



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

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.

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 Liquefied Natural Gas substantive change submitted.
- ABET Self Study for Engineering submitted.
- AACSB reaffirmation granted to the College of Business.

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2019-2020:

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

2020-2021:

- IRE will work with the Department of Engineering to prepare for their ABET visit in 2022.

- IRE will assist the College of Nursing and Health Professions in preparing for the SACSCOC site visit for level change. We will also assist in preparing the documentation for the substantive change committee.
- IRE will assist the Department of Psychology as they apply for CACREP accreditation for the Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling programs.

2021-2022:

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

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

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. *There were three additional proposals still pending the approval of the Louisiana Board of Regents at the end of the reporting cycle. The averages provided do not include these pending proposals. *There was one additional proposal still pending the approval of the Louisiana Board of Regents at the end of the reporting cycle. The averages provided do not include this pending proposal. *There were five additional proposals still pending the approval of the Louisiana Board of Regents at the end of the reporting cycle. The averages provided do not include these pending proposals.

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

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):

Proposal Type	# of Proposals	Average Processing Time	
		Days	Work Days

Courses	134	65.49	47.43
Curricula	50*	75.65	54.57
Memoranda	10	114.4	83.2
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

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

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.

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%

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.

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%.

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
2019-2020	9	Yes
2020-2021	2	Yes
2021-2022	2	Yes

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

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.

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%

*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%

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%

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%

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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...

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.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

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

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

2.1 Data

Semester	# Required	# Missing	% Submitted	# Missing Artifacts	% Submitted Artifacts
Fall 2014	27	8	70.4%	—	—
Spring 2015	27	7	74.1%	—	—
Fall 2015	28	6	78.6%	—	—
Spring 2016	28	4	85.7%	—	—
Fall 2016	32	2	93.7%	9	71.8%
Spring 2017	32	1	96.8%	4	87.5%
Fall 2017	36	4	88.8%	1	97.2%
Spring 2018	36	1	97.2%	1	97.2%

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

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

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 participate 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.

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

Request Type Breakdown for 2021-2022:

Request Type	# of Requests
Accreditation Report	13
Degrees Awarded	8
Employee/Faculty	15
Enrollment/Retention	46
Financial Aid	5
SEI	6
Student Credit Hour Production	1
Other	26

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

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.

2 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: SEIs delivered and reported on time.

2.1 Data

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.

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.

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

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.

3 Assessment and Benchmark

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

3.1 Data

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 digitizing accreditation, policy, and program review files.

2019-2020:

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

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

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

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

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.

4 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Faculty credentialing automation through matching CIP codes.

4.1 Data

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 alteration of courses CIP codes has also been built into all of the curriculum approval processes for courses.

2019-2020:

This automated process for verifying and validating that faculty members have the appropriate qualifications to teach their courses as described in the guidelines by SACSCOC continues to work well. We are able to quickly identify and resolve any faculty/course assignments with missing credential information.

2020-2021:

The automated process for verifying and validating that faculty members have the appropriate qualifications to teach their courses as described in the guidelines by SACSCOC, again, continues to work well. When mismatches are identified, we find the missing credential or course information and work with department heads to resolve any additional missing credential information.

2021-2022:

There are no new data to report for this year because we have finalized our processes.

4.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2017-2018:

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

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.

2019-2020:

By running the matching program at various times before and during a semester, new faculty credential information is identified and entered into Banner. CIP codes for new courses are entered and reviewed during the Curriculum approval process. The entry of CIP codes from the automated hiring process is still in the implementation stage, and we hope to make some progress on this during the 2020-2021 academic year in collaboration with the Office of Human Resources and Student Employment.

2020-2021:

We continue to run the matching program at various times before and during a semester. CIP codes for new courses continue to be entered and reviewed during the Curriculog approval process. When new faculty credential information is identified, it is entered into Banner manually. The automated hiring process remains in the implementation stage, and we hope to begin to enter new hires in the fall of 2021. When implemented, the automated hiring process will include appropriate CIP codes for teaching faculty credential information.

2021-2022:

Our process is working well; therefore, we will no longer track this assessment.

5 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Implement a data dashboard.

5.1 Data

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.

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.

5.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

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.

Performance Objective 5 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

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.

2019-2020:

- The advising workshop is now a standard annual offering.
- Student satisfaction with advising increased while faculty satisfaction with advising decreased, according to the SEA and FEA, respectively.
- The appointment software, RegisterBlast, has been expanded across campus.

2020-2021:

The advising workshop was canceled this year due to various disasters that rendered the campus unusable.

2021-2022:

We funded conference travel for Dr. Kedrick Nicholas and Andrea Burton.

1.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

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.

2019-2020:

- The advising workshop is now moving to Welcome Back Week right before the fall semester.
- The QEP stipend money was entirely cut from the IRE budget.

2020-2021:

Major personnel changes and the past year of disasters leaves the future of advising in limbo. We hope to bring the workshop back, but it may be in the form of a Moodle course or some mode that does not require physical presence on campus.

2021-2022:

Due to many personnel changes on campus and the upcoming conclusion of the QEP, we are unsure of the status of the advising workshop or other QEP-related efforts.

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

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

2.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

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

2019-2020:

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

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

2020-2021:

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

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

2021-2022:

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

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

Performance Objective 6 Increase stakeholder satisfaction of services provided.

1 Assessment and Benchmark

Benchmark: Earn an average score of at least 4.65 (on a 5.0 scale) on each item of the IRE Service Survey relating to the manner in which services are provided by IRE staff.

Prior to 2020-2021, the benchmark was to earn an average score of at least 4.5 (on a 5.0 scale) on each item of the IRE Service Survey relating to the manner in which services are provided by IRE staff.

1.1 Data

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

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

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		
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in an ethical manner.	4.55	4.63		
Overall, the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff provides services in a timely manner.	4.42	4.40		
Overall, I feel that information received from the Institutional Research and Effectiveness staff is accurate.	4.47	4.51		

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.

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.

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%

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

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.

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.

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%

Indicator	Academic Year Ending									
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	
Class Climate	4.07	4.36	4.04	4.17						
Curriculog	3.88	4.31	4.16	4.15						
Xitracs	3.86	4.29	3.92	4.16						

3.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2018-2019:

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

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

2019-2020:

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

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

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

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

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

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

2020-2021:

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

2021-2022:

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

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