



## Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

#8 Plan cycle - 8  
Plan cycle 2022/2023  
7/1/22 - 6/30/23

## **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 Ensure compliance with SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation and satisfactory maintenance of programmatic accreditations.**

### **1 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: Provide discipline-specific accreditation support.

#### **1.1 Data**

2018-2019:

- We are in the process of working with the College of Business on AACSB accreditation, and we will assist the Department of Radiologic and Medical Laboratory Sciences as needed for NAACLS accreditation.

2019-2020:

- Medical Laboratory Science underwent reaffirmation of accreditation by NAACLS.
- The College of Business underwent reaffirmation of accreditation with AACSB.
- We submitted a substantive change report for the Doctor of Nursing Practice level change to SACSCOC.

2020-2021:

- None of our programs were up for programmatic accreditation this year.
- The level change was approved by SACSCOC.

2021-2022:

- MS School Counseling substantive change submitted and approved.
- Undergraduate Certificate in Liquified Natural Gas substantive change submitted.
- ABET Self Study for Engineering submitted.
- AACSB reaffirmation granted to the College of Business.

2022-2023:

- The SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report was submitted in March. While the review committee's Action Letter requested a referral report for Standard 13.6, the review committee accepted the QEP Impact Report.
- The Department of Graduate Nursing submitted the CCNE self-study for the MSN program and hosted a site visit.
- We are still awaiting decisions from ABET for the self-study and site visit completed in 2022.

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

2018-2019:

IRE made progress digitizing our older accreditation files. We anticipate needing to heavily assist with AACSB re-accreditation efforts, primarily with data support. We also need to deal with the library and collection development issues.

2019-2020:

Medical Laboratory Science has a successful report and will conduct a virtual site visit soon. AACSB accreditation completed a hybrid site visit, and the College of Business will need to improve assurance of learning processes to be in compliance. Pending the results of the site visit by SACSCOC during the 2020-2021 academic year, we are prepared to submit follow-up reports. There are no programmatic accreditation reviews during the 2020-2021 academic year.

2020-2021:

- IRE will work with the Department of Engineering to prepare for their ABET visit in 2022.
- IRE will assist the College of Nursing and Health Professions in preparing for the SACSCOC site visit for level change. We will also assist in preparing the documentation for the substantive change committee.

- IRE will assist the Department of Psychology as they apply for CACREP accreditation for the Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling programs.

2021-2022:

- IRE will assist the College of Nursing and Health Professions with the CCNE reaffirmation of the graduate program.
- IRE will assist the Department of Psychology as they undergo CACREP reaffirmation requirements.
- IRE will assist the Burton College of Education in their CAEP self-study.
- IRE will prepare the SACSCOC Fifth Year Report.

2022-2023:

- IRE will continue to assist the Department of Psychology and Counseling with CACREP reaffirmation.
- IRE will continue to assist the Burton College of Education with their CAEP self-study and site visit.
- IRE will assist the Department of Engineering and Computer Science as they seek accreditation of the BSChE program.

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

### **1 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: Average processing time of less than either 40 days or 30 work days for all Curriculog proposals.

Prior to 2020-2021, the benchmark was 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**

2018-2019 (for catalog year 2019-2020):

Proposal Type	# of Proposals	Average Processing Time	
		Days	Work Days
Courses	330	35.63	26.47
Curricula	221	40.88	30.25
Memoranda	24	48.3	35.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>30.87</b>

2019-2020 (for catalog year 2020-2021):

Proposal Type	# of Proposals	Average Processing Time	
		Days	Work Days
Courses	225	27.8	20.68
Curricula	78*	44.9	33.05
Memoranda	18	62	45.31
<b>Total</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>44.9</b>	<b>33</b>

2020-2021 (for catalog year 2021-2022):

Proposal Type	# of Proposals	Average Processing Time	
		Days	Work Days

Courses	134	65.49	47.43
Curricula	50*	75.65	54.57
Memoranda	10	114.4	83.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>85.18</b>	<b>61.73</b>

2021-2022 (for catalog year 2022-2023):

Proposal Type	# of Proposals	Average Processing Time	
		Days	Work Days
Courses	139	44.81	31.65
Curricula	153*	44.94	32.18
Memoranda	13	47.85	34.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>45.87</b>	<b>32.64</b>

2022-2023 (for catalog year 2023-2024):

Proposal Type	# of Proposals	Average Processing Time	
		Days	Work Days
Courses	247	34.14	24.43
Curricula	165	45.79	32.34
Memoranda	9	46.11	33.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>42.01</b>	<b>29.997</b>

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

2018-2019:

The spreadsheet I created to track launch, approval, and completion/import dates of all Curriculog proposals proved useful in being able to determine average processing time. I reported the average processing time in both days and work days, because faculty and staff are not expected to work over the weekend.

As expected, the average processing time for courses was much lower than the average processing time for curricula, because some curricula must be sent to the state for approval. I was not expecting the average processing time for the memo proposals to be the highest, so this is something I will be paying attention to during the 2020-2021 curriculum cycle. Overall, I believe an average processing time of 41.6 days and 30.87 work days is fair considering we had 575 proposals this year.

Although I stated in my 2017-2018 analysis that I would be setting a benchmark this year, I am going to wait until the 2019-2020 reporting year to set a benchmark. The Curriculum and Course Development Policy was revised in the middle of the curriculum cycle to remove the UCC/GC representative approval step and to force approve proposals on the AAC step after seven days, so I would like to see what impact this has on the average processing time in the next curriculum cycle.

2019-2020:

The average processing time increased by 3.3 days and 2.13 work days over the 2018-2019 reporting year. While the average processing time for courses decreased by 7.83 days and 5.79 work days, the average processing time increased by 4.02 days and 2.8 work days for curricula and by 13.7 days and 9.41 work days for memoranda.

The increase in average processing time for curricula is likely due a large number of proposals requiring state approval and the state being overwhelmed with proposals. It took an extraordinarily long time for state approval this year, which leaves me hoping to have less proposals requiring state approval next year. Since hope is not a concrete plan for improvement, my plan is to communicate with departments at the

beginning of the fall semester and get all proposals requiring state approval submitted no later than the end of October.

For memoranda, I did launch these proposals earlier than I did last year, which means they were hanging out there for quite a while before department heads and deans acted on them. Again, to decrease the average processing time, I plan to notify department heads as soon as the memoranda have been submitted, which hopefully will result in quicker approvals.

Effective with the 2020-2021 academic year, the benchmark will be an average processing time of less than either 40 days or 30 work days.

#### 2020-2021:

The average processing time increased by 40.28 days (an 89.71% increase) and 28.73 work days (an 87.06% increase) over the 2019-2020 reporting year, so we did not meet the benchmark established last year.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the University being hit by Hurricane Laura and Hurricane Delta, the 2021-2022 curriculum cycle was entirely virtual. Also, because the University was closed for much of September, I extended the deadline for proposals by a month to the end of October. This all contributed to the curriculum cycle being more spread out and taking much longer. In other words, this curriculum cycle was an outlier, and we expect to be somewhat back to normal for the 2022-2023 curriculum cycle.

