvement of services and intended outcomes. One approach would be to write a white paper documenting Steps 1 – 5 of these guidelines with graphical or tabular data incorporated into the document or attached as appendices.

Lastly, Non-Instruction Program Review, Summary, and Quality Improvement Plan is made to replace the Internal College Survey and, as such, provides necessary accreditation documentation.

Please send a copy of your Non-Instructional Program Review Summary and Quality Improvement Plan to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability.