

# **Inst. Research and Effectiveness**

Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

## **Introduction**

The mission of the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness is to provide leadership and support for the institution's operational and strategic decisions and facilitate processes that ensure continuous improvement.

## Performance Objective 1 Ensuring compliance with SACSCOC principles of accreditation and satisfactory maintenance of professional accreditations.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Maintain fulfillment of SACSCOC compliance requirements through a compliance and policy audit.

#### 1.1 Data

2016-2017:

The policy audit began in August 2015. Several policies were merged, several were deleted, and new policies were created as demonstrated in the policy audit spreadsheet.

- New Policies: 19
- Deleted Policies: 87
- Updated Policies: 81

The compliance audit began in January 2016 and included a review of the University in the context of each SACSCOC compliance standard. IRE completed the policy audit in August 2016 and submitted the report in September 2016 to the Off-Site committee. The On-Site committee visited in March 2017 and required responses to 3.3.1.1, 3.3.1.2, 3.3.1.3, and the QEP.

A new University President and Provost began in July 2017, and Senior Staff is now engaged in an informal policy review.

2017-2018:

Senior Staff held informal discussions to familiarize the new leadership about McNeese policies. IRE will no longer track numbers of new, deleted, and updated policies. Instead, the compliance calendar will be used to annually evaluate McNeese's policies and procedures for compliance with SACSCOC.

#### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Because the new President and Provost are interested in an informal review of policies, the policy audit spreadsheet will be discontinued as a method of tracking policy evolution. Senior Staff minutes will continue to reflect policy development.

2017-2018:

This assessment will be discontinued for next year, and the compliance calendar will replace this as the method for ensuring compliance.

### 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Provide discipline-specific accreditation support.

#### 2.1 Data

2015-2016:

- We collected all programmatic accreditation reports that were missing from the office's collection.
- We assisted in the CCNE reports for Nursing.

2016-2017:

- We assisted in the CAEP reports for Education programs and JRCERT for Radiological Sciences.

2017-2018:

- We assisted in report for CAC-ABET, ACEND, and NASM.
- Upcoming programmatic accreditation efforts include AACSB (business), NAACLS (clinical laboratory science).

[Accreditation Calendar](#) [DOCX 14 KB 7/23/18]

#### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

We will continue to provide information as requested and continue to keep complete files about programmatic accreditation. Cabinets in the west office of BBC 432 contain programmatic accreditation files, and these will be transferred to electronic files in Banner Document Management.

2017-2018:

The library requested more involvement and feedback in accreditation efforts as they relate to library resources and services. We made no progress with digitizing our accreditation records, but we remain committed to the goal. IRE will begin logging meetings with on-site compliance reviewers and collecting information about what we provide these reviewers.

### 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Establish and maintain a SACSCOC Compliance Calendar.

#### 3.1 Data

2017-2018:

The compliance calendar is complete, was approved through Senior Staff, and has been distributed across campus. Senior Staff also approved the [Continuous Compliance Policy](#).

IRE will provide training to all participants, and they will be required to update their sections each year.

[Accreditation Calendar](#) [XLSX 14 KB 7/23/18]

#### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

New item for 2018-2019. IRE will provide training to all participants, and they will be required to update their sections each year. IRE will make this calendar available on the IRE website and on the policy page.

## Performance Objective 2 Develop and maintain curriculum and course development procedures and the academic catalog.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Timely processing (from submission to catalog import) of Curriculog proposals.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was timely processing of University Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council paperwork.

#### 1.1 Data

2016-2017:

Of the 250 curriculum and course development proposals that were submitted in 2016-2017, the average number of days between GC/UCC approval and AAC approval was 17.44 days.

2017-2018:

With the implementation of Curriculog, I assumed one of the system reports would provide the processing time from launch to completion; however, this seems to have been a misguided assumption. Although I was not able to determine an accurate average processing time this year, the processing time seemed to be relatively similar to the pre-Curriculog paper process. The committees met to discuss and approve each proposal as they had done in the past, but Curriculog's comment feature made this a more transparent process. It was also more efficient on the back end since we no longer had to scan and upload each form three times for each new signature.

#### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

The average of 17.44 days between GC/UCC approval and AAC approval would be considered, in my professional opinion, timely processing; however, this does not take into account the date the paperwork was received by IRE, which is a flaw in the measurement of this assessment. Also not taken into account is how long it took to update the catalog with these changes once the catalog was rolled. With the implementation of the new curriculum management software, Curriculog, for the 2018-2019 curriculum cycle, I should be able to determine a more accurate processing time from the reports available.

2017-2018:

As stated in the Data field above, I was not able to determine an accurate average processing time using Curriculog reports as I had hoped. Thus, I am not able to set a more definitive benchmark this year. Now that I am aware of the

system limitations, I will be creating a spreadsheet to track launch, approval, and completion/import dates for all proposals submitted in 2018-2019 for the 2019-2020 curriculum cycle, and I should be able to set a definitive benchmark at the end of the reporting year after consulting with the registrar, committee chairs, and provost.

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Obsolete courses (courses that have not been offered in the last five academic years) will be reduced by 50% through an annual course cleanup of the Academic Catalog.

### 2.1 Data

Catalog Year	# of obsolete courses	# of inactivated courses	% inactivated
2018-2019	634	426	67.2%
2019-2020			
2020-2021			

[2018-2019 Course Cleanup Memo\\_APPROVED](#) [PDF 53,312 KB 8/1/18]

#### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark of a 50% reduction of obsolete courses was met for this year. IRE will continue to work with the Registrar's Office and academic departments each year to remove courses that are no longer needed or consistent with the mission/goals of the department or University. As we move forward, I believe that the benchmark of 50% is going to be harder to meet due to the decreasing number of obsolete courses. That said, the benchmark may be reduced next year pending the results of the 2019-2020 course cleanup.

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Reduce the number of addenda made to the published catalog.

### 3.1 Data

Academic Year	# of addenda	Benchmark met?
2015-2016	366	-
2016-2017	31	Yes
2017-2018	14	Yes

#### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

There was a drastic decrease in the number of addenda to the 2016-2017 catalog, because almost all of the addenda to the 2015-2016 catalog was required for the implementation of Degree Works. Regardless, we hope to continue to reduce the number of addenda to the published catalog through the enforcement of the deadlines in the Academic Catalog Policy.

2017-2018:

Enforcement of the deadlines in the Academic Catalog Policy helped us reduce the number of addenda from 31 to 14. I am hoping to reduce it even more through continued enforcement of the policy and working with the Registrar's Office to catch issues during the curriculum cycle for the next catalog. That said, effective 2018-2019, the benchmark will be set at no more than 10 addenda to the published catalog.

## Performance Objective 3 Maintain the assessment cycle with university-wide participation.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 100% participation in assessment plan process.

#### 1.1 Data

Academic, Administrative, and Student Support Services

Reporting Year	# Required	# Missing	% Participation

2013-2014	69	13	81.2%
2014-2015	69	10	85.5%
2015-2016	68	5	92.6%
2016-2017	74	4	94.6%

#### Academic Programs

Reporting Year	# Required	# Missing	% Participation
2012-2013	76	36	52.6%
2013-2014	75	5	93.3%
2014-2015	60	8	86.6%
2015-2016	61	13	87.6%
2016-2017	63	3	95.2%

#### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Due to personnel changes in the department of General and Basic Studies and in the Burton College of Education, master plans were not submitted for several academic programs. IRE conducted a Master Plan workshop with deans and department heads on August 7, 2016. Jessica Hutchings has visited departments to provide assistance with their master plans. IRE uses Xitracs, which has a module for program planning and assessment. Wesley LeJeune has worked with Xitracs staff to set up our programs in the module to facilitate online master plan submission. IRE hired a student in the fall who will enter all 2016 master plans into Xitracs so that all 2017 submissions can be entered directly into the system. This will make tracking master plan submission easier. Continue to strive for 100% participation.

2016-2017:

IRE met with all academic departments during Summer 2017 to revise administrative unit and academic program master plans and convert all plans to Xitracs. More departments are submitting required academic program plans, and plans reflect more meaningful information than they did in the past. Completion rates for the master plans for administrative units fell this year due to several factors. First, more emphasis was placed on academic programs as we worked to submit the SACSCOC compliance reports. Second, Fort Polk leadership changed. Third, we have several new deans and department heads this year, and as they have learned their jobs, master plans have been pushed to the bottom of their lists. We will work with them during the year to get everyone caught up. This is a year of transition as we not only implement Xitracs, but we also acclimate to the new University President and Provost.

To address the issues in the SACSCOC On-Site Committee's report, IRE will implement the following plan in 2017-2018:

- September 2017: Deadline for entering 2016-2017 assessment information into Xitracs.
- October 2017: Assessment plans will be available as PDF documents for viewing on the MyMcNeese Portal.
- December 2017: Permissions for editing and/or viewing assessment reports will be set up in Xitracs.
- April 2018: Approval processes, or the workflow, for assessment reports will be set up in Xitracs and online instructions (text and video) will be made available.
- June 2018: Peer review processes for assessment reports will be set up in Xitracs and online instructions (text and video) will be made available.
- August 2018: IRE will provide an overview of the new assessment process at the annual Faculty and Staff Retreat.

2017-2018:

(based on 2016-2017 data and work done during 2017-2018)

The data show that participation in the assessment process is increasing every year. The 2017-2018 academic year was extremely busy, and a lot of efforts were made by IRE to improve the assessment culture on campus. As stated in the analysis for last year, IRE met with all academic departments to work on their academic program and unit assessment plans. This process was continued with non-academic units in spring 2018, and we learned that assessment has been widely misunderstood for years. As we continue to strive for 100% participation in the assessment process, it is our goal to continuously improve the quality of the reports being submitted. We were not

able to set up approval processes or peer review processes as stated in the timeline provided last year due to the limitations of Xitracs; however, we are slowly working towards implementing built-in approval processes, and we hope to implement peer review processes a little further down the road when assessment is better understood across campus.

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Increase participation in general education assessment course summary form submission by four courses until all general education courses participate.

### 2.1 Data

2015-2016:

Three courses were added to those tagged for assessment:

- RELS 201
- SPAN 202
- ANTH 201

2016-2017:

Four courses were added to those tagged for assessment:

- ART 101
- ART 217
- ART 228
- ART 245

2017-2018:

Eight courses submitted assessment data that were not previously tagged.

- SPAN 201
- SPAN 202
- ART 102
- ART 105
- ART 251
- ART 262
- ENGL 271
- ENGL 272

#### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Benchmark met, thanks to the Department of Visual Arts. In 2017-18, IRE and the gen ed committee will work to increase the gen ed assessment participation of courses in the natural sciences and social/behavioral sciences.

2017-2018:

Benchmark met, thanks to the Department of Visual Arts and also to the Department of English and Foreign Languages. Next year, we will require all courses in the general education core curriculum to submit assessments, therefore this assessment will be eliminated. The percentage of courses submitting information will still be tracked elsewhere in this performance objective.

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 100% collection of forms from courses tagged for assessment.

### 3.1 Data

Semester	# Required Forms	# Missing Forms	% Forms Submitted	# Missing Artifacts	% Artifacts Submitted
Fall 2014	27	8	70.4%	N/A	N/A
Spring 2015	27	7	74.1%	N/A	N/A
Fall 2015	28	6	78.6%	N/A	N/A
Spring 2016	28	4	85.7%	N/A	N/A
Fall 2016	32	2	93.7%	9	71.8%

Spring 2017	32	1	96.8%	4	87.5%
Fall 2017	36	4	88.8%	1	97.2%
Spring 2018	36	1	97.2%	1	97.2%

### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Participation in assessment is steadily increasing, and we are going to keep the momentum going. The General Education Assessment Council has a presence on campus now, and the departments are growing accustomed to submitting data and artifacts.

2017-2018:

Participation in assessment continues increasing, and next year we will require all courses in the general education core curriculum to submit course summary forms and artifacts. We do not expect full participation in the beginning, but we will track the gradual implementation. This exercise will allow us to see which courses need standardized assessments.

## Performance Objective 4 Ensure accurate and timely federal and state reporting.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Data reported for IPEDS, US News & World Report, Louisiana Works Initiative, Board of Regents (BOR) Strategic Plan, and other BOR and ULS reporting will be submitted accurately.

#### 1.1 Data

2016-2017:

All reports were accurately submitted.

2017-2018:

Report	Issues
IPEDS: IC Header	none
IPEDS: Inst Characteristics	none
IPEDS: Completions	none
IPEDS: 12 Mo. Enrollment	none
IPEDS: Student Fin Aid	none
IPEDS: Grad Rates	none
IPEDS: 200% Grad Rates	none
IPEDS: Admissions	none
IPEDS: Outcome Measures	none
IPEDS: Fall Enrollment	none
IPEDS: Finance	none
IPEDS: Human Resources	none
IPEDS: Academic Libraries	none
BOR: Completers	none
BOR: Financial Aid	none
BOR: Space Utilization	none
BOR: Employee Salary Fall	none
BOR: Employee Salary	

Spring	none
US News & World Report	none
Equity In Athletics Disclosure	none

### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

We will continue accurate data reporting. Future data and analyses will provide more information about particular reports and their issues.

2017-2018:

We will continue successful and accurate data reporting. As we learn more and improve our skill sets, we plan to complete reports sooner before the deadlines while completing ad hoc data requests simultaneously.

## Performance Objective 5 Provide internal data support.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Track all data requests and ensure all data requests are completed.

#### 1.1 Data

Academic Year	# of requests
2015-2016	64
2016-2017	122
2017-2018	82

2017-2018:

We tracked 82 data requests between July 2017 and June 2018. We now make sure and enter all data requests that are not submitted via the data request form.

### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Continue to track the number of fulfilled data requests and make sure no reports go unrecorded.

2017-2018:

The number of data requests fell by 40 from 2016-2017. This is most likely because we direct folks to the website when we know the data they are asking for is already published.

### 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: SEI's delivered and reported on time.

#### 2.1 Data

2016-2017:

All SEI's and their associated reports were delivered to the appropriate stakeholders in a timely manner. Online results were done earlier than any previous year.

2017-2018:

All SEI's and their associated reports were delivered to the appropriate stakeholders in a timely manner.

### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Continue to monitor success. We met or exceeded all deadlines for delivering SEI forms and reports. Per the Provost's request, we will explore an alternate SEI schedule that allows deans and department heads to receive scores before the end of the academic year.

2017-2018:

We met or exceeded all deadlines for delivering SEI forms and reports. We explored and will implement an alternate SEI schedule that will allow deans, department heads, and faculty to receive their scores before the end of the

academic year.

### 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Digitizing older student enrollment and workload files so they can be sent electronically more easily and quickly.

#### 3.1 Data

2016-2017:

So far, our student worker has digitized workload reports back to Fall 2003.

2017-2018:

In 2016-2017, student worker had just started digitizing workload reports. Spring 2003 was where she started. Since then, she has digitized up to Fall 2017. She has also digitized 14th census day reports from 13 terms.

##### 3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

We will continue to digitize remaining workload files and enrollment files. In the future, we plan to digitize other reports such as old IPEDS reports, ESDS and FADS.

2017-2018:

We will continue to digitize remaining workload and enrollment files. We have found that the process takes a little more time than first expected. Thus, we have not started the process of digitizing other reports.

### 4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Faculty credentialing automation through matching CIP codes.

#### 4.1 Data

2016-2017:

All courses have been matched with appropriate CIP codes, and most faculty have also been matched with codes. IRE is working with HR and Colleen in UCS to create an automated hiring process in which CIP codes are integrated into the system.

2017-2018:

Course and faculty CIP codes have been loaded/entered into the Banner System in supplemental data fields on SCACRSE and PPAGENL. The program to verify faculty credentials to courses taught is working.

##### 4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Process is going well.

2017-2018:

Beginning in October 2017, CIP codes have been assigned and verified when a new course was added through the automated process in Curriculum. CIP codes will also be assigned to new faculty as part of the automated hiring process to be implemented in Fall 2018. Also, we will begin to match CIP codes for faculty with CIP codes for courses prior to the beginning of the semester to catch and resolve any issues.

### 5 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Implement a data dashboard.

#### 5.1 Data

2016-2017:

The University purchased Visart, which can take student data files and create images and reports useful for internal and external audiences. IRE is now learning how to use the software, and we hope to launch some new images during the summer.

2017-2018:

We have made some data dashboards using Visart. One dashboard is currently public on the McNeese website. However, Pagos Inc. has informed us that they have discontinued Visart and merged their dashboarding capability into their SpreadsheetWeb product. They are still supporting their Visart customers but they are not updating the product anymore. With this new information, we are considering migrating to the SpreadsheetWeb product. At this time, we are

discussing this possibility within the IRE department, with our University Computing Services department, and with Pagos Inc.

### 5.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

IRE will work with UCS as necessary to implement the new software.

2017-2018:

We will make a decision regarding the migration to SpreadsheetWeb. If we stay with Visart, we will work to publish more meaningful data dashboards to our website; however, we may encounter programming bugs that will not be remedied by Pagos Inc. If we migrate to SpreadsheetWeb, we will also work to publish data dashboards; however, we may have some installation and learning curve delays.

## Performance Objective 6 Develop and implement the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Develop ways to improve advising and surveys to measure student satisfaction with advising.

#### 1.1 Data

2015-2016:

The 2016 faculty/staff retreat provided training for advisors in the areas of Academic Support Services, Student Support Services, and Upcoming Technologies. Degree Works was implemented to improve accuracy of degree audits in the advising process.

2016-2017:

New student and faculty evaluations of advising are being administered this year. A stipend was offered to each college to improve advising processes. The advising workshop will occur again in January 2018.

2017-2018:

- The QEP stipend funded several good projects, and the list is attached.
- IRE is working with Alumni Affairs and the Career and Student Development Center to create a first-destination survey for our alumni. It will be distributed beginning 2018-2019.
- IRE is planning the redesign of the General Education Core Curriculum, much of which will involve creating a first-year experience, a la Dr. John Gardner.