#### 2021-2022:

We did not meet the benchmark established for 2020-2021; however, the average processing times were back down to pre-COVID and pre-hurricane levels. While the average number of days was up to 45.87 (an increase of 2.16% over 2019-2020), the average number of work days was down to 32.64 (a decrease of 1.09% over 2019-2020). Considering everything the University has gone through since 2020, these numbers are laudible.

With the Board of Regents now requiring institutions to submit academic plans listing any new programs or terminations we plan to submit for the next three years (though we only have to submit a one-year plan for this first year), I should be better prepared for future curriculum cycles by taking those lengthy processing times into consideration from the start. I can also seek approval from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to bring proposals up for review in the order in which they are submitted, as opposed to doing one college per meeting. These two strategies should bring me closer to meeting the benchmark next year.

#### 2022-2023:

We met the benchmark of an average processing time of less than 30 work days this year, although it was only by a hair at 29.997 work days. The average processing times of 42.01 days and 29.997 work days are the lowest averages we have had since 2018-2019, which is commendable given that the 421 proposals we had this year is more than we have had since 2018-2019.

As stated in my plan for continuous improvement last year, I was able to meet the benchmark this year by having the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee review proposals in the order in which they were submitted. However, I feel this may have led to more errors on the back end (i.e., after proposals were approved and imported into the catalog), so this may not be the best strategy moving forward. The benchmark will remain as is for at least one more year, at which point I will reevaluate.

## 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	Inactivated courses	
		#	%
2018-2019	634	426	67.2%

2019-2020	408	297	72.8%
2020-2021	162	67	41.4%
2021-2022	85	41	48.2%
2022-2023	151	78	57.6%
2023-2024	120	32	26.7%

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

2018-2019:

Contrary to my prediction in the 2017-2018 analysis above, we well exceeded our benchmark of a 50% reduction of obsolete courses, even surpassing the 67.2% reduction in the 2018-2019 catalog. The process to remove obsolete courses was handled through a new Curriculog approval process for memos, with one being submitted for each department listing all courses not offered by the department within five years.

Based on the data, this seemed to drastically help us meet our benchmark; however, it was not a flawless process. Although the memos went through the usual approval steps for a course deletion, the list of courses being deleted was not always shared within the department. This resulted in some administrative assistants and faculty contacting me either later in the fall or early in the spring to ask why a course or courses were no longer showing up in the catalog. To address this moving forward, I will stress to department heads the need to share this information interdepartmentally as soon as I launch the proposals in Curriculog. I may also have to consider creating accounts in Curriculog for administrative assistants and setting them up to receive notifications when the proposals are completed.

2019-2020:

We did not meet the 50% benchmark this year, falling short by 8.6%. We have, however, drastically reduced the number of obsolete courses over the last three years, leaving only 95 obsolete courses in the system at the end of this academic year. While that number is expected to go up to 155 once we back up the cut-off to include another academic year, that is still considerably less than the 634 we started with three years ago. As I stated in my 2017-2018 analysis above, I believe the benchmark may need to be lowered slightly after next year; however, I will make that determination based on next year's data.

2020-2021:

We did not meet the 50% benchmark again this year; however, we were only short by 1.8%, which is better than last year. Since we began tracking this data four years ago, we have inactivated 831 courses, which is, in my opinion, outstanding! Because we were only short by 1.8% this year, I am going to leave the benchmark at 50% and see how we do next year.

2021-2022:

We finally met the benchmark of 50% again this year after two years of not meeting the benchmark. The percentage of courses inactivated increased by 9.4% over last year, which is largely due to the number of obsolete courses increasing by 66. Since we began tracking this data, we have inactivated 909 out of 1,440 obsolete courses, or 63.1%. For next year, I expect approximately 140 courses will be on the chopping block, so I will leave the benchmark at 50%.

2022-2023:

We fell short of meeting the benchmark of 50% by 33.3% this year, which is the worst we have done since we started tracking this data. Since faculty have the final say on whether to inactivate courses, all IRE can do is make the case for inactivating obsolete courses. Because I am not sure if the 26.7% we achieved this year is the new normal, I am going to leave the benchmark at 50% for one more year and then reevaluate.

## 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Process zero addenda proposals for the currently published catalog.

Prior to 2022-2023, the benchmark was to process no more than 10 addenda proposals for the currently published catalog.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was to 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
2018-2019	20	No
2019-2020	9	Yes
2020-2021	2	Yes
2021-2022	2	Yes
2022-2023	0	Yes

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

2018-2019:

I did not meet the benchmark created last year of no more than 10 addenda proposals being submitted for the currently published catalog; however, eight of the addenda proposals that were submitted were due to the state-mandated redesign of teacher education programs, which was obviously beyond my control. Additionally, we allowed the Department of Biology to create four new graduate courses for their new integrative biology concentration of the M.S. in Environmental and Chemical Sciences program, three of which were 500-level courses that required alterations to the cross-listed 400-level courses. This was to provide incoming students with more course options in the spring 2019 class schedule, since the Department of Biology was already low on options due to the low number of graduate courses in the department's course inventory. That said, without the eight education course proposals and the three biology course proposals that resulted from the three new graduate course proposals, I would have met the benchmark.

Moving forward, I do not foresee any similar situations that would result in more than 10 addenda proposals, so I will wait until next year when I have gathered more data to consider whether corrective action is necessary in order to meet the benchmark.

2019-2020:

For the first time in at least the last five years, I had less than 10 addenda proposals for the currently published catalog. This was accomplished through relatively strict adherence to the deadlines in the Academic Catalog Policy and better communication with faculty regarding the issues caused by addenda.

Moving forward, I hope to further decrease the number of addenda as well as the number of proposals allowed to go through for the new catalog right after it is published. While I do not consider these addenda since the new catalog is not effective until June 1, these proposals still cause problems for me and the Registrar's Office. I will re-evaluate this benchmark as well as determine if a benchmark is needed for post-publication proposals after next year.

2020-2021:

For the second time in at least the last six years, I had less than 10 addenda proposals for the currently published catalog with only two (!) being submitted. Since I have been in this role and regularly communicating deadlines for several years now, the number of addenda is decreasing as expected. After one more year of data collection, I am hoping that I can change the benchmark for this assessment to zero addenda proposals.

2021-2022:

For the second time in two years, I only had two addenda proposals for the currently published catalog. Although it is not zero this year as I had hoped, I am still going to change the benchmark to zero addenda proposals for 2022-2023.

2022-2023:

I am thrilled to have met the new benchmark of zero addenda proposals for the currently published catalog,



and I could not have done it without the cooperation of faculty. Moving forward, I will continue to regularly communicate deadlines in order to keep meeting this benchmark.

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

#### **1 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: 100% participation in the assessment reporting process.

##### **1.1 Data**

Administrative Units (7.3):

Reporting Year	# Submitted	% Participation
2017-2018	14/17	82.3%
2018-2019	33/45*	75.6%
2019-2020	14/42	33.3%
2020-2021	31/44	70.5%
2021-2022	34/44	77.3%

\*Increase due to colleges and departments being reclassified as administrative units instead of academic and student services.

