DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 241 CE 080 841

AUTHOR	Karl, Luis C.
TITLE	Development of a Program Evaluation Instrument for the Adult Basic Education Program at Nicolet Area Technical College.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	65p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Evaluation Criteria; Formative Evaluation; Literature Reviews; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Program Validation; Summative Evaluation; *Test Construction; *Test Validity; Validated Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Nicolet Area Technical College WI

ABSTRACT

A formative committee conducted a developmental study to produce a program evaluation instrument (PEI) that would be effective in conducting an adult basic education (ABE) program evaluation study at Nicolet Area Technical College (NATC). Five procedures were used to complete this product. First, a literature review was conducted that assisted in the development of the product validation criteria. A review of benchmark studies for program effectiveness provided direction in the evaluation instrument completion. Second, basic education staff held a series of investigatory meetings at which demographic trends affecting the ABE program were outlined. The information obtained that was used to develop the validation criteria for the PEI. Third, the formative committee refined the validation criteria, which included monitoring and screening data, indicators of program quality in ABE, and development of the PEI. Fourth, all criteria considered critical in an effective PEI were measured as a standard against the developed PEI. The PEI was determined to be appropriate for the intended use. Fifth, the PEI was presented to the summative committee, which validated that the PEI met required criteria and was appropriate for the ABE program's evaluation process. (Appendixes include 12 references, indicators of program quality, monitoring and screening criteria and standards, and the PEI.) (YLB)

DEVELOPMENT OF A PROGRAM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR THE ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM AT NICOLET AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Luis C. Karl

Nicolet Area Technical College

April, 2000

DEVELOPMENT OF A PROGRAM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT FOR THE ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM AT NICOLET AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

By

Luis C. Karl

April, 2000

The problem in this developmental study was that the Adult Basic Education (ABE) program at Nicolet Area Technical College needed to conduct a program evaluation but lacked an appropriate evaluation instrument. The ABE department needed to develop a program evaluation instrument that would satisfy federal, state, and institutional requirements for effective program delivery. The purpose of the study was to apply appropriate monitoring and screening criteria and standards to the development of an ABE program evaluation instrument.

There were two research questions for this study. First, "What is the format of a program evaluation instrument that will provide the criteria necessary to effectively evaluate the ABE program's instructional delivery?" Second, "How will the evaluation instrument integrate with strategic plans concerning assessment, instructional long range planning, and data scanning

with links to new components of program development?" A developmental study was conducted to create a program evaluation instrument to analyze data that enabled judgments to be made about the ABE program's effectiveness.

The study resulted in the development of a program evaluation instrument that integrated the strategic plan data elements with the monitoring and screening criteria and standards established for effective program assessment and planning. It was concluded that an effective program evaluation instrument should contain matrices that document evidence that the program accomplishes its purpose by addressing student success through recruitment, access, cost, retention, curriculum, and employment preparation. It was recommended that effective program evaluation instruments contain monitoring and screening criteria, prioritized recommendations, and program component implementation strategic plans.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Page

Chapter

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem

The Wisconsin Technical College System Board (WTCSB) developed a new paradigm for the delivery of basic education in Wisconsin in response to a rapidly changing technology environment. Rapid change is coupled with increased costs for education and decreasing funding sources. Nicolet College directed the ABE program to investigate its own effectiveness and make recommendations for program improvement to meet current and near-future customer needs. The problem is that a program evaluation instrument needed to be developed to assist in the process of investigating the basic education program's effectiveness (Wisconsin Technical College System 1994).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to gather information that provided benchmark recommendations and WTCSB-supported guidelines to be used in the development of an evaluation instrument for the Adult Basic Education (ABE) program at Nicolet Area Technical College (NATC). Past practice of NATC program delivery did not apply to future customer needs, which needed to be researched. An appropriate program evaluation instrument would be used to

determine if program delivery meets current and near-future customer demands.

Research Questions

There were two research questions for this study. First, "What is the format of a program evaluation instrument that will provide the criteria necessary to effectively evaluate the Adult Basic Education program's instructional delivery?" Second, "How will the evaluation instrument integrate with strategic plans concerning assessment, instructional long range planning, and data scanning with links to new components of program development?"

Definition of Terms

Adult Basic Education (ABE). Adult Basic Education is instruction offered to adults on a continuum, beginning with elementary levels and culminating with competencies equivalent with grade 12.9 (graduation equivalent).

Alternative high school program (AHSP). Wisconsin statute 118.15 outlines a secondary school with a nontraditional curriculum that is usually administered through the district vocational-technical or community college.

Computer software programs for ABE. Such courses are designed to provide orientation to existing software programs,

including word processing, that are used in basic skills education. This course provides students with essential exposure to computer technology (now a recognized basic skill) and access to excellent multimedia instructional resources in basic education.

Full-time Equivalent (FTE). Full-time equivalent is a formula used to calculate the cost of instructing students through the accumulation of one course credit. Thirty course credits equal one FTE. The institution counts the unduplicated number of enrolled students during a fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) that generate course credits. The cost of instructor salary, divided by the number of FTEs generated may be used to determine a cost per student.

Instructional Services. Instructional services refers to administrators responsible for academic programs at the college.

Instructional Technology. Instructional technology is the theory and practice of design, development, utilization, management, and evaluation of processes and resources for learning.

Retention. Retention is the ability to keep; as to keep students enrolled in ABE programs until graduation or course/ competency completion. Retention includes transition from basic

education programs to post-secondary programs leading to an associate degree or a competency certificate.

Review. Review refers to a process of investigating an area of the Basic Education program that has continual decrease in enrollment or FTEs over an established period of time. Recommendations are made, as part of the review, for program component improvement to increase enrollment or to eliminate the program component through reallocation of resources.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Changes in the economy in the last 25 years have been disastrous for those who left school before receiving a high school diploma. Today, a 30-year-old male who has dropped out of high school earns one-third less than a comparable worker without a diploma would have earned in 1971. Adult basic education (ABE) is a second chance educational route for those adults wishing to improve their lives. Basic education (B.E.) programs need to focus on current employability demands, in addition to a basic high school equivalency certificate that will improve the lives of their students who complete ABE programs (Murnane, Willet, & Tyler, 1998).

Present Status of Topic

The Wisconsin Technical System Board (WTCSB) presented A Strategic Policy Recommendations Report (June, 1994) to the Wisconsin Technical College System institutions that called for a shift to a new education paradigm that will take basic skills education into the 21st century. This shift is organizationally embodied in an adult school-to-work continuum which serves as the framework for basic skills education programming.

