



Action Project #1: Create and offer options for learning based on customer requirements/goals.

Institution: Moraine Park Technical College

Contact Person: Janice Collins – jcollins@morainepark.edu -- 920-924-3287

Annual Update and Review: 2003

Description

This project will identify and frame issues and problems related to the College's program development process and the methods used to determine new programming. Current practices for new program development will be reviewed, and a structure will be developed and implemented to identify options for learning and educational experiences to serve the best interests of the College and its communities.

Related AQIP Criteria

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Primary | 1-Helping Students Learn |
| Related | 3-Understanding Students' and Other Stakeholders' Needs |
| Related | 7-Measuring Effectiveness |
| Related | None |
| Related | None |

Related AQIP Principles

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Principle | |
| Principle | |
| Principle | |
| Principle | |

Rationale for Action

The College is aware of changing needs and expectations of students. By enhancing the viability of the program development process, MPTC will provide cutting edge programming that will lead to employment for learners while at the same time be responsive to local employers' needs for well-trained employees. As a learning college, the focus needs to be on the learner and providing as many options for learning as possible. This project will allow the College to investigate new programming as well as determine learner's preferences for delivery method. As a result, MPTC will improve program efficiency (programs and classes will be full and thus more efficient to run). Learners will be satisfied and will return for additional training. As a result of increased FTEs, the College will receive additional state aids that can be used to improve curriculum and provide additional options for learning.

Areas Affected

- 1) Primary Learning System;
- 2) Instructional Design and Development;
- 3) Institutional Research/Customer Requirements Major Process Team

Processes Affected

- 1) New program development including environmental scanning and program needs assessment;
- 2) Program approval process;
- 3) Elements of Quality Programs (EQP) (program review process);
- 4) Academic advising;
- 5) Program/course enrollment;
- 6) Retention;
- 7) Course Scheduling

Process Measures

- 1) Number/type of new programs discussed and implemented;
- 2) Program review data (course efficiencies, FTEs);
- 3) Program enrollments processed;
- 4) Course withdrawals processed;
- 5) Drop/Add forms processed;
- 6) Program change forms processed

Outcome Measures

Annual tracking of the following measures would provide information on goal achievement:

- 1) Assessment of Student Learning;
- 2) Learner satisfaction;
- 3) Course completion rates;
- 4) Retention/withdrawal rates;
- 5) Graduate Follow-up Study;
- 6) Employer Satisfaction Survey

Performance Targets

| Year | Quantitative and Qualitative Stretch Targets |
|-------|---|
| One | Develop model for new program development that includes needs assessments that provide clear evidence of need for program and scheduling preferences. |
| Two | Develop and implement new program(s) utilizing needs assessments and state program development process. |
| Three | Track student satisfaction for new programs and delivery methods, and continuing in year four, to track student satisfaction and programmatic results, determine trends, and draw comparisons by benchmarking with similar colleges in the State WTCS System. |

Keeping Focus

As work at MPTC is accomplished through use of the existing team structure, teams would be charged with assuring that the energy of the College remains focused on this project and its goals, and achieves the desired outcomes. Progress can be reported to all staff on the Intranet website.

Contact Person Information:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| First Name: | Janice |
| Middle Initial: | A |
| Last Name: | Collins |
| Title: | Outcome Assessment/NCA Associate |
| Email: | jcollins@morainepark.edu |
| Phone: | 920-924-3287 |
| | |

Annual Update: 2003-09-19

A. Describe the past year's accomplishments and the current status of this Action Project.

Since the nationwide search of colleges to identify exemplary new program development processes did not result in components that we considered to be exemplary, the Academic Affairs Guidance and Support Team (AAGST) along with Institutional Advancement/Research brainstormed and identified the most important/essential building blocks to a new program development process. The key building blocks included: receiving and utilizing ideas from a variety of sources; establishing a follow-up process; establishing firm criteria to screen ideas; utilizing business partnerships; and incorporating up-to-date information on district employer needs. A small committee comprised of staff from Institutional Advancement and Resource Development/NCA expanded the nationwide search and investigated business and industry models for new product development. Using a business model as a base and keeping in mind the essential building blocks, the committee developed, from scratch, a program development process for Moraine Park (flowchart can be requested from Moraine Park). The Vice President of Teaching and Learning and AAGST reviewed the proposed process in Spring 2003. Feedback was very positive and adjustments were made to the process. AAGST recommended piloting the new program development process during the 2003-2004 academic year.

Review (10-31-03):

Apparently the first year national research did not result in the building blocks that your AAGST Team members were able to create. The Team must have had to conduct some essential environmental scanning in your service area and they are to be commended for that as well as reviewing the business/industry model for new product development. It appears that the new program development process is now implemented. However, were targets established for the number of new programs that might be piloted this year? Were training programs established to acquaint MPTC faculty/staff with their opportunities to identify new areas for program development? Your performance targets may have to be revised to include these steps since your current performance targets really focus on areas that come about after the new programs are piloted. A performance target and measure needs to be developed to identify a specific number of programs since it is expensive to pilot new programs and takes time to evaluate the results.