Academic Programs (8.2.a):

Reporting Year	# Submitted	% Participation
2012-2013	40/76	52.6%
2013-2014	70/75	93.3%
2014-2015	52/60	86.6%
2015-2016	48/61	87.6%
2016-2017	60/63	95.2%
2017-2018	58/64	90.6%
2018-2019	48/63	76.2%
2019-2020	8/60	13.3%
2020-2021	44/61	72.1%
2021-2022	52/65	80.0%

Academic and Student Services (8.2.c):

Reporting Year	# Submitted	% Participation
2017-2018	43/48	89.6%
2018-2019	19/20	95%
2019-2020	12/21	57.1%
2020-2021	14/21	66.7%
2021-2022	18/22	81.8%

Overall Participation:

Reporting Year	# Submitted	% Participation
2017-2018	115/129	89.1%
2018-2019	100/128	78.1%
2019-2020	34/123	27.6%

2020-2021	89/126	70.6%
2021-2022	104/131	79.4%

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

2018-2019:

For the 2017-2018 reporting year, I revised the Data field above to disaggregate participation rates by the relevant SACSCOC standards. While the quantitative data above shows a decrease in participation rates (especially from 95.2% to 90.6% for academic programs), it does not tell the whole story. The 2017-2018 academic year began with a new administration and several changes to academic leadership. This is not necessarily an excuse for the lack of participation, but new leadership means new objectives and new data, which means there may have been no data to report. Furthermore, the quality of the reports that were submitted has increased significantly from just two years ago. The submission of the reports in Xitracs has allowed IRE to easily provide constructive feedback on every assessment item, and I expect the quality of reports to continue improving. As for the programs and units not submitting reports, IRE will reach out near the beginning of the semester to build a plan if one does not exist and include the appropriate vice president, if necessary. Baby steps...

2019-2020:

The 2018-2019 reporting year saw an 11% decrease in overall participation, which breaks down to a decrease of 6.7% for administrative units, a decrease of 14.4% for academic programs, and an increase of 5.4% for academic and student services. With even more changes in administrative/academic leadership this year, the result was 15/28 missing reports not being submitted or not even being built yet. Obviously, 28 missing reports is unacceptable, and we will do our best to work with faculty, department heads, and deans on resolving these issues for the 2019-2020 reporting year. Since the SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report is only a couple years away, academic programs must start submitting assessment reports, and we will lean on Dr. Adrian and the deans for their assistance in getting this accomplished.

2020-2021:

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the University being hit by Hurricane Laura and Hurricane Delta, the 2019-2020 reporting year saw a 50.5% decrease in overall participation. This breaks down to a decrease of 42.3% for administrative units, 62.9% for academic programs, and 37.9% for academic and student services. Needless to say, the events of 2020 hit us hard, especially with regard to assessment. However, IRE implemented Assessment, Commencement, and Evaluation (ACE) Week at the end of the Spring 2021 semester, during which all academic programs were required to complete their assessment reports. A quick glance at the Programs module in Xitracs shows it was successful at getting more academic program reports submitted over the 2019-2020 reporting year. Next year's data will show whether we got back to pre-2019-2020 reporting levels or higher, but we are optimistic.

2021-2022:

We did not get back to pre-2019-2020 reporting levels as we had hoped in last year's analysis. Overall participation was down 7.5% compared to the 2018-2019 reporting year, which breaks down to a decrease of 5.1% for administrative units, 4.1% for academic programs, and 28.3% for academic and student services (while this seems like a lot, there were only five fewer reports).

Even though we saw a decrease compared to two years ago, we would still consider ACE Week a success for academic program report submissions. Whenever possible, IRE is also working with units/programs not actively participating in assessment to get them involved moving forward. While our main priority this summer and fall is going to be completing the Fifth-Year Interim Report, this will be a priority in the spring.

2022-2023:

The 2021-2022 reporting year was a phenomenal year for assessment reporting. Our overall participation increased by 8.8% and was our highest participation rate since the 2018-2019 reporting year. Administrative unit participation increased by 6.8% (highest since 2017-2018), academic program participation increased by 7.9% (highest since 2017-2018), and academic and student services participation increased by 15.1% (highest since 2018-2019).

While we only reported on academic program assessment on the SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report, it was the first time since at least the 2012 SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report that we were not dinged on assessment, which is OUTSTANDING!

That said, we still have some improvement to do in this area since our benchmark is 100% participation. While the dye has essentially already been cast for the 2022-2023 reporting cycle, meaning that it will be increasingly difficult to collect assessment reports not already completed, IRE will do its best to push assessment hard for the 2023-2024 reporting cycle through regular communication with unit heads.

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 100% collection of forms from all general education course sections.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 100% collection of forms from courses tagged for assessment.

### 2.1 Data

Semester	# Required	# Missing	% Submitted	# Missing Artifacts	% Submitted Artifacts
Fall 2014	27	8	70.4%	—	—
Spring 2015	27	7	74.1%	—	—
Fall 2015	28	6	78.6%	—	—
Spring 2016	28	4	85.7%	—	—
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%

Semester	Submitted Forms		Submitted Artifacts	
	#	%	#	%
Fall 2018	360/434	82.9%	347/434	80.0%
Spring 2019	340/425	80.0%	285/425	67.1%
Fall 2019	345/419	82.3%	337/419	80.4%
Spring 2020	267/409	65.3%	202/409	49.4%
Fall 2020	247/409	60.3%	—	—
Spring 2021	342/418	81.8%	—	—
Fall 2021	285/360	79.2%	241/360	66.9%
Spring 2022	279/334	83.5%	252/334	75.4%
Fall 2022	291/362	80.4%	283/362	78.2%
Spring 2023	290/343	84.5%	288/343	84.0%

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

2018-2019:

We stated last year that we would begin requiring every course in the General Education Core Curriculum to submit a course summary form, but we ended up requiring every section of every general education course to submit a course section summary form. While our participation decreased by 5.9% over last fall and 17.2% over last spring, it was something we expected. The benefits of having every instructor submit their own course section summary form are 1) every instructor is engaging in the assessment process and 2) it helps us tune in on our problem areas. We now know exactly who did not participate and whether assessments are the same across all sections of a particular course. We plan to continue requiring every section to submit a form in 2019-2020, and then we will revisit this process. One minor thing we do plan to

change for 2019-2020 is adding an e-mail field that will allow for the submission to be sent to the person completing the form.

#### 2019-2020:

This was the second year of requiring every general education course section to submit a course section summary form. While we did not meet the benchmark for 100% participation, I believe we did fairly well. Comparing fall over fall, participation in form submission decreased by 0.6%; however, artifact submission increased by 0.4%. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, we did have sharp decreases in participation this spring over last spring (14.7% for form submission and 17.7% for artifact submission). Since we are not sure how long we will be dealing with the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the best plan we have to keep participation up in the fall is to communicate with departments and individual faculty prior to the beginning of the semester.

Also, I wanted to note that we were unable to have a copy of submissions sent to the person completing the webform simply by adding an e-mail field to the webform as stated in the 2018-2019 analysis. I am hoping that we can explore this option again once the webform is moved to the new web publisher by the end of the summer.

#### 2020-2021:

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic as well as the University being hit by Hurricane Laura and Hurricane Delta, we saw the percentage of submitted forms continue to decrease in Fall 2020 by 5% over Spring 2020. However, IRE implemented Assessment, Commencement, and Evaluation (ACE) Week at the end of the Spring 2021 semester, during which all sections of General Education courses were required to submit their course section summary forms by the Tuesday before Commencement. Compared to Spring 2019 and Spring 2020, Spring 2021 was our best spring semester with 81.8% of sections submitting data, which tells us that ACE Week was a tremendous success.

Because 2020-2021 was such a wonky year, we did not keep track of which sections submitted artifacts; however, we will revisit how we keep track of this information and report it in 2021-2022.

We will definitely hold ACE Week again in Spring 2022, and we are looking at some variation of ACE Week for Fall 2021. We fully expect participation to increase for 2021-2022 through more targeted communication with faculty.

#### 2021-2022:

This academic year was extraordinary for general education assessment submissions. We had the highest participation rate in a single semester (83.5% in Spring 2022) since we began requiring one submission for each section of all general education courses. A quick calculation of annual participation rates shows we were only 0.23% away from our highest annual participation rate back in 2018-2019. As for artifact submissions, we did have our lowest fall submission rate (66.9%) since Fall 2018, but we had our highest spring submission rate (75.4%).

Moving forward, we need to make sure all general education faculty are aware of the submission requirement prior to the start of each semester. This means IRE needs to inform department heads of which sections must participate in general education assessment no later than the Monday that faculty return, and IRE needs to send an email to individual faculty to let them know by that date as well. Perhaps IRE being more proactive on the front end will increase submission rates at the end of the semester.

#### 2022-2023:

I am proud to say that, yet again, we had the highest participation rate in a single semester (84.5% in Spring 2023) since we began requiring one submission for each section of all general education courses. We also had our best fall participation rate since Fall 2019 (pre-COVID and pre-hurricanes) with 80.4%. Furthermore, a quick calculation of annual participation rates shows we beat our highest annual participation rate of 81.49% back in 2018-2019 by 0.92% with a 2022-2023 participation rate of 82.41%. While we did not meet the benchmark of 100% participation, we seem to be on the right track with increases in two consecutive years. Baby steps...

Admittedly, I did not follow through on my plan for continuous improvement last year, which makes this year's results even more extraordinary! However, I fully intend to email department heads and all general education section instructors as soon as they return for the Fall 2023 semester. Perhaps this will lead to a third consecutive year of increasing participation rates!

#### **Performance Objective 4 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
2018-2019	100
2019-2020	83
2020-2021	70
2021-2022	103
2022-2023	121

Request Type Breakdown for 2021-2022:

Request Type	# of Requests
Accreditation Report	13
Degrees Awarded	7
Employee/Faculty	12
Enrollment/Retention	38
Financial Aid	6
SEI	5
Student Credit Hour Production	0
Other	22

Request Type Breakdown for 2022-2023:

Request Type	# of Requests
Accreditation Report	8
Degrees Awarded	8
Employee/Faculty	20
Enrollment/Retention	54
Financial Aid	3
SEI	5
Student Credit Hour Production	2
Other	21

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

**2018-2019:**

The number of data requests went up by 18 from 2017-2018. This is most likely due to the Ruffalo Noel Levitz consulting work that is underway on campus. With the new attitude towards using data to make decisions, it is anticipated that the number of data requests will stay steady or go up in the future. There are some data requests that require analysis, and this type of data cannot be presented on our website.

In addition, we hope to move our data request submission form to the Jira project management system. This will allow us to ask questions about the data requests and write comments on how the data was acquired, etc.

**2019-2020:**

The number of data requests fell by 17 from 2018-2019. This is most likely due to the Ruffalo Noel Levitz consulting work slowing down a bit from its current pace. In addition, many more individuals are using our online tools for data, such as the Factbook and Quick Facts.

We are still working on getting a Jira project management system account set up in order for us to better track our data requests.

**2020-2021:**

The number of data requests fell by 13 from 2019-2020. This is most likely due to the two hurricanes that the University endured. In addition, many more individuals are using our online tools for data.

We are still working on getting a Jira project management system account set up in order for us to better track our data requests.

**2021-2022:**

The number of data requests went up by 33 from 2020-2021. This is most likely due to the fact that the COVID-19 pandemic is calming down and many other initiatives are picking up post-hurricane recovery. Of the 103 requests, the most requested category was enrollment/retention. As a result of this, we will attempt to prioritize dashboards related to enrollment.

**2022-2023:**

The number of data requests went up by 18 from 2021-2022. This is most likely due to the fact that post-hurricane and COVID-19 initiatives are picking back up and the University is returning to some sort of normalcy. Two specific items of note: Employee/Faculty requests went up by five, and Enrollment/Retention requests went up by eight. This is most likely due to our enrollment challenges and the fact that these areas are being monitored more closely.

A ticketing system was developed to better assist in tracking our data requests. It utilizes Forms, Sharepoint, Teams, and Outlook, all products of Microsoft 365.

## **2 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: SEIs delivered and reported on time.

### **2.1 Data**

**2018-2019:**

All SEIs and their associated reports were delivered to the appropriate stakeholders in a timely manner. We also implemented a 100% online administration of SEIs.

**2019-2020:**

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

**2020-2021:**

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

**2021-2022:**

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

2022-2023:

All SEIs 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**

2018-2019:

We implemented the alternate SEI schedule that allowed deans, department heads, and faculty to receive scores before the end of the academic year. This necessitated a move to 100% online administration. We will continue to revise and refine the timeline of delivery of results. We are also going to explore the Moodle connector, which allows us to place SEI surveys in the Moodle system for students. This is expected to help increase response rate for SEIs.

2019-2020:

The alternate SEI schedule that allowed deans, department heads, and faculty to receive scores before the end of the academic year was successful. We met the deadline of when the reports were to be delivered. Due to COVID-19 and the subsequent moving of instruction to 100% online, some reports that are normally printed out had to be manually emailed to instructors. These were completed within the regular deadline.

We are in the process of doing some improvements to the Class Climate system. We will be adding the Moodle Connector, which will allow SEI links to be delivered via student Moodle accounts. This will hopefully boost response rates for SEIs. We are also in the process of updating the online survey template, which will drastically modernize the look and feel of our surveys.

2020-2021:

We met all deadlines related to report delivery. Due to the two hurricanes, some reports that are normally printed out had to be manually emailed to instructors. These were completed within the regular deadline. This change will become permanent. A Class Climate update allowed us to start using the updated survey template. This has modernized the look and feel of our surveys. We were not able to add the Moodle Connector due to issues with the Moodle system itself. We hope to take a look at this in the coming year, subject to Moodle working correctly.

2021-2022:

The entirety of the SEI process went smoothly and as planned. The deadlines for administration and delivery of reports were met and delivered via email. The Moodle Connector issue has not been resolved. We plan to incorporate the "Response Rate Notification" option in the administration of the SEIs. This will send the instructor a notification of the response rate in real time, in hopes this will encourage instructors to advise students to submit their SEI.

2022-2023:

The SEI process went well this year. All deadlines related to administration and delivery of reports were met. We incorporated the "Response Rate Notification" this past year. In Fall 2022, we set the response rate at 30%. In Spring 2023, we set the response rate at 40%. We will monitor to see whether the 40% boosts participation, with a goal of boosting to 50% in the near future.

## **3 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: Digitize older files so they can be sent electronically more easily and quickly.

### **3.1 Data**

2018-2019:

One student worker has digitized workload reports up to Fall 2018. She has also continued digitizing 14th day census reports. Another student worker has begun digitizing accreditation, policy, and program review files.

2019-2020:

Unfortunately, no further progress was made on digitizing files this year.

2020-2021:

We were unable to make progress on this project this year due to COVID-19 and the University being hit by Hurricane Laura and Hurricane Delta.

2021-2022:

We now have system in BDM for Connie to scan and store old personnel files.

2022-2023:

During this reporting year, Connie scanned at least 833 employee files, including active faculty, unclassified staff, and visiting lecturers.

The IR student worker was able to restart the digitizing of various enrollment files. Most of these files are from the 1970s and 1980s and are copies of much larger paper data files.

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

2018-2019:

We will continue to keep scanning workload reports as they are completed as well as enrollment files. Enrollment files will also be continued. We have also begun the process of scanning old data requests. All of this work will continue in the 2019-2020 academic year.

2019-2020:

Due to several, higher priority projects throughout the year, we were not able to make any further progress on digitizing files in our office. We plan to circle back to it during the 2020-2021 academic year.

2020-2021:

Now that we are back in our building after the hurricanes, we are preparing a scanning project for Connie that will digitize all faculty and staff files. Our student will also be scanning files on the IR side of the office.

2021-2022:

It took a while, but Connie is now set up to digitize our personnel files, and we have a new hiring approval process with HR that is mostly electronic. We will track Connie's scanning progress from this point forward.

2022-2023:

Since Connie has scanned all the active personnel files, she will move on to the inactive files stored in the workroom. Once she is done with those, she will begin tackling the files in the storage closet. On the IR side, the student worker will continue scanning enrollment files as time permits and between higher priority projects.

## **4 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: Implement a data dashboard.

### **4.1 Data**

2018-2019:

We upgraded our Visart system to the new Spreadsheetweb product. However, we had some installation issues and had to reinstall the system. We now appear on track to start building test dashboards. We hope to have a dashboard ready for Fall 2019.

2019-2020:

We found that the Spreadsheetweb product did not work for us. We were in the process of exploring the Power BI product when the University of Louisiana System (ULS) purchased the Tableau dashboard software for all system schools. As a result, we have abandoned Spreadsheetweb and the Power BI exploration and will be using Tableau. We have started building dashboards, such as a dashboard for daily registration statistics.

2020-2021:

Due to the two hurricanes, we were not able to get as far with dashboards as we would have liked. However, we have made headway with the registration statistics dashboard. It is presented and discussed at Senior Staff each week during registration season. We have also made strides with a public census day dashboard, but problems with the embed code have prevented us from posting publicly. We will be working to remedy this.

2021-2022:

The registration statistics dashboard has continued to be presented and discussed at Senior Staff each week during registration season. After much work, the public census day dashboards are now live and available for



viewing on the IRE website.

2022-2023:

The registration statistics dashboard is delivered to Senior Staff each week during registration season. The public census day dashboards continue to be available on the IRE website; they are continuously updated each term.

Retention and graduation rate dashboards were created. These will be updated as data become available.

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

2018-2019:

We upgraded Visart to the new Spreadsheetweb product. We will continue to learn ways to use the system to display data in order to make informed decisions. We will research dashboards at other schools in order to get ideas. We plan to have two semester dashboards at a time and also have other dashboards that display data that is yet to be decided.

2019-2020:

We will continue to learn the new Tableau software to display data in the most efficient and useful way in order to make informed decisions. We look forward to collaborating with our sister schools and the University of Louisiana System on how to best display data for each of our institutions.

2020-2021:

We will continue to learn and research the best way to display our data in the most efficient and useful way. We look forward to collaborating with our sister schools and the University of Louisiana System on how to best display data for each of our institutions.

2021-2022:

Now that we have successfully launched a public dashboard, we will continue to expand and create additional dashboards in order to display data.

2022-2023:

We hope to create and launch a public completers dashboard. We also hope to create an internal dashboard that will assist with tracking retention for each cohort by college, department, and major. We are in the process of creating a professional licensure dashboard to comply with recently enacted federal regulations regarding Title IV.

### Performance Objective 5 Develop and implement the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

#### 1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 100% collection of forms from all *Navigate Your Future* QEP course sections.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was assignments that address QEP student learning outcomes will be embedded in 105 identified courses at the introductory, midpoint, and capstone levels.

##### 1.1 Data

Academic Year	2016-2017	2017-2018
Benchmark	Pilot, no benchmark	50% tagged courses
# tagged courses	42	42
# courses participating	11	29
% courses participating	26.1%	69%
# tagged sections	128	128
# sections participating	—	104
% sections participating	—	81.25%
Benchmark met?	—	Yes

Semester	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
Benchmark	75% tagged courses		100% tagged courses	
# tagged courses offered	51	55	54	56
# courses participating	33	40	45	30
% courses participating	64.7%	72.7%	83.3%	53.6%
# tagged sections	172	151	146	152
# sections participating	97	82	103	62
% sections participating	56.4%	54.3%	70.5%	40.8%
Benchmark met?	No	No	No	No

Semester	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
Benchmark	100% tagged courses		100% tagged courses	
# tagged courses offered	53	55	48	54
# courses participating	25	47	43	47
% courses participating	47.1%	85.4%	89.6%	87%
# tagged sections	145	140	123	117
# sections participating	64	114	98	101
% sections participating	44.1%	81.4%	79.7%	86.3%
Benchmark met?	No	No	No	No

Semester	Fall 2022	Spring 2023
Benchmark	100% tagged courses	
# tagged courses offered	47	52
# courses participating	41	47
% courses participating	87.2%	90.4%
# tagged sections	117	113
# sections participating	88	99
% sections participating	75.2%	87.6%
Benchmark met?	No	No

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

2018-2019:

Due to many mitigating factors (new leadership, general education redesign, etc.), we did not reach our implementation goal for the year. This academic year, we plan to meet with colleges and departments who have fallen behind and help them implement their assignments.

2019-2020:

Although we did not meet the benchmark for 100% participation this year, participation at the course level and the section level did increase, at least in the fall. In Fall 2019, course participation increased by 18.6% over the previous fall and 10.6% over Spring 2019, and section participation increased by 14.1% over the previous fall and 16.2% over Spring 2019.

Participation in Spring 2020 was much lower than the three preceding semesters, which we attribute to

courses having to move online due to the COVID-19 pandemic. We will do our best to work with faculty on adjusting or implementing appropriate assignments to accommodate the delivery method of their courses prior to the Fall 2020 semester. With only two years left of the QEP, it is extremely important that we reach 100% participation.

2020-2021:

Although we still did not meet the benchmark for 100% this year, we did have the highest percentage of courses and sections participating in Spring 2021 than we have had since we implemented the QEP. For Spring 2021, we had 85.4% of courses and 81.4% of sections, which is great considering the various disasters we encountered during the 2020-2021 academic year. We attribute the increase to the implementation of Assessment, Commencement, and Evaluation (ACE) Week at the end of the Spring semester, during which all sections of QEP courses were required to submit their course section summary forms by the Tuesday before commencement.

Since ACE Week seems to have been a tremendous success, we will definitely hold ACE Week again in Spring 2022, and we are looking at some variation of ACE Week for Fall 2021.

2021-2022:

Unfortunately, we did not meet the 100% benchmark again this year. However, we did have our BEST year since the pilot in 2016-2017! We had our highest-ever course participation rates in both semesters, and we had our highest-ever section participation rate in Spring 2022 (Fall 2022 is the third highest behind Spring 2021).

Even though the QEP Impact Report will be submitted as part of the Fifth-Year Impact Report in March 2023, we will still gather data from QEP sections for the entire 2022-2023 year, just in case we are required to continue with the QEP to demonstrate compliance. That said, IRE will make every effort to increase participation even more in 2022-2023 through the same pre-semester communication with department heads and QEP faculty as planned for general education assessment.

2022-2023:

While we did not meet the benchmark of 100% participation from QEP course sections, we still closed out the last semester of QEP data collection with both the highest course participation rate and the highest section participation rate. The course participation rate in Spring 2023 was 90.4%, which is 0.8% more than the previous high of 89.6% in Fall 2021. The section participation rate in Spring 2023 was 87.6%, which is 1.3% more than the previous high of 86.3% in Spring 2022.

Our QEP Impact Report would not have been accepted by SACSCOC had it not been for faculty doing their part since we piloted the QEP in Fall 2016. On behalf of everyone in IRE, I want to thank all faculty, staff, and students for making the QEP a success!

The *Navigate Your Future* QEP is officially concluded, and this performance objective will be removed effective with the 2023-2024 reporting cycle.

## **Performance Objective 6 Increase stakeholder satisfaction of services provided.**

### **1 Assessment and Benchmark**

Benchmark: Earn an average score of at least 4.65 (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.

Prior to 2020-2021, the benchmark was to 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	41/125	32.8%
2017-2018	42/118	35.6%

2018-2019	40/122	32.8%
2019-2020	143/634	22.6%
2020-2021	173/600	28.8%
2021-2022	159/561	28.3%
2022-2023	134/533	25.1%

Indicator	Academic Year Ending			
	2017	2018	2019	2020
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff conducts business in a collegial manner.	4.61	4.59	4.35	4.62
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in an ethical manner.	4.74	4.72	4.5	4.69
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in a timely manner.	4.6	4.66	4.43	4.6
Overall, I feel that information received from the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff is accurate.	4.66	4.69	4.42	4.62
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.65</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>4.43</b>	<b>4.63</b>

Indicator	Academic Year Ending			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff conducts business in a collegial manner.	4.46	4.52	4.68	
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in an ethical manner.	4.55	4.63	4.77	
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in a timely manner.	4.42	4.40	4.66	
Overall, I feel that information received from the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff is accurate.	4.47	4.51	4.64	
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.48</b>	<b>4.52</b>	<b>4.69</b>	

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

#### 2018-2019:

All of the scores decreased this year. This could be due to many reasons, including new leadership around campus, additional work created by Ruffalo Noel Levitz consultants, and general education redesign efforts. We will give this survey one more year before adjusting the benchmark.

#### 2019-2020:

We achieved the benchmark on all four survey items this year, with all four scores increasing on a range from 0.17 to 0.27 points. It should be noted that while our response rate percentage decreased by 10.2%, our number of responses increased by 103. This is due to our survey being combined with service surveys for several other offices on campus and sent out to all faculty and staff as opposed to only unit heads and select faculty as in previous years.

We are very satisfied with our scores on these four items and will increase the benchmark to 4.65 for the 2020-2021 academic year.

#### 2020-2021:

The response rate for our survey increased by 6.2%; however, our scores slightly decreased on a range from 0.14 to 0.18. Decreased satisfaction may be due to the terrible year McNeese endured between

COVID-19, two hurricanes, and an ice storm. We will retain our benchmark and work to bring some normalcy back to our operations in 2021-2022.

#### 2021-2022:

We did not meet the benchmark of 4.65 on any of the above indicators this year, though we were only 0.02 points away for providing services in an ethical manner. Our scores for three out of the four items increased compared to last year; the score for providing services in a timely manner decreased by 0.02 points compared to last year. We will not change the benchmarks and work to improve our timeliness and collegiality. Now that the campus is back online and we expect a normal academic year, we hope to see a boost in these ratings.

#### 2022-2023:

We met the benchmark of 4.65 on all items except the last one regarding the accuracy of information, which was just shy of the benchmark by 0.01 points. The average of all four scores exceeded the benchmark by 0.04 points.

After reading through the survey comments, our plan for continuous improvement is to seek feedback on the back end of data requests. For several years, we have had at least one survey comment stating that the data we provided was incorrect; however, data do not lie, so perhaps there was a miscommunication somewhere along the way. We should be able to resolve those issues and will work to do so.

## 2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an average score of at least 4.50 (on a 5.00 scale) on each item of the IRE Service Survey relating to services provided or responsibilities.

### 2.1 Data

Academic Year	Response Rate	
	#	%
2016-2017	41/125	32.8%
2017-2018	42/118	35.6%
2018-2019	40/122	32.8%
2019-2020	143/634	22.6%
2020-2021	173/600	28.8%
2021-2022	159/561	28.3%
2022-2023	134/533	25.1%

Indicator	Academic Year Ending					
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Accreditation Support	4.59	4.58	4.25	4.59	4.32	4.54
Annual Research Hours Reporting	4.46	4.64	4.17	4.5	4.28	4.39
Assessment Reports	4.16	4.41	4.19	4.47	4.25	4.36
Catalog Updates	4.44	4.47	4.47	4.5	4.26	4.38
Curriculum and Course Development Process	4.38	4.52	4.28	4.53	4.2	4.32
Data Requests	4.68	4.5	4.63	4.56	4.41	4.53
Faculty Workload Process	4.61	4.57	4.25	4.33	4.08	3.99
General Education Assessment Process	4.61	4.67	4.17	4.32	3.88	3.95
QEP Assessment Process	—	—	4.15	4.37	4.14	3.93
Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website	4.21	4.36	4.26	4.36	4.16	4.12
Student Evaluation of Instruction Process	4.54	4.16	3.69	3.98	3.76	3.85

<b>Average</b>	<b>4.47</b>	<b>4.49</b>	<b>4.23</b>	<b>4.41</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.22</b>
----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Indicator	Academic Year Ending					
	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
Accreditation Support	4.62					
Annual Research Hours Reporting	4.65					
Assessment Reports	4.5					
Catalog Updates	4.55					
Curriculum and Course Development Process	4.52					
Data Requests	4.6					
Faculty Credential Review	4.64					
Faculty Workload Process	4.47					
General Education Assessment Process	4.38					
Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website	4.41					
Student Evaluation of Instruction Process	3.89					
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.48</b>					

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

2018-2019:

The benchmark of 4.50 was achieved on only the Data Requests item, which is somewhat concerning since our response rate was roughly the same as last year when most of our scores increased. As stated earlier in this report, the 2018-2019 academic year was way busier than usual and brought several changes to academic leadership, goals, policies, and processes. In addition, the Ruffalo Noel-Levitz consultation began at the end of the fall semester, which consumed a lot of the IRE staff's time. This could provide a very general explanation for some score decreases. That said, there are some score decreases that can be easily explained.