With the call for new andragogy and terminology to replace

outdated perception of ABE programs, the WTCSB shifted to a curriculum which is student-centered, driven by content knowledge teaching, which is socially and culturally relevant, and which develops critical thinking, life-long learning skills, and English language proficiency (WTCSB, 1994). The programs are now called Basic Education (B.E.).

Research in the development of the "New Paradigm" for basic skills in Wisconsin was based on increasing movements to consider student outcomes as a priority. This process could be accomplished by including activities that perform extensive student assessment through improved student assessment models, and to refocus institutional missions from serving the institutional needs to serving students in their learning. Assessment has been identified as a prominent driver for institutional and program strategic planning.

Further, the new paradigm was proposed to consider the apparent conflict that may exist in the belief that the primary goal of education is student achievement, while current higher education institutions may function according to other influences, such as maintaining employment of long-term instructors. Eventually, the term, "learning paradigm" should be

less of a shift in the approach to education to more development of systems that focus on student learning than instruction.

The reason for the paradigm shift in Wisconsin's vocational and technical college instructional delivery was based on meeting student needs. These needs were outlined in a document that listed nine indicators of program quality in adult basic education programs in Wisconsin that address learner success (Wisconsin Technical College System Board, 1998).

Recent changes in the method of program delivery at NATC occurred because of rapid technology development and the sudden need of adult learners to utilize computers in their daily lives. The adult basic education program must respond to stakeholders by providing services to learners that meet their immediate needs. The WTCSB called upon all technical college ABE programs to provide services in computer literacy to all their enrolled clients (WTCSB, 1997).

All WTCS learning centers have been directed to conduct program evaluations that will identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats in their ABE programs that: (a) assist in the enrollment and completion of occupational programs and/other post secondary education, (b) attain and retain meaningful and sustainable employment, (c) effectively support

academic success within the family, (d) become informed and productive participants in the civic life of the community, and (e) become self-directed and life-long learners. To achieve these purposes, the WTCSB set policy and guidance for the effective implementation of its B.E. programs to establish instructional bridges and organizational structures which help move learners up the educational continuum into occupational and post secondary programs (NATC, 1997).

With the continuum of educational services concept, in adult basic education (ABE), was the recognition that basic skills education is much broader in scope than generally perceived. Adult basic education programs and services range from those needed by adult learners at the lowest level of literacy to adults seeking a high school credential, to the high school graduate needing a high school course as a prerequisite for entry into a technical college program, to the student enrolled in a technical college program who needed supplemental assistance to ensure program graduation (Beder, 1998).

Research by Staff

Classical studies in teacher-as-researcher are part of recent literature on educational evaluation and reform. Action research by higher education staff has provided a team approach

and a forum for sharing questions, concerns, and results. Teacher research in program planning has promoted professional dialogue and has created a more professional culture in schools. The concept of action research can be traced back to the early works of John Dewey in the 1920s and Kurt Lewin in the 1940s. The concept of research by all members of the institution, including teachers, is recommended as a human resources component of the organizational frames described by Bolman and Deal (1997). Because the practitioners (teachers) are closer to the clients and the immediate problems associated with program access and student retention, membership by instructional staff should be included in program model design (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Benchmark Studies

Terry O'Banion (1997), in his recommendations for program changes, recommends to shift perspectives in higher education from instruction to student learning. Those topics are judgement of institutional success on the quality of student learning and shared responsibility in student learning between the college and the student (O'Banion, 1997).

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) has featured benchmark arguments in favor of rapid change in the way institutions of higher education provide services to students

that focus on learning, rather than instruction. The change that is needed to respond to customer demand can no longer be incremental. Rather, change must be system-wide and holistic. Learning must be placed first in every aspect of policy, mission, programs, and practices of colleges that hope to prepare its clients for the immediate future (Barr, & Tagg, 1995).

Technology

Benchmark studies show that technology is rapidly changing the approach people use to provide educational opportunities. Students and staff must remain abreast of technology advancement in order to maintain their competitiveness in the job market. If community colleges fail to provide the opportunity to learn these skills they risk a decrease in student enrollment, as students will seek colleges better able to accommodate their needs. In developing a program evaluation instrument, colleges need to consider the impact of computer technology, both from a cost and benefits perspective, in providing quality access to technology. Program evaluation instruments should include categories for technology-budget considerations, so that necessary services to students can be maintained.

Doucette (1994) describes two ways technology is implemented. The first type of implementation is the use of

technology as a simple add-on to enhance current instructional methods. With multimedia technology, instructors can create attention-catching lectures and can also generate plans which allow them to change format based on student understanding and interest. The second type of implementation Doucette (1994) describes is the more complex process of using technology to transform both the teaching and learning functions. Systems that provide students with access to a multimedia computer station equipped with programs of course content allow them to work at their own pace. Students can focus on individual areas of weakness because the course content comes from computer disks rather than from formal lectures. Benefits to consider in the use of multimedia technology, in program planning and evaluation is the student receives immediate feedback, learning style accommodation, improved retention and understanding of the material, increased levels of student participation and interest, and more opportunities for team learning (Doucette, 1994).

Using computer-based technology in a lab-type setting can provide flexibility in instructional delivery for students who have difficult schedules, such as adults with short study periods. The Flex Lab at Santa Fe Community College offers courses which are accessed by computer so that students can work

on assignments at their own pace in a relaxed, non-competitive learning environment. The lab is staffed by trained personnel who can answer questions and provide guidance to the students. Lab-type instructional programming can also increase a college's potential to provide distance education if programs can be accessed through the Internet (Ortego & Richards, 1995).

Technological advancement has established a significance in ABE programs to the extent that basic computing skills are considered a fourth component of basic skills (reading, writing, arithmetic, and personal computer use). The WTCSB has called on system institutions to develop policy that makes personal computer technology, in B.E. programs, a priority in funding and access for students.

Programs that effectively use technology have a carefully designed technology plan that is a part of the overall program improvement plan. To realize the benefits of technology, programs must develop a plan for integrating technology into the curriculum. An effective technology plan is based on the shared vision of educators, students, community members, and leaders with technological expertise. Technology is transforming society and the ABE program does not have a choice as to whether technology will be incorporated, but how it will be used to

enhance learning (North Central Regional Educational Laboratory & Illinois State Board of Education, 1995).

Integral to the reforms of basic education(B.E.) is the coupling of curriculum development with emphasis on the importance of academic knowledge in technical training. The changes in B.E. have prompted studies of the Rindge School of Technical Arts (RSTA) in Cambridge, Massachusetts, as a model practice by organizations such as the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater's Center for Work and Education and Boston's Jobs for the Future. The Rindge School conducted a program evaluation to plan for the elimination of the divisions between hand and mind and now requires rigorous academics with technical training for all vocational students. The problem is that emphasis on academics may prevent students from finding adequate time to learn the trades that will provide them with their future income (Dai Vo, 1996).

The mission of upgrading the curriculum and program offerings for vocational-technical and community college students is to emphasize the tendency of technology to create quality training for the academically disadvantaged. Curriculum that includes educational technology should provide greater access and

quality of education to disadvantaged individuals by reducing the cost of access to the best instruction. New technologies, if properly implemented, should decrease the discrepancy between the information haves and have-nots (Snider, 1996).

Education in the ABE programs should be individualized to the needs of each student. Enrollment should be open-entry, open-exit, with a variety of schedules to accommodate students' personal lives. Education should involve more holistic, knowledge-based intellectual frameworks, rather than "short-lived retention of fractionated contextual cues" (Barr & Tagg, 1995).

Educational climate should foster the belief that student learning is the central objective of all employees in the institution. The mission of the college must reflect that belief and internal and external stakeholders should carry this philosophy with them in their daily work, regardless of their assignment.

Summary

It is the mission of the B.E. programs to facilitate the acquisition by adult learners of basic academic, research, critical thinking and technology skills and culturally and socially relevant social science, mathematical and scientific knowledge. All Wisconsin B.E. programs must facilitate the

acquisition of college survival skills, a global understanding of careers, and understanding of the employment market and work. Further, ABE programs should develop and facilitate educational programs that collaborate with other educating entities, public and private human service agencies, business/industry and labor, and respond to technological advancement.

Institutions need to conduct evaluations on their programs' effectiveness in meeting current and future customer needs. Program evaluation components need to include categories that address the critical issues discussed by benchmark studies, trends, staff research/recommendations, and customer needs in higher education.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Problem Solving Methodology

The problem solving methodology that was used in this study was development. Development was used through an organized procedure to produce a product which was used to analyze data that enabled judgments to be made about the Adult Basic Education(ABE) program's effectiveness in meeting the strategic plan goals and in the subsequent improvement of the ABE program.

Procedures

Data Gathering

Five procedures were used to complete this development practicum. First, a review of literature concerning basic education program evaluations was conducted. The review included directives from the Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCSB) that addressed the indicators of program quality in Wisconsin in Adult Basic Education (Appendix A), Nicolet Area Technical College (NATC), and benchmark studies of program evaluation processes conducted within the past five years.

Second, a self-study on the ABE program at NATC was conducted during the fall semester, 1998, by the basic education staff. The study began with a discussion by the basic education

staff, who identified trends that should be considered as evaluation criteria to be used during the program evaluation process. This discussion began during a full-day planning meeting on October 2, 1998. Among the topics for consideration by the discussion group were those outlined by authorities in higher education in their recommendations for program changes to shift perspectives in higher education from instruction to student learning. Those topics were judgement of institutional success on the quality of student learning and shared responsibility in student learning between the college and the student.

Further discussion centered on the concept of creating a seamless system of delivery that would provide access to educational services for learners as they need them, when they need them, and wherever they need them. This component of the discussion clarified the importance of the outreach centers as part of the ABE program. Seven NATC outreach centers provide access and quality of ABE services to remote areas of the district for students who are unable to travel the distance to the main campus. A significant component of the discussion centered on the continual identification, development, testing, implementation, and assessment of a range of effective learning

technologies including new applications of computer and information technology for ABE students. Budgeting for new equipment, facilities, and staff were important sub-components of the development of a program evaluation instrument tool.

Consideration of faculty work load, work site, and job description were included in the development process of program evaluation. For example, faculty whose primary responsibility is the design of learning methods and environments, with less emphasis on the traditional responsibility of instruction, must be considered; cross-disciplinary teams of staff who work collaboratively to devise programs to increase student competencies and retention should be available on campus and outreach centers. The diversity of ABE work-related environments in the Nicolet College district required extensive consideration.

Philosophy of program delivery was also discussed. Education in the ABE programs should be individualized to the needs of each student. Enrollment should be open-entry, open-exit, with a variety of schedules to accommodate students' personal lives. Education should involve more holistic, knowledge-based, intellectual frameworks. Educational climate should foster the belief that student learning is the central objective of all employees in the institution. The mission of

the college must reflect that belief and internal and external stakeholders should carry this philosophy with them in their daily work, regardless of their assignment.

A list of trends that impact the ABE program delivery were developed to assist in the establishment of the criteria. The trends included, but were not limited to, the following: (a) Wisconsin's Work, Not Welfare (W-2) law, which influenced a decrease in ABE enrollments during the 1997-98 academic year and established the need for more flexible scheduling to meet employment schedules of part-time students; (b) an increased enrollment of alternative high school students in ABE programs; (c) increased requests for accommodations for students with disabilities; (d) technology-related learning has increased hours that most students spend in the learning centers; (e) computer literacy designated as the "fourth" basic skill in ABE program delivery; (f) increased demand for customized learning certificate programs for employment; (g) increased difficulty in basic skills-related learning to satisfy workplace education skills analysis recommendations; (h) increased competition for funding through grant sources, which has been historically reserved for institutions of higher learning; (i) adult basic education partnering with business and industry, as outlined in

the WTCSB guidelines; (j) competition from outside instructional resources to serve local clients; (k) a shift in focus from serving lower level students to serving higher academic needs in basic skills, to be eligible for grant funding; and (l) a top priority in the college strategic plan to increase services to Native Americans in their communities, local learning centers, and Nicolet College district campus programs.

Criteria

Formative Committee

Information from the Teaching, Curriculum, and Instructional Resources (TCIR) college standing committee was reviewed in relation to recommended components for inclusion in the program evaluation instrument that was developed and refined by a formative committee, which was established through the basic education staff and college staff who work closely with components of the basic education program on the main campus. The formative committee consisted of four full-time faculty in the ABE program, two members of the ABE Advisory Committee, and two NATC staff members outside of the ABE program. See Appendix B for a rationale for membership selection in the formative committee. Subsequent planning meetings were held by the formative committee, during February and March, 1999, to

establish the criteria that was used to develop the program evaluation instrument. Through the research and discussion process, the criteria was refined into short statements and established for the program evaluation instrument by the formative committee (Appendix C).

