Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

#9 Plan cycle - 9
Plan cycle 2023/2024
7/1/23 - 6/30/24

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

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.

2023-2024:
- The Referral Report for Standard 13.6 was completed and submitted to SACSCOC in October 2023. The SACSCOC Board of Trustees accepted the Referral Report at its June meeting, and no additional reporting is required. This officially wraps up the SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report.
- We assisted the Department of Graduate Nursing with their CCNE self-study for the DNP program and assisted with planning the site visit in March 2024.
- We assisted the Department of Engineering and Computer Science with their ABET self-study for the CSCI program.

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2019-2020:
Medical Laboary 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.

2023-2024:

IRE met its benchmark to provide discipline-specific accreditation support through the assistance we provided to the Department of Graduate Nursing and Department of Engineering and Computer Science. Moving forward, IRE will continue to support our departments in retaining their programmatic accreditation and assist in any way we can.

However, because programmatic accreditation is the sole responsibility of the departments, IRE will no longer assess this benchmark effective with the 2024-2025 academic year. Instead, we will establish a new benchmark to mirror the to-be-revised performance objective that states, "Ensure compliance with SACSCOC *Principles of Accreditation* and coordinate all efforts related to the reaffirmation of accreditation."

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

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
Total	**324**	**44.9**	**33**

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

		Average Processing Time

Proposal Type	# of Proposals	Days	Work Days
Courses	134	65.49	47.43
Curricula	50*	75.65	54.57
Memoranda	10	114.4	83.2
Total	**194**	**85.18**	**61.73**

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
Total	**305**	**45.87**	**32.64**

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
Total	**421**	**42.01**	**29.997**

2023-2024 (for catalog year 2024-2025):

Proposal Type	# of Proposals	Average Processing Time	
		Days	Work Days
Courses	187	72.57	41.76
Curricula	142	71.86	41.37
Memoranda	9	81	56
Total	**338**	**75.14**	**46.38**

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
We did not meet our benchmark of an average processing time of less than either 40 calendar days or 30 work days for all Curriculog proposals. The average processing time for the 2023-2024 curriculum cycle for the 2024-2025 Academic Catalog was 75.14 days and 46.38 work days—significantly above the benchmark. This cycle was the worst we have experienced since 2020-2021, which was conducted entirely online due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Hurricane Laura, and Hurricane Delta. While the curriculum cycle itself ran smoothly, several factors contributed to our inability to meet the benchmark this year.

First and foremost, the assistant vice president for academic affairs, who led IRE, resigned from the University effective July 28, 2023. On September 1, 2023, the assistant director of institutional effectiveness assumed the role of executive director of IRE. However, we were unable to fill the vacated assistant director position, which was reclassified as an assessment specialist, until July 1, 2024. As a result, the executive director had to manage all curriculum-related responsibilities and temporarily take on assessment-related duties, in addition to their new role. This significantly reduced the time available to

focus on the 2023-2024 curriculum cycle, as reflected in the processing times. For the 2024-2025 cycle, we anticipate that the executive director will have more time to dedicate to curriculum and course development, thanks to the appointment of the assessment specialist.

Second, several graduate-level proposals were submitted early in the cycle but were delayed due to the Graduate Council's meeting schedule. Although many of these proposals were entered into Curriculog well before the October 2 deadline, the Graduate Council did not meet to review them until late November. This delay of roughly 60 calendar days and 40 work days contributed to the prolonged processing times. For 2024-2025, IRE will collaborate with the executive director of the Graduate School and the Graduate Council to explore moving their proposal review meeting to late October or early November.

Lastly, several undergraduate-level proposals were held up at the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) step due to issues that needed to be resolved before approval. Some proposals were delayed for multiple weeks at this stage, further affecting the average processing time. For the 2024-2025 cycle, IRE will work to resolve as many issues as possible before proposals reach the UCC, while respecting the responsibility of each college's UCC representative to act as the liaison for their college.

Given that this year was an outlier for the reasons mentioned above, we will maintain the current benchmark for 2024-2025.

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%
2024-2025	122	72	59.0%

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
We met our benchmark of reducing obsolete courses by 50% with 59% of obsolete courses being inactivated for the 2024-2025 Academic Catalog. This was the highest percentage of obsolete courses we have inactivated since the high of 72.8% for the 2019-2020 Academic Catalog.

Since we have had several changes in academic leadership since last year, we will leave the benchmark at 50% for the 2025-2026 Academic Catalog. We expect the new leadership to be more willing to inactivate obsolete courses.

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
2023-2024	0	Yes

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
We met our benchmark of zero addenda proposals again this year. This was due in large part to IRE "holding the line" and faculty being extremely cooperative in this effort.

Because we feel the message has sunk in with faculty that IRE will not make changes to the currently published catalog absent very compelling justification, we will no longer assess this benchmark effective 2024-2025.

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%
2022-2023	29/42	69.0%

*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%

| 2022-2023 | 37/69 | 53.6% |

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%
2022-2023	16/20	80.0%

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%
2022-2023	82/131	62.6%

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
We experienced a complete 180-degree turn in the 2022-2023 reporting year from the 2021-2022 reporting year in that we experienced our lowest participation rates since the 2019-2020 reporting year. For 2022-2023, we saw an 8.3% decrease in administrative unit participation, a 26.4% decrease in academic program participation, and a 1.8% decrease in academic and student services participation. Overall, there was a 16.8% decrease in participation rates.

The drastic decreases in participation could be attributed to noncompliance from the College of Agricultural Sciences (from which we received zero program or unit reports), the College of Business (from which we received zero program or unit reports), the Burton College of Education (from which we received zero program reports), and several senior administrative units. There have been numerous changes in leadership since the 2022-2023 reporting year, and IRE will work especially hard with these specific areas to bring them into compliance with the University's Assessment Policy.

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	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%
Fall 2023	302/343	88.0%	293/343	85.4%
Spring 2024	282/327	86.2%	278/327	85.0%

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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 continous 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!

2023-2024:
Yet again, we had the highest participation rate in a single semester (88.0% in Fall 2023) since we began requiring one submission for each section of all general education courses. We also had our second highest participation rate in a single semester in Spring 2024 with 86.2%. The annual participation rate this year was 87.2%, which is 4.8% higher than last year's highest participation rate of 82.4%. Again, while we did not meet the benchmark of 100% participation, we are absolutely on the right track with increases in three (!!) consecutive years.

While we have been on the right track and partipation has increased, effective with the 2024-2025 academic year, IRE will be shifting the responsibility for general education assessment to the academic departments responsible for the courses as well as the General Education Assessment Council. This shift in responsibility will require that the academic departments designate one faculty member per general education course to gather assessment data from all section instructors and submit one summary form per course. In other words, we will be going back to the pre-2018-2019 practice of requiring one submission per general education course. While IRE will still be responsible for collecting these submissions (and artifacts), the General Education Assessment Council (with the assistance of IRE) will be responsible for developing an assessment plan for these submissions and holding faculty responsible for submitting assessment data each semester.

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
2023-2024	84

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

Total	**103**

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
Total	**121**

Request Type Breakdown for 2023-2024:

Request Type	# of Requests
Accreditation Report	6
Degrees Awarded	7
Employee/Faculty	7
Enrollment/Retention	39
Financial Aid	1
SEI	1
Student Credit Hour Production	2
Other	21
Total	**84**

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
The number of requests fell by 37 from 2022-2023, with the Employee/Faculty and Enrollment/Retention request types seeing the largest decreases, by 13 and 15, respectively. These decreases are likely due to the conclusion of the academic program reviews conducted in 2022-2023 at the administration's request, reducing the need for these data in 2023-2024. The decline in Enrollment/Retention requests may also be attributed to IRE's continued publication of enrollment dashboards on its website and the more concise presentation of retention data in unit assessment reports. Additionally, the overall decrease could be linked to the December 2023 announcement that our president and his leadership team would be stepping down in June 2024, leading to some ongoing initiatives being put on hold until the new administration took over in July 2024.