- Annual Research Hours Reporting: The decreased score for annual research hours reporting can be attributed to the recent and major changes in academic leadership and processes on campus. One major factor attributed was an unexpected change in office personnel, which resulted in immediate transition and ongoing training of new personnel within IR as these processes were being conducted. Our expectation is that the process will be better as all new leadership begin to acclimate into their new roles.
- Assessment Reports: Previously "Assessment Plans" on the survey, the decrease of 0.22 points is likely due to the implementation of Xitracs. The 2017-2018 reporting year was the first year that assessment reports were completed in Xitracs, and we have made several changes to both unit and program reports since its implementation.
- Curriculum and Course Development Process: The 2018-2019 academic year was the second year that departments used Curriculog to submit curriculum and course proposals. It was very clear from the beginning of the curriculum cycle that most faculty had forgotten how to enter proposals. To address this decrease of 0.24 points in the 2020-2021 curriculum cycle, we will create our own "user manual" for each type of Curriculog proposal, which should help us to increase this score.
- Faculty Workload Process: The decreased score for faculty workloads may have been attributed to the recent changes in personnel within the IR, as well as academic leadership within departments here on campus. Training and the transitioning of new office personnel were being conducted during the implementation of this process. We will continue to monitor this and expect an improvement within the next year.
- General Education Assessment Process: Beginning in the Fall 2018 semester, a form was required for every section of general education courses as opposed to one form for all sections. This was to help us determine our problem areas, but it required more time from those faculty teaching multiple sections of general education courses. If time permits this summer or at the beginning of the fall

semester, we will look at the quality of the submissions and possibly revisit our submission procedures.

- Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website: We are still below the benchmark and the score has fallen even more from last year. Its possible that folks are looking for specific data that cannot be presented on the website because it has to be analyzed. The website should be moved to the new WordPress platform this year, which may assist us in presenting our data more clearly. In addition, the new dashboards may assist in showing data in a clearer way.
- Student Evaluation of Instruction Process: This decrease could be attributed to the change in the SEI process. The process went 100% online this past year. We will monitor this in the next year to see if this score rises; we expect that it will rise as faculty get more familiar and comfortable with the new process.

#### 2019-2020:

The benchmark of 4.5 was achieved for five of the 11 services/responsibilities of our office; however, all scores increased this year except for the Data Requests score, which only decreased by 0.07 points and is still above the benchmark. Compared to last year when we saw all scores decrease and only met the benchmark for one item, this year seems like a drastic improvement; however, there is always room for more. That said, here are our plans for the items still below the benchmark:

- Assessment Reports: We try every year to provide feedback on assessment reports and make them easier and more useful for faculty/staff. This year was no exception, and next year will not be an exception either. In fact, we will be folding strategic planning into unit assessment reports this upcoming year, a task which began to take shape this year. We will also collaborate with faculty and unit heads this fall to create the plans that still do not exist.
- Faculty Workload Process: The increase by 0.08 points this year resulted from increased efforts to effectively communicate with department heads and deans throughout the workload process. In an effort to continuously improve and make the faculty workload process more efficient, numerous changes have been made to the University's Responsibilities of Academic Staff Policy. Specific changes were made to the Course Scheduling, Workload, and Overload sections of the policy. These changes will make the process of determining workload hour equivalency easier. All policy changes will go into effect in Fall 2020. In addition, we are developing a plan to move the faculty workload process completely online through the Banner Faculty Load and Compensation (FLAC) module, which would create a bridge between the university's existing systems and better enable us to track workload more efficiently.
- General Education Assessment Process and QEP Assessment Process: General education and QEP assessment participation both took a hit from the COVID-19 pandemic. The sudden shift to online instruction meant some assessments were not or could not be administered, and some faculty were overwhelmed, understandably. That said, these assessments must still be administered, and we will do our best to assist faculty with adjusting or creating new assessments prior to the Fall 2020 semester.
- Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website: The website was not really maintained during the 2019-2020 academic year, aside from the Factbooks and Quick Facts pages, because we knew content and management of that content would be moving from Drupal to Wordpress. We expect the new website to be live by the end of the summer, at which point we will evaluate content and develop a plan within our office for regular updates. We may also move some of the content meant for mostly internal audiences to the MyMcNeese Portal, if the web team has not already done so.
- Student Evaluation of Instruction Process: While this is still our lowest scoring item and the only one below 4.0, it did increase by 0.29 points this year. Our instance of Class Climate was recently migrated from a local to a hosted solution, which essentially cuts out the "middle man" (UCS) between us and Class Climate. During the 2020-2021 academic year, we plan to begin using both the Moodle connector that was recently installed for SEI delivery to students as well as a new online template that will modernize the look of our surveys. We hope these changes will increase response rates, thus increasing faculty satisfaction with this process.

It should be noted that while our response rate percentage decreased by 10.2%, our number of responses

increased by 103. This is due to our survey being combined with service surveys for several other offices on campus and sent out to all faculty and staff as opposed to only unit heads and select faculty as in previous years.

#### 2020-2021:

The response rate for our survey increased by 6.2%; however, our scores decreased by an average of 0.25 and on a range from 0.15 to 0.44. Again, we attribute the decreased satisfaction to the terrible year McNeese endured between COVID-19, two hurricanes, and an ice storm. We will retain our benchmark and work to bring some normalcy back to our operations in 2021-2022.

#### 2021-2022:

This year, we only met the benchmark of 4.50 for accreditation support (4.54) and data requests (4.53). On the remaining nine items, we saw increases on all but three; the score for the IRE website went down 0.04, faculty workload process went down 0.09, and QEP assessment process went down 0.21.

The IRE website was recently redesigned to make it easier for visitors to find information. We still have a lot of work to do, so maybe that as well as visitors becoming more familiar with the new layout will help increase the score for next year.

The 0.09-point decrease for faculty workload process may be due to recent problems during Spring 2022, specifically with the total calculation of workloads within the Access database. The issue was communicated and resolved but may have resulted in negative feelings towards the overall process. However, we plan to continue our efforts to identify problems and apply solutions to provide a more effective and efficient process. The Faculty Load Compensation (FLAC) module remains a goal but is currently on hold due to other Banner priorities. We will continue to make efforts to improve the process and strive to achieve a higher score in the upcoming fiscal year.

We are unable to explain the steady decrease over the last two years for the QEP assessment process since participation rates have increased significantly in that same time. It is also odd that the score for general education assessment increased by 0.13 while the score for QEP assessment decreased by 0.21, especially since the process is the same for both. It should be noted that there is now only a 0.02-point gap between the two as opposed to the 0.26-point gap we had last year. We will see if the communication plan provided for both general education and QEP assessment results in higher scores next year.