Third, the formative committee gathered data from the institutional data processing department that provided a history of full-time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment in each of the ABE program areas studied in the program evaluation. The formative committee identified recommendations, insights, and comments about any aspect of the educational offerings or programs during the evaluation process that would be integrated into the evaluation instrument components. The Monitoring and Screening Criteria and Standards were listed as criterions one through six. Trends that indicated continual changes in enrollment in certain areas provided data to recommend review. Percentages of decreasing enrollment, throughout an extended period, may be established as a check point for review. For example, a decrease of 10% in enrollment in a specific area of learning may be an alert to review the area in a program evaluation exercise to recommend change or improvement.

Formative committee meetings were held during the fourth week of February, and the first week of March, 1999, where committee members discussed and compiled information in each of the criteria categories listed, which were eventually written into the evaluation instrument's two components (Appendixes C and D). One component was titled, Monitoring and Screening Criteria and Standards (Appendix C), with columns that listed data elements, definition, measure, benchmark, and review level. The second component was titled Program Evaluation and Improvement Recommendation Form (Appendix D), which had three columns that addressed the following: (a) evaluation questions and topics for consideration, (b) analysis, insights, comments, and (c) action.

The ABE program evaluation formative committee established data elements, from the trends study, that responded to the Nicolet College institutional and ABE department goals and plans. These data elements were listed under the appropriate criterion in the instrument. A definition and measure for each data element was established, with a third section for action recommended if a review of the program process was inadequate, or if success was not at acceptable levels. Trends in enrollment were considered to be important monitoring and screening criteria for measuring program effectiveness. This information responded

to the trends criteria established for the program evaluation study (Appendix C).

Summative Committee

Fourth, the formative committee presented the program evaluation instrument to the summative committee on March 15, 1999. The summative committee consisted of the ABE cluster coordinator, two ABE Advisory Committee members, the vice-president of instruction, and a member of the NATC Teaching, Curriculum, and Instructional Resources (TCIR) standing committee (Appendix E).

Validation of the Criteria

The summative committee validated the criteria established for the program evaluation instrument by comparing the following criteria components to the evaluation instrument to verify if those components were included: (a) The instrument must contain data elements that address ABE services that respond to the nine indicators of program quality (Appendix A); (b) the institutional strategic plan goals must be incorporated into the basic education strategic plan and goals (Appendix F), which must be tied to the WTCSB regulations and guidelines for the operation of adult basic education programs; (c) each criterion must include data elements of program goals (Appendix C), including current

effectiveness and efficiency that supports program success and review levels; and (d) trends that may be impacting the strategic goals and plans for program success (Appendix D).

Development of the Product

Fifth, the formative committee compiled all evaluation topics and data gathered for consideration on a draft evaluation instrument form. The process of entering the criteria on a draft evaluation form was done during a series of meetings that were task-oriented sessions that focused on constructing the document in a format that was in a matrix configuration. The product was two components that outlined the monitoring and screening criteria and standards crucial to successful program operation and a section for program improvement recommendations. It contained evaluation questions and topics that addressed strategic goals of the ABE program, including performance standards and measures used to evaluate program effectiveness (Appendixes C and D). This instrument was the draft model of the program evaluation instrument. The instrument construction sessions were completed by March 22, 1999. These work meetings resulted in the actual development of the program evaluation instrument.

Validation of the Product

The summative committee then validated if the product was a useful tool for an effective program evaluation. The validation process was conducted by comparing the established criteria for program effectiveness against the components of the new program evaluation instrument. The Monitoring and Screening Criteria and Standards were listed on the instrument as criterion one through six.

The ABE program evaluation formative committee established data elements that responded to the institutional and department goals and plans. These data elements were listed under the appropriate criterion in the instrument. A definition and measure for each data element was established, with a third section for action recommended if a review of the program process was inadequate, or if success was not at acceptable levels.

The purpose of this validation exercise was to determine if the critical attributes of a program evaluation instrument were in place, according to the established criteria. The summative committee completed its comparative study by March 29, 1999.

Assumptions

For this study, it was assumed that the members of the formative committee were able to identify appropriate trends that

should be considered in planning for an effective program evaluation instrument and a subsequent program evaluation. It was assumed that the diversity of the Nicolet district basic education staff responsibilities could be considered in the components of the instrument.

It was also assumed that the recommendations made by the summative committee are beneficial to addressing current and future trends in ABE education. Finally, it was assumed that recommendations are reasonable and could be implemented without financial prohibition.

Limitations

The data collected by the trends committee may not be appropriate to future needs of potential clients. Financial restrictions may limit the extent to which implementation of recommendations can be made. The basic education instructional duties and learning center environments are diverse, and therefore challenge the extent to which an effective program evaluation instrument could address all of the program unique conditions. Monitoring and screening data that was used to develop the instrument may only apply to the current year of program evaluation.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

A developmental study was conducted by a formative committee to produce a program evaluation instrument that would be effective in conducting an adult basic education (ABE) program evaluation study at Nicolet Area Technical College (NATC). Five procedures were used to complete this product.

First, an extensive literature review was conducted, which assisted in the development of the product validation criteria. A review of benchmark studies for program effectiveness was conducted to provide direction in the evaluation instrument completion. Information from the Teaching, Curriculum, and Instructional Resources (TCIR) college standing committee was reviewed in relation to recommended components for inclusion in a program evaluation instrument.

Second, a series of investigatory meetings were held by basic education staff, where demographic trends affecting the ABE program were outlined. These meetings resulted in an accumulation of information that was used to develop the validation criteria for the program evaluation instrument (Appendix C).

Third, the formative committee (Appendix B) refined the validation criteria, which included monitoring and screening data, indicators of program quality in adult basic education, and the development of the program evaluation instrument (Appendixes C and D). The instrument was organized to establish three column categories that would respond to evaluation questions and topics regarding the successful operation of a basic education program. The topics and data components were the criteria standards against which the product was measured.

The three columns were evaluation questions and topics for consideration; analysis, insights, and comments; and, action indicated for success. Six categories were established to apply to the three columns for evaluation: (a) progress in current program, (b) current effectiveness and efficiency (include multiple options for access), (c) trends affecting the Basic Education program, (d) assessment of the program system, (e) instructional technology, and (f) prioritized recommendations for improvement.

The formative committee also considered district economic development needs, technology program needs on campus, and infusion of basic education with other programs on campus. The criteria included: (a) monitoring and screening criteria and

standards that were provided by the Teaching, Curriculum, and Instructional Resources (TCIR) standing committee; (b) evaluation questions and topics for consideration, including current effectiveness and efficiency of ABE program, Indicators of Program Quality (Appendix A), and multiple access options available to clients; (c) trends affecting the program or area; (d) consideration of assessment loops currently being used in the ABE program; (e) consideration of instructional technology being used and what should be considered for future use; and (f) student data reports on enrollment and course completion from previous years.

