Inst. Research and Effectiveness

Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Introduction

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

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

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Provide discipline-specific accreditation support.

1.1 Data

2015-2016:
- We collected all programmatic accreditation reports that were missing from the office's collection.
- We assisted in the CCNE reports for Nursing.

2016-2017:
- We assisted in the CAEP reports for Education programs and JRCERT for Radiological Sciences.

2017-2018:
- We assisted in report for CAC-ABET, ACEND, and NASM.
- Upcoming programmatic accreditation efforts include AACSB (business), NAACLS (clinical laboratory science).

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.

Accreditation Calendar [DOCX 12 KB 6/3/19]

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
We will continue to provide information as requested and continue to keep complete files about programmatic accreditation. Cabinets in the west office of BBC 432 contain programmatic accreditation files, and these will be transferred to electronic files in Banner Document Management.

2017-2018:
The library requested more involvement and feedback in accreditation efforts as they relate to library resources and services. We made no progress with digitizing our accreditation records, but we remain committed to the goal. IRE will begin logging meetings with on-site compliance reviewers and collecting information about what we provide these reviewers.

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.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Establish and maintain a SACSCOC Compliance Calendar.

2.1 Data

2017-2018:
The compliance calendar is complete, was approved through Senior Staff, and has been distributed across campus. Senior Staff also approved the Continuous Compliance Policy.

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

2018-2019:
IRE was not able to provide training to all participants this year due to a lack of time. University Advancement updated the narrative for their two standards; however, no other standards were updated in 2018-2019.

Accreditation Calendar [XLSX 14 KB 1/28/19]

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

2018-2019:
With the Ruffalo Noel-Levitz consultation and general education redesign kicking off in the fall, IRE did not have time to train the individuals responsible for updating compliance narratives this year. We will do our best to make this a priority in the 2019-2020 academic year.

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

1 Assessment and Benchmark

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

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

1.1 Data

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

2017-2018:
With the implementation of Curriculog, I assumed one of the system reports would provide the processing time from launch to completion; however, this seems to have been a misguided assumption. Although I was not able to determine an accurate average processing time this year, the processing time seemed to be relatively similar to the pre-Curriculog paper process. The committees met to discuss and approve each proposal as they had done in the past, but Curriculog's comment feature made this a more transparent process. It was also more efficient on the back end since we no longer had to scan and upload each form three times for each new signature.

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
Total	**575**	**41.6**	**30.87**

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
The average of 17.44 days between GC/UCC approval and AAC approval would be considered, in my professional opinion, timely processing; however, this does not take into account the date the paperwork was received by IRE, which is a flaw in the measurement of this assessment. Also not taken into account is how long it took to update the catalog with these changes once the catalog was rolled. With the implementation of the new curriculum management software, Curriculog, for the 2018-2019 curriculum cycle, I should be able to determine a more accurate processing time from the reports available.

2017-2018:
As stated in the Data field above, I was not able to determine an accurate average processing time using Curriculog reports as I had hoped. Thus, I am not able to set a more definitive benchmark this year. Now that I am aware of the system limitations, I will be creating a spreadsheet to track launch, approval, and completion/import dates for all proposals submitted in 2018-2019 for the 2019-2020 curriculum cycle, and I should be able to set a definitive benchmark at the end of the reporting year after consulting with the registrar, committee chairs, and provost.

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.

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			

2018-2019 Course Clean-up Memorandum Approved [PDF 53,312 KB 1/28/19]

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:
The benchmark of a 50% reduction of obsolete courses was met for this year. IRE will continue to work with the Registrar's Office and academic departments each year to remove courses that are no longer needed or consistent with the mission/goals of the department or University. As we move forward, I believe that the benchmark of 50% is going to be harder to meet due to the decreasing number of obsolete courses. That said, the benchmark may be reduced next year pending the results of the 2019-2020 course cleanup.

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.

3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 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

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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

2017-2018:
Enforcement of the deadlines in the Academic Catalog Policy helped us reduce the number of addenda from 31 to 14. I am hoping to reduce it even more through continued enforcement of the policy and working with the Registrar's Office to catch issues during the curriculum cycle for the next catalog. That said, effective 2018-2019, the benchmark will be set at no more than 10 addenda to the published catalog.

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.

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

Academic, Administrative, and Student Support Services:

Reporting Year	# Required	# Missing	% Participation
2013-2014	69	13	81.2%
2014-2015	69	10	85.5%
2015-2016	68	5	92.6%
2016-2017	74	4	94.6%

Administrative Units (7.3):

Reporting Year	# Required	# Missing	% Participation
2017-2018	17	3	82.3%
2018-2019			

Academic Programs (8.2.a):

Reporting Year	# Required	# Missing	% Participation
2012-2013	76	36	52.6%
2013-2014	75	5	93.3%
2014-2015	60	8	86.6%
2015-2016	61	13	87.6%
2016-2017	63	3	95.2%
2017-2018	64	6	90.6%
2018-2019			

Academic and Student Services (8.2.c):

Reporting Year	# Required	# Missing	% Participation
2017-2018	48	5	89.6%
2018-2019			

Overall Participation:

Reporting Year	# Required	# Missing	% Participation
2017-2018	129	14	89.1%
2018-2019			

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:
Due to personnel changes in the department of General and Basic Studies and in the Burton College of Education, master plans were not submitted for several academic programs. IRE conducted a Master Plan workshop with deans and department heads on August 7, 2016. Jessica Hutchings has visited departments to provide assistance with their master plans. IRE uses Xitracs, which has a module for program planning and assessment. Wesley LeJeune has worked with Xitracs staff to set up our programs in the module to facilitate online master plan submission. IRE hired a student in the fall who will enter all 2016 master plans into Xitracs so that all 2017 submissions can be entered directly into the system. This will make tracking master plan submission easier. Continue to strive for 100% participation.

2016-2017:
IRE met with all academic departments during summer 2017 to revise administrative unit and academic program master plans and convert all plans to Xitracs. More departments are submitting required academic program plans, and plans reflect more meaningful information than they did in the past. Completion rates for the master plans for administrative units fell this year due to several factors. First, more emphasis was placed on academic programs as we worked to submit the SACSCOC compliance reports. Second, Fort Polk leadership changed. Third, we have several new deans and department heads this year, and as they have learned their jobs, master plans have been pushed to the bottom of their lists. We will work with them during the year to get everyone caught up. This is a year of transition as we not only implement Xitracs, but we also acclimate to the new University President and Provost.

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

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

Retreat.

2017-2018:
(Based on 2016-2017 data and work done during 2017-2018)
The data show that participation in the assessment process is increasing every year. The 2017-2018 academic year was extremely busy, and a lot of efforts were made by IRE to improve the assessment culture on campus. As stated in the analysis for last year, IRE met with all academic departments to work on their academic program and unit assessment plans. This process was continued with non-academic units in spring 2018, and we learned that assessment has been widely misunderstood for years. As we continue to strive for 100% participation in the assessment process, it is our goal to continuously improve the quality of the reports being submitted. We were not able to set up approval processes or peer review processes as stated in the timeline provided last year due to the limitations of Xitracs; however, we are slowly working towards implementing built-in approval processes, and we hope to implement peer review processes a little further down the road when assessment is better understood across campus.

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...

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%

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Participation in assessment is steadily increasing, and we are going to keep the momentum going. The General Education Assessment Council has a presence on campus now, and the departments are growing accustomed to

submitting data and artifacts.

2017-2018:
Participation in assessment continues increasing, and next year we will require all courses in the general education core curriculum to submit course summary forms and artifacts. We do not expect full participation in the beginning, but we will track the gradual implementation. This exercise will allow us to see which courses need standardized assessments.

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.