As a general observation, some of the comments provided on the service survey make it clear that the role and functions of IRE are not widely known or understood by some faculty and staff. Since our office is responsible for so many things, we can see how that's come to be. Since the University is expecting a more normal academic year after two years of chaos, we hope that we will have more opportunities to educate faculty and interact with them.

#### 2022-2023:

We are thrilled to see that scores increased on every item related to services provided or responsibilities of IRE. The faculty workload process had the biggest score increase of 0.48 points over last year's score, while the student evaluation of instruction (SEI) process had the lowest score increase of 0.04 points. We met the benchmark on all but the last four items: faculty workload process, general education assessment process, IRE website, and SEI process. The overall average score of 4.48 was just shy of meeting the benchmark by 0.02 points.

For three of the four items on which we did not meet the benchmark--faculty workload process, general education assessment process, and IRE website--scores did increase over last year by 0.48, 0.43, and 0.29, respectively. These were the three highest score increases over last year, so we are moving in the right direction.

We are constantly making changes to the faculty workload process to make it easier on everyone, such as using OneDrive for the entire process. As stated last year, the Faculty Load Compensation (FLAC) module remains a goal, but it is still on hold due to other Banner priorities. Our hope is that the University will get caught up on Banner upgrades and roll out Banner 9 Self-Service during the 2023-2024 academic year,



which will allow us to make progress toward implementing the FLAC module.

Regarding the general education assessment process, I will note that this is the highest score we have had since 2017-2018; therefore, even though we did not meet the benchmark, we consider this great news! While we are not sure what the next year holds for IRE in terms of structure, personnel, or responsibilities, we plan on making general education assessment a priority. We also expect the conclusion of the QEP will make general education assessment seem less burdensome, thus increasing this score even more next year.

We also plan on making the IRE website a priority during the 2023-2024 academic year. Specifically, we would like to add more data and resources in order to further educate faculty and staff on our office's mission and services.

Lastly, regarding the SEI process, we are trying. We know this has been a problem area for a while, really since we moved the entire process online. We believe the score reflects dissatisfaction with response rates since we moved the process online, which we are trying to address by having response rate notifications sent to faculty if the response rate has not yet reached a target set by the IRE office (currently at 40%, but will increase to 50% in the near future). As stated throughout this report, baby steps...

### 3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an average score of at least 4.40 (on a 5.00 scale) on each item of the IRE Service Survey relating to software utilized across campus and administered by IRE.

Prior to 2020-2021, the benchmark was to earn an average score of at least 4.00 (on a 5.00 scale) on each item of the IRE Service Survey relating to software utilized across campus and administered by IRE.

#### 3.1 Data

Academic Year	Response Rate	
	#	%
2018-2019	40/122	32.8%
2019-2020	143/634	22.6%
2020-2021	173/600	28.8%
2021-2022	159/561	28.3%
2022-2023	134/533	25.1%

Indicator	Academic Year Ending								
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Class Climate	4.07	4.36	4.04	4.17	4.15				
Curriculog	3.88	4.31	4.16	4.15	4.34				
Xitracs	3.86	4.29	3.92	4.16	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Average</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>4.04</b>	<b>4.16</b>	<b>4.25</b>				

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

2018-2019:

This is the first year we have measured satisfaction with the three software systems IRE uses campus-wide. We did not meet our preliminary benchmark of 4.00 for Curriculog and Xitracs, but we did meet it for Class Climate. Something IRE is considering doing next year in Class Climate is combining the service surveys sent out to all faculty and staff into one big survey, which we hope reduces survey fatigue and faculty and staff find it more convenient. We are also hoping the second year of online-only SEIs will bring a score bump for next year. Lastly, we hope to integrate Class Climate with Moodle, which may increase scores in a year or two.

The 2018-2019 reporting year was only the second year that we had used Curriculog and the first year we had used Xitracs. For Curriculog, faculty entering proposals had either forgotten how to use the system from the previous year, or they were new faculty who had never been trained. I plan to create step-by-step instructions for each proposal type for the upcoming curriculum cycle, which should help bring this score up. For Xitracs, IRE learned a lot and made several changes to table layouts and data presentation in general after the first year of assessment reports were submitted. We also provided feedback on individual assessments via comments in the system, which helps us engage the campus in conversations regarding assessment. We are working to make this system as user-friendly and simple as possible for those that have to complete reports, so this is certainly one score we will be monitoring next year.

#### 2019-2020:

We well exceeded our benchmark of 4.0 for all three software solutions. Compared to last year, scores increased by 0.29 for Class Climate, 0.43 for Curriculog, and 0.44 for Xitracs.

It should be noted that while our response rate percentage decreased by 10.2%, our number of responses increased by 103. This is due to our survey being combined with service surveys for several other offices on campus and sent out to all faculty and staff as opposed to only unit heads and select faculty as in previous years.

For Class Climate, we combined several service surveys as stated in our analysis last year, which may have contributed to a bump in this score. During the 2020-2021 academic year, we plan to begin using both the Moodle connector that was recently installed for SEI delivery to students as well as a new online template that will modernize the look of our surveys.

For Curriculog, faculty did not have nearly as many issues as they had last year, which could be due to both less proposals this year as well as administrators being given the ability to edit proposals at any step in the process. DIGARC is planning for significant feature/design enhancements before the end of September, the details of which have not yet been released. With this happening right at the peak of the curriculum cycle, we will have to see how it impacts this satisfaction score.

Lastly, for Xitracs, not much has changed since last year. If we had to guess, we would attribute this score increase to faculty and staff being more familiar and comfortable with the system after using it to submit assessment reports for a second year. As stated in a previous analysis, we plan to focus more on folding strategic planning into the assessment process this upcoming year.

Effective with the 2020-2021 academic year, we will increase the benchmark for this assessment to 4.4.

#### 2020-2021:

The response rate for our survey increased by 6.2%; however, our scores decreased by 0.32, 0.15, and 0.37, respectively. Again, we attribute the decreased satisfaction to the terrible year McNeese endured between COVID-19, two hurricanes, and an ice storm. We will retain our benchmark and work to bring some normalcy back to our operations in 2021-2022.

#### 2021-2022:

We did not meet the benchmark of 4.4 for any of the software systems this year, though the scores for Class Climate and Xitracs saw increases of 0.13 and 0.24, respectively. The score for Xitracs decreased by 0.01, which is really not bad considering last year was the first time some had been back in the system for two years and considering that there was almost a year between then and the date this survey was administered.

While we do not have any specific plans to increase our scores in this area, we will continue to make improvements in each system to make them more efficient and user-friendly, just as we have done every year. We are always open to suggestions from faculty and staff!

#### 2022-2023:

We did not meet the benchmark of 4.4 for either Class Climate or Curriculog again this year, though the score for Curriculog increased by 0.19 points over last year. The score for Class Climate decreased by

0.02; however, we believe this may be due to a misunderstanding on the survey. We are asking respondents to rate their satisfaction with the system itself, not with the content of the system. In other words, we think that a lack of satisfaction with the SEI process, administered through Class Climate, is bringing this score down. On next year's survey, we plan to add descriptive text for clarification, and we will see if that has any impact on the scores for these two systems.