Fourth, all of the criteria considered to be critical in an effective program evaluation instrument was measured as a standard against the developed program evaluation instrument. The validation component was conducted by the summative committee (Appendix E). The summative committee compared the ABE monitoring and screening standards in the program evaluation instrument to the established criteria and standards for the college. The result was that the summative committee determined that the instrument was considered to be appropriate for the intended use, based on the criteria from which it was measured.

The two research questions were answered through the development of a program evaluation and improvement recommendation form, as follows: The format of the product included categories that addressed evaluation questions and the following topics for consideration; analysis, insights, and comments; and indicated action to complete the evaluation. Monitoring and screening criteria and standards, including data elements, definition/measures of the data elements, benchmarks, and review levels for insufficient progress, were compiled to guide the program evaluation instrument.

Specific categories in the program evaluation instrument format included (a) current program effectiveness and efficiency, (b) verification of multiple access options for students to appropriate instruction, (c) trends affecting basic education, (d) assessment loops utilized through collaboration with internal and external offerings, (e) instructional technology review and two-year plan, and (f) prioritized recommendations for program improvement.

Five, the program evaluation instrument was presented to the summative committee, during a scheduled meeting on March 15, 1999. The summative committee met again on March 22, 1999. That meeting involved an item analysis of the program evaluation

instrument, against the established criteria. The summative committee subsequently validated that the program evaluation instrument met the required criteria and was appropriate for the adult basic education program's evaluation process.

The form was further enhanced through the inclusion of a budget recommendations form for program improvement. The budget form included categories for capital cost, staff cost, base allocation increase, technology improvement, and/or physical resources improvement or modification. The result of the program evaluation instrument development effort was a product that can be used effectively in accordance with the research questions.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

Nicolet Area Technical College's (NATC) Basic Education (ABE) program needed to develop a program evaluation instrument that would be effective in assessing the program's effectiveness. Changes in the adult basic education paradigm, coupled with rapid advances in technology prompted the ABE program to review benchmarks in ABE delivery, recognize state and local policy, and make recommendations for program delivery.

Recent studies have shown a definite change in program delivery methods that focus on student learning, rather than instruction. Literature reviews have strongly favored program changes to respond to customer need, rather than traditional course construction and delivery.

Instruction must be cost efficient, include computer literacy training, provide flexible scheduling, and have value toward application of skills learned. Literature has further indicated the need for change to be system-wide and holistic, rather than incremental. Institutional program delivery change must be student, rather than staff, centered.

Benchmark studies have shown that program evaluation instruments must address the issues of program delivery by including a focus on curriculum updates and appropriateness. Assessment loops for program integration with other departments, business and industry, and post-secondary education should be a part of the evaluation measures. Focus must place priority on the student needs, regarding access to and value of programs. Program delivery should not be focused on the convenience and preference of the staff. Benchmark studies have shown that additional emphasis on program evaluations should be placed on new and expanding funding sources, technology plans, and professional development.

Conclusions

There were two research questions for this study. First, "What is the format of a program evaluation instrument that will provide the criteria necessary to effectively evaluate the ABE program's instructional delivery?" Second, "How will the evaluation instrument integrate with strategic plans concerning assessment, instructional long range planning, and data scanning with links to new components of program development?"

The research questions for this study were answered. First, the format of an ABE program evaluation instrument that can

provide the criteria necessary to effectively evaluate the ABE program's instructional delivery included categories that addressed evaluation questions and topics that included the following: (a) a current report on progress of the ABE program, when considering recruitment, retention, and program/goal completion, (b) current effectiveness and efficiency, (c) trends affecting the ABE program, (d) assessment loops that address required outcomes for program success, (e) instructional technology considerations, and (f) prioritized recommendations for improvement.

Second, the analysis, insights, comments, and indicated action section were necessary to complete the evaluation components that addressed environmental scanning, trends, and future needs. Monitoring and screening criteria and standards, including data elements, definition/measures of the data elements, benchmarks, and review levels for insufficient progress, were compiled to guide the program evaluation instrument. Program evaluation instruments must address all aspects of program delivery that impact student success.

Implications

A new paradigm for the delivery of ABE in Wisconsin called for response to rapid change in demographics, technology, and

increased costs in serving adult basic education students. If institutions that deliver ABE services develop strategic plans to respond to the new paradigm, an effective program evaluation instrument can enhance current and future planning.

A program evaluation instrument that can respond to the monitoring and screening criteria and standards for effective ABE program delivery, can enhance the efficiency of program evaluations and assist in program planning through the analysis, insights, comments and action areas indicated for change/ improvement. Annual program reviews can be linked to previous use of the developed instrument, through the establishment of one and two-year plans that overlap evaluations. Budget requests can be justified through sections of the program evaluation instrument that indicate need through analysis and measure against the criteria for effective program delivery.

Recommendations

Staff

It was recommended that program staff be involved in the development of program evaluation instruments. The process of involving the basic education instructional staff in the research and development of a basic education program evaluation instrument has provided them with a clearer understanding of the

scope of program operation. An instrument that was effectively designed to measure what it purported to measure, required extensive research into the critical attributes and criteria for monitoring and screening data that comprise the components.

Implementation

It was recommended that Nicolet Area Technical College (NATC) consider the approval of implementing the developed program evaluation instrument to the required ABE program evaluation process for the current academic year. This approval would come from the Teaching, Curriculum, and Instructional Resources standing committee (TCIR) for immediate implementation.

Instrument Adoption

It was also recommended that the institution consider adopting the instrument as a model tool in various program evaluations. Adoption of the instrument could be accomplished through discussion of the instrument's initial use, as an example of effectiveness. Dissemination of the instrument could be conducted through the TCIR standing committee meetings, which monitor program change.

An adaptation of the Basic Education program evaluation instrument could be completed through various program needs, by introducing the instrument to each college department and

providing guidance from TCIR in adapting it to specific program needs.

Further Study

It was further recommended that further study be conducted on the monitoring and screening criteria and standards for program evaluation contained in the instrument. Annual updates on the strategic plan component and trends effecting the ABE program evaluation are recommended. Indicators of program quality in basic education programs should be further studied to align the indicators with current environmental scanning data. A comparison of the indicators of quality with potential ABE clients in the district should provide data for predicted success in service to the people of northern Wisconsin.

REFERENCES

Barr, R.B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning--A new paradigm for undergraduate education. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Report No. ED414961 97)

Beder, H. (1998). Assessment study (Teaching and learning models) [Online]. Available: http://hugse1.harvard.edu/~ncsall/beder.html (1998, October 12).