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

1 Assessment and Benchmark

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

1.1 Data

Report	Issues in Academic Year Ending							
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
BOR: Completers	0	0	0					
BOR: Financial Aid	0	0	0					
BOR: Space Utilization	0	0	0					
BOR: Employee Salary Fall	0	0	0					
BOR: Employee Salary Spring	0	0	0					
Equity in Athletics Disclosure	0	0	0					
IPEDS: IC Header	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Inst. Characteristics	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Completions	0	0	0					
IPEDS: 12 Month Enrollment	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Student Financial Aid	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Graduation Rates	0	0	0					
IPEDS: 200% Grad. Rates	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Admissions	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Outcome Measures	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Fall Enrollment	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Finance	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Human Resources	0	0	0					
IPEDS: Academic Libraries	0	0	0					
Louisiana Works	0	0	0					
U.S. News & World Report	0	0	0					

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
We will continue accurate data reporting. Future data and analyses will provide more information about particular reports and their issues.

2017-2018:
We will continue successful and accurate data reporting. As we learn more and improve our skill sets, we plan to complete reports sooner before the deadlines while completing ad hoc data requests simultaneously.

2018-2019:
There were no problems with data reporting this year. We will continue successful and accurate data reporting. We will strive to complete reports sooner than the deadlines, if at all possible.

Performance Objective 5 Provide internal data support.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

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

1.1 Data

Academic Year	# of requests
2015-2016	64
2016-2017	122
2017-2018	82
2018-2019	100

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

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Continue to track the number of fulfilled data requests and make sure no reports go unrecorded.

2017-2018:
The number of data requests fell by 40 from 2016-2017. This is most likely because we direct folks to the website when we know the data they are asking for is already published.

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.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: SEIs delivered and reported on time.

2.1 Data

2016-2017:
All SEIs and their associated reports were delivered to the appropriate stakeholders in a timely manner. Online results were done earlier than any previous year.

2017-2018:
All SEIs and their associated reports were delivered to the appropriate stakeholders in a timely manner.

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.

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

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

2017-2018:

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

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.

3 Assessment and Benchmark

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

3.1 Data

2016-2017:

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

2017-2018:

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

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 digiticing accreditation, policy, and program review files.

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

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

2017-2018:

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

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.

4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Faculty credentialing automation through matching CIP codes.

4.1 Data

2016-2017:

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

2017-2018:
Course and faculty CIP codes have been loaded/entered into the Banner System in supplemental data fields on SCACRSE and PPAGENL. The program to verify faculty credentials to courses taught is working.

2018-2019:
The process is working well to identify proper credentials for teaching faculty. The matching program has had improvements, and, when appropriate the course CIP codes and faculty CIP codes are updated based on documentation. CIP code data is entered for new faculty based on hiring documentation. The addition or alleration of cources CIP codes has also been built into all of the curriculog approval processes for courses.

4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Process is going well.

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

2018-2019:
The matching program is run several times prior to and during a semester to identify missing credentials. Then it is run at the end of a semester in case any changes were made. The automated hiring process for faculty has been delayed, so CIP codes for new faculty are entered as they are identified.

5 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Implement a data dashboard.

5.1 Data

2016-2017:
The University purchased Visart, which can take student data files and create images and reports useful for internal and external audiences. IRE is now learning how to use the software, and we hope to launch some new images during the summer.

2017-2018:
We have made some data dashboards using Visart. One dashboard is currently public on the McNeese website. However, Pagos Inc. has informed us that they have discontinued Visart and merged their dashboarding capability into their SpreadsheetWeb product. They are still supporting their Visart customers but they are not updating the product anymore. With this new information, we are considering migrating to the SpreadsheetWeb product. At this time, we are discussing this possibility within the IRE department, with our University Computing Services department, and with Pagos Inc.

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.

5.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
IRE will work with UCS as necessary to implement the new software.

2017-2018:
We will make a decision regarding the migration to SpreadsheetWeb. If we stay with Visart, we will work to publish more meaningful data dashboards to our website; however, we may encounter programming bugs that will not be remedied by Pagos Inc. If we migrate to SpreadsheetWeb, we will also work to publish data dashboards; however, we may have some installation and learning curve delays.