B. Describe how the institution involved people in work on this Action Project.

The Academic Affairs Guidance and Support Team is responsible for this project and makes all the decisions as to whether a new learning opportunity should move forward to the next phase within the process. Institutional Advancement/Research facilitates the process and provides extensive research support. This team also manages the Idea Vault or the Access database that is used to capture information for each new learning opportunity/need. College instructional partners, deans and associate deans share information from AAGST meetings with their unit and work

teams. AAGST and Institutional Advancement also work very closely with the Programming and Design work team, which coordinates the process for those ideas that move from Phase 5 to the state agency for a formal needs assessment process. Everyone at Moraine Park has the opportunity to submit new program or training ideas by filling out an Idea Vault worksheet (sheet can be requested from Moraine Park). This worksheet will be available on Moraine Park's Intranet site. In addition to Moraine Park staff, students, business leaders, advisory committee members, economic development groups/Workforce Development, and community members are also sources of inputs for new program/training ideas. Staff who work directly with these outside sources can simply submit a worksheet addressing the needs or learning opportunities gathered from these inputs.

Review (10-31-03):

While it appears the building blocks are in place, it seems that one or two new programmatic ideas should be piloted through the process that might even have the 10 month time collapsed since spending the college time and energy for 10 months with its concomitant curricular or major focus can be very expensive. Perhaps it is better to do a mini-timeframe to test the model - this is often the way a business model works. Perhaps this mini-model could be identified from some of your current environmental scanning and input from business/industry, or be one of the program ideas that you mention below that has progressed to the phase 3 stage. While it is good to obtain input from everyone, it is assumed that the AAGST will group ideas that fit together and focus on a particular academic program/major.

C. Describe your planned next steps for this Action Project.

AAGST recommended piloting the new program development process during the 2003-2004 academic year. The estimated timeline from new idea (Phase 1) to concept (Phase 5) is 10 months. After Phase 5, the program idea would enter the formal state needs assessment process. Having already gathered much of the required data, the state process should be expedited. Any learning opportunity or idea that warrants investigation as a certificate/short term training activity or current program modification can fall out of the formal phase process and follow the program modification or internal development process. These two alternative processes allow for quicker response time to community and business needs if a 1 or 2 year program is not necessary.

Review (10-31-03):

Having the opportunity for the short-term training or certificate program to be developed more rapidly has merit. They could then be evaluated and the determination can be made to further develop them into a full program.

D. Describe any "effective practice(s)" that resulted from your work on this Action Project.

After a successful pilot of the new process during the 2003-2004 academic year, new leading edge programs, in addition to certificate or short-term training options, should be thoroughly researched and some may be approved for implementation. One

benefit of the new process over the old process will be better-designed concepts and programs, which will be more responsive to the needs of our district employers and community members. After the first 2 months of piloting the process, many deans and instructional partners from AAGST complimented Institutional Advancement/Research on a well-designed and interactive process. As of August 2003, 25 new ideas were researched and presented to AAGST for Phase 1 with 9 of those ideas moving forward to Phase 2. Five of the 9 Phase 2 ideas will be validated with a mini survey targeting district employers during Phase 3.

Review (10-31-03):

It sounds like the building blocks are working, and the survey during Phase 3 will be critical. The timeline for moving new programs through the entire process with full curricular/programmatic development can be expensive. Is there a way to conduct the mini-pilot as mentioned above without full curricular development and get enough feedback to fully implement the program? This could save considerable time and dollars.

E. What challenges, if any, are you still facing in regards to this Action Project?

One key challenge identified in year one of the Action Project was determining the local needs of business and industry and including them within the process. To address this issue, business and industry advice and input has been added to several phases of the new process. Interactions with Business Leaders (roundtables), Advisory Committees, Economic Development Corporations/Chambers of Commerce and a community call to action (community focus groups/surveys) have been included as "inputs" for new ideas. Institutional Advancement/Research will coordinate the whole process, but will need the help and support of the Deans and Campus and Community Outreach Partners to gather ideas from these business and industry inputs. Before ideas get too far along in the process, they will be validated with a mini-survey targeting district employers, uncovering local support. At this phase, employers will also have the opportunity to provide us with additional new learning ideas or needs.

Review (10-31-03):

Meeting this challenge is critical since the time and energy of your Institutional Advancement/Research team can also be valuable and expensive. The mini-survey with a quick turnaround of information is vital to the success of this initiative. As mentioned earlier, your performance targets need to be re-articulated for this early response system for new programs. The performance targets now listed focus more on regular programs and program review processes than on the actual program development process that you have developed.

F. If you would like to discuss the possibility of AQIP providing you help to stimulate progress on this action project, explain your need(s) here and tell us who to contact and when?

Review (10-31-03):