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership (2nd. Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Dai Vo, C. (1996). When the walls break down. Vocational Education Journal, 71, 18-19.

Doucette, D. (1994). Transforming teaching and learning using information technology: A report from the field. Community College Journal, 65(2), 18-24.

Murnane, R., Willet, J., & Tyler, J.(1998). GED impact study. Available: http://hugse1.harvard.edu/~ncsall/ged.html [1998, October 12].

Nicolet Area Technical College (1997). NATC Strategic plan. Rhinelander, WI: Author.

Ortego, S., & Richards, B. (1995). Contract training and computer-assisted instruction at Santa Fe Community College. Paper presented at "Workforce 2000," the Annual Conference on Workforce Training for the League for Innovation in the Community College, February, 1995,(ED 381 199).

Snider, J.H. (1996). Education wars: The battle over information-age technology. The Futurist, 30, 24-28.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education,(1993). An American imperative: Higher expectations for higher education. Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 364 144)

Wisconsin Technical College System (1994). A new paradigm for basic skills education in Wisconsin. Wisconsin Technical College System Board. Madison, WI: Author.

Wisconsin Technical College System (1998). Indicators of program quality in Wisconsin adult basic education. Wisconsin Technical College System Board. Madison, WI: Author.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Indicators of Program quality in Wisconsin Adult Basic Education

INDICATOR 1: LEARNER PROGRESS IN EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
Learners demonstrate progress toward attainment of basic education competencies.

INDICATOR 2: LEARNER ADVANCEMENT TOWARD GOALS
Learners advance in the instructional program or complete the program educational requirements that allow them to pursue their educational, family, community, workplace, and personal goals.

INDICATOR 3: STUDENT RETENTION
Students remain in the program long enough to meet their educational needs/goals.

INDICATOR 4: PROGRAM PLANNING PROGRESS
Program has a planning process that is on-going and participatory, guided by evaluation and based on a written plan that considers community demographics, needs, resources, and economic and technological trends, and is implemented to its fullest extent.

INDICATOR 5: CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
Program has curriculum and instruction that addresses a variety of student learning styles and levels of student needs.

INDICATOR 6: ON-GOING STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROCESS
Program has an on-going staff development process that is responsive to the specific needs of its staff, offers training in the skills necessary to provide quality instruction, and emphasizes practice and systematic follow-up.

INDICATOR 7: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES
Program identifies students' needs for support service and makes services available to students directly or through referral to other educational and service agencies.

INDICATOR 8: COORDINATION OF SERVICES
Program successfully coordinates services for the population in the community identified in the

(appendix continues)

Adult Education and Family Literacy Act as under-served regarding literacy and basic education.

INDICATOR 9: VOLUNTEER SERVICES
Programs will coordinate services and demonstrate collaboration among technical college districts, community-based organizations, and volunteer literacy providers.

Appendix B

Formative Committee

Members of the Formative Committee were selected because of their affiliation with the B.E. program through their current assignments and the benefits that effective B.E. programs can provide for their students.

- Four full-time faculty in the B.E. program were selected: (a) mathematics instructor, (b) communications/English instructor(c) reading skills instructor, and (d) basic computer software skills instructor.
- Two members of the B.E. Advisory committee were selected:
- The NATC Registrar served from a post-secondary programs perspective.
- One academic advisor from the general education faculty served with the connection of assisting enrolled students with remediation and skills enhancement courses in the B.E. program.
- Two instructors outside of the B.E. program consisted of an auto mechanics instructor and a nursing education instructor. These instructors were selected because of the number of students in their programs that have transitioned through B.E. preparation courses.

Appendix C
Monitoring and Screening Criteria and Standards

Monitoring & Screening Criteria and Standards Data Element	Definition/Measure	Benchmark	Review Level
Criterion 1: Documented evidence that program accomplishes its purpose.			
GED/HSED: Completion of program. Completion of one or more GED tests.	% of students who complete program from those who state GED/HSED as goal.		A decline of greater than 10% of the last three years.
Academic Support for Post-Secondary Programs (ASPP)	% of students who improve basic skills in reading, English, or math or % of students who complete the program course(s) for which they are receiving instruction.		Less than 70% improve basic skills by one or more grade levels in reading, English, or math. Or less than 67% complete the program course(s) for which they enrolled.
Post-Secondary Preparation enrollment (PSP): Student enters college program	% of PSP students that enter college program within 1 or 2 semesters.		Less than 50% of the students who enroll in PSP courses enter college program within 1 or 2 semesters.
English-As-A-Second Language (ESL): (1) Student meets goal for instruction (complete GED/HSED, enroll in college courses, become U.S. citizen, etc.) (2) Completion of ESL level in which the student is currently enrolled.	(1) % of students who accomplish stated goals. (2) % of students who successfully complete* ESL level in which they are enrolled		Less than 70% make significant gains toward accomplishment of stated goals for ESL level in which they are enrolled.
Work Place Literacy (WPL): On-the-job instruction in B.E. courses leading to improved B.E. skills.	% of students who successfully complete* course in which they are enrolled (See Issue 2 on last page)		Less than 70% complete the course in which they are enrolled.
High School Completion (HSC):Adults and Alternative High School students enrolled in B.E. courses for transfer to High School credit.	% of students who successfully complete* course in which they are enrolled.		Less than 70% complete the course in which they are enrolled.

(appendix continues)

Criterion 2: Documented evidence that program prepares students adequately for entry level employment or transfer.			
[GED/HSED] 1) Achievement of core abilities 2) Graduate satisfaction 3) % entering Nicolet/ another college.			Less than 90% satisfaction rate. Less than 30% attend college within three years of completion.
[ASPP] 1) Student satisfaction 2) Achievement of core abilities.	(2) Will be developed in connection with assessment.		Less than 67% student satisfaction rate
[PSP] Documented evidence that the PSP courses prepare students adequately for program courses at NATC or another college.	% of PSP course completers who successfully complete their first semester of college program course work at NATC or another college.		Less than 70% successfully complete their first semester of college program course work at NATC or another college.
English-As-A-Second Language (ESL): (1) Achievement of core abilities. (2) Graduate satisfaction.	(1) Will be developed in connection with assessment. (2) Percentage of graduates who report that they are very satisfied, or satisfied, with the training they received on a six month follow-up survey.		Less than 90% satisfaction rate.
(WPL): Course completer satisfaction	(1) Will be developed in connection with assessment. (2) Percentage of graduates who report that they are very satisfied, or satisfied, with the training they received on a six month follow-up survey.		Less than 90% satisfaction rate.
(HSC): Course completer satisfaction	(1) Will be developed in connection with assessment. (2) Percentage of graduates who report that they are very satisfied, or satisfied, with the training they received on a six month follow-up survey.		Less than 90% satisfaction rate.