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.

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

1 Assessment and Benchmark

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

1.1 Data

2015-2016:
The 2016 faculty/staff retreat provided training for advisors in the areas of Academic Support Services, Student Support Services, and Upcoming Technologies. Degree Works was implemented to improve accuracy of degree audits in the advising process.

2016-2017:
New student and faculty evaluations of advising are being administered this year. A stipend was offered to each college to improve advising processes. The advising workshop will occur again in January 2018.

2017-2018:
- The QEP stipend funded several good projects, and the list is attached.
- IRE is working with Alumni Affairs and the Career and Student Development Center to create a first-destination survey for our alumni. It will be distributed beginning 2018-2019.
- IRE is planning the redesign of the General Education Core Curriculum, much of which will involve creating a first-year experience, a la Dr. John Gardner.

2018-2019:
- Appointment software was purchased and is being administered by the Office of Testing Services.
- General education redesign is in full-swing. We have three new major student learning outcomes and five minor outcomes.
- The QEP stipend was discontinued due to a lack of interest.
- QEP funds paid for Kedrick Nicholas to attend a professional development conference.

2017-2018 QEP Stipend for Colleges   [DOCX 14 KB 1/28/19]

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
We will continue to track developments in advising as they relate to QEP efforts. Also, we will create a new assessment to track the student and faculty evaluations of advising.

2017-2018:
- The student and faculty evaluations of advising were administered and will be tracked under separate assessments.
- The Advising Workshop is now a fixture of January's activities.
- The QEP stipend funded several good projects, and the stipend will continue.

2018-2019:
- Much of our QEP work took a back seat to general education redesign. People in new leadership roles across campus also hindered our abilities to implement QEP assignments into tagged courses. This situation will improve as these leaders become more familiar with campus operations.

2 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.

2.1 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

Academic Year	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
Benchmark	75% tagged courses		100% tagged courses	
# tagged courses	67	67		
# courses participating	33	40		
% courses participating	49.3%	59.7%		
# tagged sections	172	151		
# sections participating	97	82		
% sections participating	56.4%	54.3%		
Benchmark met?	No	No		

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:
Far exceeded our goal of 50% implementation. It should be simple to reach next year's goal of 75%.

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.

Performance Objective 7 Increase stakeholder satisfaction of services provided.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

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

1.1 Data

Academic Year	Response Rate	
	#	%
2016-2017	41/125	33%
2017-2018	42/118	36%
2018-2019	40/122	33%

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	
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in an ethical manner.	4.74	4.72	4.5	

Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in a timely manner.	4.6	4.66	4.43	
Overall, I feel that information received from the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff is accurate.	4.66	4.69	4.42	

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

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.

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	33%
2017-2018	42/118	36%
2018-2019	40/122	33%

Indicator	Academic Year Ending					
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Accreditation Support	4.59	4.58	4.25			
Annual Research Hours Reporting	4.46	4.64	4.17			
Assessment Reports	4.16	4.41	4.19			
Catalog Updates	4.44	4.47	4.47			
Curriculum and Course Development Process	4.38	4.52	4.28			
Data Requests	4.68	4.5	4.63			
Faculty Workload Process	4.61	4.57	4.25			
General Education Assessment Process	4.61	4.67	4.17			
QEP Assessment Process	–	–	4.15			
Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website	4.21	4.36	4.26			
Student Evaluation of Instruction Process	4.54	4.16	3.69			

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

The benchmark of 4.50 was achieved on most items for this academic year. The pretty significant increases for Annual Research Hours Reporting, Assessment Plans, Curriculum and Course Development, and Institutional Research and Effectiveness Website could be attributed to the following:

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

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

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.

3 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: 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	33%

Indicator	Academic Year Ending								
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
Class Climate	4.07								
Curriculog	3.88								
Xitracs	3.86								

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.