Decreases in data requests are not necessarily negative, especially when they result from IRE's efforts to increase transparency and make data more accessible. Moving forward, our plan for continuous improvement includes continuing to enhance data accessibility on the IRE website or through other appropriate channels as needed.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: SEIs delivered and reported on time.

2.1 Data

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.

2023-2024:
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

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.

2023-2024:
This year's SEI process went smoothly, with all administrative and report delivery deadlines met. The "Response Rate Notification" was set at 40%, and we plan to increase this to 50% for the upcoming year. Additionally, we plan to incorporate the Moodle connector into the SEI process, which we expect will boost response rates.

To further our goal of increasing SEI response rates, we will delete the current assessment effective 2024-2025 and replace it with a new assessment and benchmark: "Develop, implement, and communicate strategies to increase SEI response rates."

3 Assessment and Benchmark

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

3.1 Data

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.

2023-2024:
The IRE student worker was able to continue the digitizing of various enrollment and evaluation files.

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
The IRE student worker will continue scanning paper files as time permits between higher priority duties.

Effective 2024-2025, we will no longer assess this benchmark.

4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Implement a data dashboard.

4.1 Data

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.

2023-2024:
We successfully rolled out a professional licensure dashboard to comply with recently enacted federal regulations regarding Title IV.

The registration statistics dashboard is now shared with the provost weekly during registration season. The enrollment dashboards, based on census day enrollment for each term, continue to be updated for the Fall, Spring, and Summer terms as data become available and are publicly accessible on the IRE website.

Additionally, the retention and graduation rates dashboards, which present data as reported to IPEDS (by fall cohort at the University level), are updated with new data as it becomes available.

4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
We are proud to have successfully rolled out the new professional licensure dashboard, which was one of the more challenging dashboards to create.

As part of our continuous improvement efforts, we plan to make significant progress on developing a publicly accessible completers dashboard, as well as an internal dashboard that tracks the retention of each Fall cohort at the college, department, and major levels.

Performance Objective 5   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%
2023-2024	129/544	23.7%

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
Average	**4.65**	**4.67**	**4.43**	**4.63**

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	4.61
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in an ethical manner.	4.55	4.63	4.77	4.66
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in a timely manner.	4.42	4.40	4.66	4.51
Overall, I feel that information received from the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff is accurate.	4.47	4.51	4.64	4.53
Average	**4.48**	**4.52**	**4.69**	**4.58**

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
We met the benchmark of 4.65 on only one indicator: "Overall, the IRE staff provides services in an ethical manner," with a score of 4.66, though this still represents a decrease of 0.11 compared to last year. The scores for the other three indicators also decreased, with the first score dropping by 0.07, the third by 0.15, and the fourth by 0.11.

There are two main reasons for these decreases, which apply to all three assessments under this Performance Objective. First, IRE staff believe these scores accurately reflect our performance in 2023-2024. Second, low morale across campus likely contributed. This past year was particularly challenging for our office. As noted under Performance Objective 2, the assistant vice president for academic affairs, who led IRE, resigned effective July 28, 2023. The assistant director of institutional effectiveness became the executive director of IRE on September 1, 2023. However, we were unable to fill the assistant director position, which was reclassified as an assessment specialist and remained vacant until July 1, 2024. Consequently, the executive director of IRE took on all curriculum-related and assessment-related responsibilities, in addition to their new role. This meant that throughout the 2023-2024 academic year, only one full-time person was dedicated to institutional effectiveness. Additionally, a significant amount of staff time in Fall 2023 was spent on the office's move to the SEED Center in November, and towards the end of Spring 2024, staff time was devoted to the transition from the Burckel administration to the Rousse administration. As a result, IRE struggled to regain its footing, which is reflected in our survey scores.