(appendix continues)

Criterion 3: Documented evidence of student demand for program's curriculum.			
[GED/HSED] Course Utilization	(1) unduplicated number of enrolled students, June 1 - July 31. (2) Number of FTE generated in instructional area courses June 1 - May 31.		A decline of greater than 10% over the past three years.
[ASPP] Course Utilization	(1) unduplicated number of enrolled students, July 1 - June 30. (2) Number of FTE generated in instructional area courses in fiscal year (June 1 - May 31).		A decline of greater than 10% over the past three years.
[PSP] Course utilization	(1) Unduplicated number of paid students enrolled in PSP courses , June 1 - May 30. (2) Number of FTE generated in fiscal year.	Pattern of increase over past three years	A decline of greater than 10% over the past three years.
(ESL): Course utilization.	(1) unduplicated number of enrolled students, June 1 - July 31. (2) Number of FTE generated in instructional area courses June 1 - May 31.		A decline of greater than 10% over the past three years.
(WPL): Course utilization	(1) unduplicated number of enrolled students, June 1 - July 31. (2) Number of FTE generated in instructional area courses June 1 - May 31.		A decline of greater than 10% over the past three years.
(HSC): Course utilization	(1) unduplicated number of enrolled students, June 1 - July 31. (2) Number of FTE generated in instructional area courses June 1 - May 31.		A decline of greater than 10% over the past three years.

(appendix continues)

Criterion 4: Documented evidence of student retention.			
[GED/HSED] Course completion Persistence	% of students officially enrolled in a course on date of record who successfully complete the course (i.e. get a passing grade), aggregated for all courses in the instructional area, term-by-term. % of noncompleters who re-enroll without interruption		An average of less than 70% over the last three years. Less than 60% return the next semester.
[ASPP] Course completion	% of students officially enrolled in a course on date of record who successfully complete the course (i.e. get a passing grade), aggregated for all courses in the instructional area, term-by-term.		An average of less than 80% over the last three years.
[PSP] Documented evidence of student retention	% of students officially enrolled in prep courses on date of record who successfully complete their courses, as defined by getting a passing grade.		Less than 65% complete their courses with a passing grade
(ESL): Course Completion	% of students officially enrolled in an ESL course on date of record who successfully complete the course (i.e. get a passing grade), aggregated for all courses in the instructional area, term-by-term.		Less than 70% complete the ESL level in which they are currently enrolled.
(WPL): Course completion	% of students officially enrolled in a course on date of record who successfully complete the course (i.e. get a passing grade), aggregated for all courses in the instructional area, term-by-term.		Less than 65% complete their courses with a passing grade
(HSC): Course completion	% of students officially enrolled in a course on date of record who successfully complete the course (i.e. get a passing grade), aggregated for all courses in the instructional area, term-by-term.		Less than 65% complete their courses with a passing grade.

(appendix continues)

Criterion 5: Documented evidence of cost efficiency in delivery of instruction.			
[GED/HSED]: FTE per instructor	Student FTE in instructional area courses divided by total instructor workload in those courses, from June 1 through May 31.		Less than 8 FTE /instructor for all lab instruction (includes cost of ESL, HSED/GED, Remedial, etc.).
[ASPP]: FTE per instructor	Student FTE in instructional area courses divided by total instructor workload in those courses, from June 1 through May 31.		Less than 8 FTE /instructor for all lab instruction (includes cost of ESL, HSED/GED, Remedial, etc.).
[PSP]: FTE per instructor	Student FTE in instructional area courses divided by total instructor workload in those courses, from June 1 through May 31.		Less than 8 FTE /instructor for all lab instruction (includes cost of ESL, HSED/GED, Remedial, etc.).
(ESL): FTE per instructor	Student FTE in instructional area courses divided by total instructor workload in those courses, from June 1 through May 31.		Less than 8 FTE /instructor for lab instruction (includes cost of ESL, HSED/GED, Remedial, etc.).
(WPL): FTE per instructor	Student FTE in instructional area courses divided by total instructor workload in those courses, from June 1 through May 31.		Less than 8 FTE /instructor for lab instruction (includes cost of ESL, HSED/GED, Remedial, etc.).
(HSC): FTE per instructor	Student FTE in instructional area courses divided by total instructor workload in those courses, from June 1 through May 31.		Less than 8 FTE /instructor for lab instruction (includes cost of ESL, HSED/GED, Remedial, etc.).

(appendix continues)

Criterion 6: Multiple options for access to program's curriculum.			
[GED/HSED] Access Options	Number of alternative access options available, in structure, location, time, work-connection, and/or outcome.		Decline in number of access options available.
[ASPP] Access Options	Number of alternative access options available, in structure, location, time, work-connection, and/or outcome.		Decline in number of access options available.
[PSP]: Access Options	Number of alternative access options available, in structure, location, time, work-connection, and/or outcome.		Decline in # of access options available
[ESL]: Access Options	Number of alternative access options available, in structure, location, time, work-connection, and/or outcome.		Decline in # of access options available
(WPL): Access Options	Number of alternative access options available, in structure, location, time, work-connection, and/or outcome.		Decline in # of access options available
(HSC): Access Options	Number of alternative access options available, in structure, location, time, work-connection, and/or outcome.		Decline in # of access options available
Other	Number of alternative access options available, in structure, location, time, work-connection, and/or outcome.		Decline in # of access options available

Issues: (1) Need to track PSP students who transfer to other college, the semester after completing PSP/GED/HSED course or program.

(2) Need to develop tracking data for number of WPL students who complete course and apply knowledge/certificate to employment needs.

(3) Need to develop a system to gather information on student satisfaction.

***Definition of Successful Completion:** % of students officially enrolled on date of record who successfully complete the course (i.e., get a passing grade): Aggregated for all courses in the instructional area.

Appendix D

Program Evaluation Instrument

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND IMPROVEMENT RECOMMENDATION FORM

PAGE 1

PROGRAM TITLE: BASIC EDUCATION
DATES OF PROGRAM EVALUATION:
INTERNAL/FORMATIVE PROGRAM REVIEW TEAM:

(CHAIR) _____ _____

(CO-Chair)

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

The Program Evaluation Review Team for Basic Education consists of four full-time faculty in the B.E. program; two members of the B.E. Advisory Committee; one academic advisor; and two non-B.E. instructors.