[2017-18 QEP Stipend for Colleges](#) [DOCX 14 KB 7/23/18]

#### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

We will continue to track developments in advising as they relate to QEP efforts. Also, we will create a new assessment to track the student and faculty evaluations of advising.

2017-2018:

- The student and faculty evaluations of advising were administered and will be tracked under separate assessments.
- The Advising Workshop is now a fixture of January's activities.
- The QEP stipend funded several good projects, and the stipend will continue.

### 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Assignments that address QEP student learning outcomes will be embedded in 105 identified courses at the introductory, midpoint, and capstone levels.

#### 2.1 Data

Academic Year	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020
Benchmark	Pilot, no benchmark	50% tagged courses	75% tagged courses	100% tagged courses
# tagged courses	42	42	42	42
# courses participating	11	29		
% courses participating	26.1%	69%		

# tagged sections	128	128		
# sections participating	N/A	104		
% sections participating	N/A	81.25%		
Benchmark met?	N/A	yes		

## Comments

*Posted on 8/10/18 at 9:49 AM by Wesley LeJeune*

Corrected academic year headings. Check to make sure data is correct for 2017-2018.

### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Far exceeded our goal of 50% implementation. It should be simple to reach next year's goal of 75%.

## Performance Objective 7 Increase stakeholder satisfaction of services provided.

### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an average score of at least 4.5 (on a 5.0 scale) on each item of the IRE Service Survey relating to the manner in which services are provided by IRE staff.

#### 1.1 Data

Academic Year	Response Rate
2016-2017	33%
2017-2018	36%

Indicator	2016-2017	2017-2018
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff conducts business in a collegial manner.	4.61	4.59
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in an ethical manner.	4.74	4.72
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in a timely manner.	4.6	4.66
Overall, I feel that information received from the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff is accurate.	4.66	4.69

#### 1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark of 4.5 was achieved for this academic year. There were very slight decreases in the average scores for the items relating to collegiality and ethics; however, because we only have two years of data, we would like to monitor these items for one more year to determine whether this is a trend. The average scores for the items relating to accuracy and services provided in a timely manner increased slightly compared to last year. This is most likely because we are constantly thinking of ways to be more transparent with stakeholders and more efficient in our processes. Again, because we only have two years of data, we would like to monitor these items for one more year to determine whether the upward trend continues.

### 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an average score of at least 4.5 (on a 5.0 scale) on each item of the IRE Service Survey relating to services provided or responsibilities.

#### 2.1 Data

Academic Year	Response Rate
2016-2017	33%
2017-2018	36%

Indicator	2016-2017	2017-2018
Accreditation Support	4.59	4.58
Annual Research Hours Reporting	4.46	4.64
Assessment Plans	4.16	4.41
Catalog Updates	4.44	4.47
Curriculum and Course Development	4.38	4.52
Data Requests	4.68	4.5
Faculty Workload Process	4.61	4.57
Gen Ed Assessment	4.61	4.67
Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website	4.21	4.36
Student Evaluation of Instruction Process	4.54	4.16

### 2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark of 4.5 was achieved on most items for this academic year. The pretty significant increases for Annual Research Hours Reporting, Assessment Plans, Curriculum and Course Development, and Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website could be attributed to the following:

- Annual Research Hours Reporting: There were less departments reporting research hours, so the communication between IRE and the departments may have been more detailed and personable than it might have been if every department were reporting research hours.
- Assessment Plans: Although still below the benchmark, there was an increase of 0.25 over last year. We would attribute this to our one-on-one meetings with all academic departments and non-academic units in which we explained assessment in an effort to make it more useful and meaningful. In the spring when the survey was administered, we were still in the process of moving everyone over to Xitracs, but perhaps our demonstrations of the software during the one-on-one meetings contributed to the increase. This is one score we will certainly be paying attention to next year.
- Curriculum and Course Development: Curriculog was implemented in the fall, so faculty were able to import curricula and courses from the Catalog (as opposed to filling out paperwork) and the entire approval process was automated. The system is also set to full transparency, so anyone can view the status of a proposal without being logged into the system. We expect this score to increase as we move into our second year using the software.
- Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website: The website was revised this past year to remove unnecessary text and instead provide links and useful information on the home page. Faculty and staff are visiting our page because they need something, so the revisions are much more user-friendly. We are still below the benchmark on this item, but we are going to monitor it for one more year to see if the upward trend continues.

Two items to watch moving into next year are Data Requests (decreased 0.18 points) and Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) Process (decreased 0.38 points). We could not discern a reason for these decreases this year, especially with the SEI process going better than it had ever gone. Again, we will certainly monitor these two items next year and determine what action would be appropriate then.