Regarding campus-wide low morale, IRE believes this indirectly affected our scores. The 2023-2024 academic year, particularly Spring 2024, brought many changes to campus. The satisfaction survey was conducted from April 10-April 30, during the height of the University of Louisiana System's search for McNeese's eighth president. Faculty and staff were anxious about McNeese's future, and morale was already low before the search began. While we believe the scores reflect our performance this year, we also think that low morale slightly dragged our scores down more than our performance alone would have.

With the new administration now in place and the campus environment much more stable, IRE is in a better position to move forward on key priorities. To improve our scores related to the services provided, how those services are delivered, and the software used by IRE, the executive director has tasked the office with a comprehensive review of all IRE activities. We will cease any non-essential tasks and seek to improve or streamline required ones. For every survey we administer, we will evaluate whether the results are being utilized—if not, we will discontinue the survey. Additionally, we will assess and enhance our communication with stakeholders, as effective communication is crucial to improving satisfaction with our office.

Our goals and priorities for 2024-2025 are bold and ambitious, but they are achievable with IRE's capable staff.

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%
2023-2024	129/544	23.7%

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
Average	**4.47**	**4.49**	**4.23**	**4.41**	**4.16**	**4.22**

Indicator	Academic Year Ending					
	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028
Accreditation Support	4.62	4.48				
Annual Research Hours Reporting	4.65	4.47				
Assessment Reports	4.5	4.51				
Catalog Updates	4.55	4.48				
Curriculum and Course Development Process	4.52	4.51				
Data Requests	4.6	4.50				
Faculty Credential Review	4.64	4.47				
Faculty Workload Process	4.47	4.43				
General Education Assessment Process	4.38	4.32				
Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website	4.41	4.43				
Student Evaluation of Instruction Process	3.89	4.05				
Average	**4.48**	**4.42**				

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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...

2023-2024:

We only met the benchmark of 4.5 on three indicators: Assessment Reports (4.51), Curriculum and Course Development Process (4.51), and Data Requests (4.50). Scores decreased on almost all indicators compared to 2022-2023 with the only exceptions being Assessment Reports (+0.01), IRE Website (+0.02), and SEI Process (+0.16). The increase in score for the SEI process is notable because that is the one indicator on which we have struggled the most. This was the first year the SEI Process score was over 4.00 since the 2017-2018 academic year.

For an explanation of the score decreases as well as the plan for continuous improvement, please refer to field 1.1.1. The only additional plan we have for 2024-2025 is one specifically related to the SEI process. Over the summer, the director of IR worked with Class Climate to implement the software's Moodle connector. This will allow students to access their SEIs from Moodle, in addition to the link sent to them via email. It will allow faculty to actively track SEI response rates for each of the sections on which they are the primary instructor. We will also update the text of the emails sent to students and faculty to add information about the Moodle connector, and the email to faculty will also include strategies for increasing response rates that we have seen work across campus. We expect the implementation of the Moodle connector and revisions to email texts will increase response rates, which we expect will increase our SEI process score.

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%
2023-2024	129/544	23.7%

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	3.85			
Curriculog	3.88	4.31	4.16	4.15	4.34	4.18			
Xitracs	3.86	4.29	3.92	4.16	4.35	4.21			
Average	**3.94**	**4.32**	**4.04**	**4.16**	**4.28**	**4.08**			

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2023-2024:
We did not meet the benchmark of 4.40 for any of the three software products administered by IRE. Surprisingly, the score for Class Climate was our biggest decrease on the entire safisfaction survey with a decrease of 0.3 compared to 2022-2023. What is surprising about that is this is the first time the Class Climate score fell below the score for the SEI process, which we use Class Climate to administer and the score for which increased as noted in the second Assessment and Benchmark. Scores also decreased for Curriculog by 0.16 and Xitracs by 0.14.

For an explanation of the score decreases as well as the plan for continuous improvement, please refer to field 1.1.1 as well as the additional plan for continuous improvement related to the SEI process in field 2.1.1.