Overview and Intent of PET

Each department or program of the College operates with a PET. The Planning, Evaluation and Tracking system is based on the expectation that departments and programs are replicating the AC Institutional Effectiveness Model as they measure important goals for their functions.

AC’s Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Model was designed by an adhoc group of involved personnel and sanctioned by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in 2000. The AC IE Model is predicated upon the explanation and graphic model provided by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) in the Resource Manual for Institutional Effectiveness. The SACS graph has been the basis of AC’s institutional effectiveness directions since 1990.

Timeline

The Planning, Evaluation and Tracking forms were initiated as a backbone for departmental/program planning in 1998. Every department or program of the College develops a PET form. The annual timeline for implementing and updating PET forms is as follows:

- **Fall** – Establish, alter or update the PET forms
- **Fall, Spring and/or Summer** – Assess the PET goals and capture results
- **Spring** – Use the results of PET as a key tool in Strategic Budget Planning

Responsible

Each division head (both instructional and non-instructional) is responsible for initiating an update of all PET forms in their area. Each department or program head is responsible for actually developing or updating the PET with input from their personnel.

Assessment

Assessment information may be available through specific departmental or division measures, college-wide measures usually depicted in Databook or Strategic Plan, or other measures. Contact the offices of Institutional Research and Institutional Advancement to assist as needed in (1) the design of appropriate measures and (2) follow-up on the results of assessments.
PET Elements

The form elicits decisions regarding functions or outcomes to be measured. Directions for completing each element on the PET form are explained below.

**Purpose Statement:** Define the mission of your department/program. Provide a definition that (1) defines your area’s role(s), (2) is understandable to any reader, and (3) can be internalized as real for your area. Assure that your area’s purpose statement supports the mission statement of the institution.

**Goal Statements:** Determine 3-5 goals that you want to be the key measures of your area’s accomplishments and progress. You should be able to link each goal back to a relevant institutional goal.

**Assessment Tools/Standards:** For each program goal, identify the measures you are using. Specify the standard(s) you are attempting to reach.

- **Example:** 70% will pass with a grade of A - C
- **Identify the tools** you are using to determine the standard.
  - **Example:** grade analysis reports from Office of Institutional Research

**Results:** Provide the outcomes of assessment. Document results across two or more years to provide a history of comparison data if at all possible.

- **Example:** Pass rate -- Fall 1999 = 67%, Spring 2000 = 65%, Fall 2000 = 66%, Spring 2001 = 64%

**Use of Results:** When one or more year of results is available, decisions can be based on the outcomes. Explain how the results are being/were used to make changes or improvements in your area. Explain what is being/was changed (if anything).

- **Example:** Because the pass rate standard has not been met the following action is being taken for 2001-2002:
  1. Implement automated tutorial software requirement in appropriate courses. **Cost:** $200 per station x 5 computer stations in CAI Lab = $1000.
  2. Increase practice and pop tests from 2 to 4 per semester. **Cost:** None extra, use departmental supply budget.

Monitor results each semester and base further changes accordingly. Document on next PET. If standard is more nearly met, will consider requesting in a future budget 5 more units of automated tutorial software.

“Closing the Loop”

Documentation of the “use of results” and continued follow-up as appropriate facilitates the College’s ability to demonstrate that it “closes the loop” on the IE Model and embraces institutional effectiveness processes in all its operations. AC seeks continual improvement on a “quest for quality” throughout all its evaluation and planning efforts.