DATE OF COMPLETED REPORT: _____

(appendix continues)

PAGE 2

DIRECTIONS: This form is intended to capture the Program Review Team's analysis, insights, comments, and recommendations about the educational offerings of the Basic Education Programs. There are five parts plus a section for recommendations. Specific directions are provided for each part.

(All recommendations and comments from this program evaluation will be considered by the Teaching, Curriculum, and Instructional Resources standing committee (TCIR), as it prioritizes budget, curriculum, programmatic staffing, and other issues for the next academic year.)

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION	ANALYSIS, INSIGHTS, COMMENTS	ACTION INDICATED
I. PROGRESS REPORT Please review the action plan resulting from this year's evaluation. For each item, indicate whether it has been recommended for completion or drop.		
II. CURRENT EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY Do any of the monitoring and screening data elements fall below the proposed review level? If so, identify issues and possible actions to address that criterion or data element. Otherwise, analyze trends or themes from the monitoring and screening data, or move directly to Section IIA.		
IIA. Are there multiple options for success?	Check the options available in program courses. ITV ___ Evening ___ VIDEO ___ Weekend ___ Indiv. Arr. ___ Open Entry/ Internet ___ Open Exit __ Other ___	

(appendix continues)

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION	ANALYSIS, INSIGHTS, COMMENTS	ACTION INDICATED
III. TRENDS AFFECTING THE B.E. PROGRAMS Consider the trends information provided in the research; consult with B.E. Advisory Committee; review course and program outcomes; and assessment data to answer the following questions: A. What are the emerging trends in B.E. and the occupations/further education B.E. supports? B. What types of education, knowledge, perspectives, skills, and sensibilities will be needed in the near future to be successful in B.E.? C. How well does the current B.E. curriculum and student learning address the listed trends and needs? What changes in the content and/or delivery should be made to better prepare students for the demands they will face upon completion of B.E. at NATC?		

(appendix continues)

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION	ANALYSIS, INSIGHTS, COMMENTS	ACTION INDICATED
IV. ASSESSMENT What assessment loops are currently used? [An assessment loop = (1) identification of desired learning outcomes; (2) assessment of students' learning or those outcomes, and (3) modification of teaching content/strategies to improve learning of those outcomes]. **A.** For individual B.E. courses? **B.** For B.E. program's technical skills? **C.** For core abilities? For any of the above in which the assessment loop is not yet completely in place, identify actions needed to take during the next year(s) to complete the process.		

(appendix continues)

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION	ANALYSIS, INSIGHTS, COMMENTS	ACTION INDICATED
V. INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY		
A. Identify current instructional technology within the B.E. programs (or discipline) labs and classrooms. (Please use the provided technology inventory list to assist with this task.)		
B. Prepare a two-year plan for improvement in instructional technology, for all Basic Education (B.E.) Programs, with rationale supporting the need and with projected costs where possible [refer to attached cost allocation budget form].		
C. Identify staff development needed to implement the planned technology effectively.		
D. Identify any issues or barriers related to the planned technology improvement.		

(appendix continues)

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION	ANALYSIS, INSIGHTS, COMMENTS	ACTION INDICATED
Check Point: Does the committee have sufficient information to make recommendations? If so, continue with VI. *Prioritized Recommendations.* VI. PRIORITIZED RECOMMENDATIONS Recommendations should contribute to the improvements indicated in the analysis, insights, and comments under Sections II, III, and IV. The supporting statement should show which issue the recommendation is intended to improve and how/why it is expected to do so. A. List recommendations that can be implemented by program faculty working as a self-contained unit (Basic Education). Include plan of action for each of the recommendations. List each recommendation in committee's priority order. B. List recommendations that require institutional support or collaboration with staff outside of B.E. (List them in prioritized order.)		

(appendix continues)

Basic Education
Nicolet Area Technical College
REQUEST FOR NEW ALLOCATION
1999-2000 Budget Development Process

1. Organizational Area, Contact Person, and Phone Number:	Basic Education			365-4492
2. Type of Request: (Check one: State total amount requested; attach itemized list).	Base Allocation increase	New Staff	One-time Operating Cost	Capital Expenditure
3. Rationale for Request: Explain how the funds will be used and why they are needed. Where appropriate, show relationship between this request and monitoring/screening data, trends data, assessment data, and program evaluation recommendations. Indicate how these expenditures will benefit teaching and learning and/or support Nicolet's strategic goals and what the impact will be if the funds are not approved.				
4. Source: Indicate how the needed dollar amount was determined; attach quotes for capital items.				
5. Time Line: when (mo & yr) must this item be available to meet the needs indicated above?				
6. Long-Term Financial Implications: Describe any long-term implications for the budget (e.g., increased revenue, ongoing financial support, etc.).				

Appendix E

Summative Committee

- The B.E. cluster coordinator served because of the affiliation with all components of the B.E. program.
- Two B.E. Advisory Committee members: (a) one consisted of an employee from a local factory, representing business and industry, and (b) one member represented the area job center.
- The vice-president of instruction served, because of the over-all supervisory role to B.E.
- A member of the Teaching, Curriculum, and Instructional Resources TCIR) standing committee was selected because of TCIR's role in approving all program development projects.

Appendix F

Strategic Plan for NATC and Basic Education

Strategic Plan One: Excellence in Educational Offerings and Delivery. To implement effective and efficient systems and structures that ensure continual dynamic alignment and excellence of educational offerings with District needs, that provide continual improvement of teaching and learning, and that make Nicolet the college of first choice for its communities.

Strategic Plan Two: Growth Through Enrollment Management and Image Enhancement. To implement systems for increasing enrollments and FTEs, building mutually beneficial partnerships and collaborative projects, improving retention and satisfaction of students, and enhancing institutional image.

Strategic Plan Three: Expansion of Collaborative, High-Leverage Partnerships. To develop, maintain, and expand high-leverage partnerships and collaborative projects that increase FTEs and revenues, that integrate technology, and that enhance the image of the college and the development of its communities.

Strategic Plan Four: Quality, Efficiency, and Culture of the College: To systematically improve the college's efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability through stewardship of resources, implementation of continual improvement systems, and commitment to a culture of service to students, staff, and the community.

CE 0fc

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Development of A Program Evaluation Instrument For the Adult Basic Education Program At Nicolet Area Technical College	
Author(s): Luis C. Karl	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Luis Karl, DEAN of Basic Education	
Organization/Address: Nicolet Area Technical College, Rhinelander, WI	Telephone: (715) 365-4493	FAX: (715) 365-4444
	E-Mail Address: LKarl@Nicolet.Tec.WI.us	Date: 11/7/00

(over)