



**OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH & PLANNING**

**ANNUAL REPORT  
2003-2004**

**HENRY M. CODJOE  
DIRECTOR**

**September 2004**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Office Profile & Productivity At-a-Glance .....	3
Summary of Major Accomplishments.....	4
Annual Progress in Strategic Planning .....	6
Annual Progress in Assessing Institutional Effectiveness .....	8
Overall Divisional Health and Plans for the Upcoming Year .....	19
APPENDIX	
1. External Institutional Effectiveness Program Review Recommendations .....	21
2. Project and Activity Log/Calendar .....	28

**Section A: Division/Department Profile & Productivity At-a-Glance**

Number of Completed Projects, Assignments and Tasks	49
Number of Major Ongoing Projects	7
Number of Major New Projects	5
Number of Consulting Service/Advice Provided to College Community	30
Number of Written ad-hoc Reports or Studies	19
Number of Surveys and Tests Administered	16
Number of Students Served by Surveys and Tests	1,204
Number of Faculty and Staff Served by Surveys	44
Number of External Data Requests and Reports Prepared for University System and External Agencies	24
Number of Internal Data Requests Provided or Answered to	12
Number of Full-Time Staff	1
Number of Part-Time Staff	0
Number of Professional Development Activities by Staff	0
Number of Community Activities	2
Percentage of Staff Serving on Committees	100%
Total Operating Expenditures (FY 2004)	\$96,346.00
Operating Supplies & Expenses (FY 2004)	\$12,435.00
Equipment Expenditures (FY 2004)	\$-0-

### **Section B: Summary of Major Accomplishments**

1. Assisted with an external review of the DSC institutional effectiveness program.
2. Summarized DSC's response and action plan to external reviewers' recommendation regarding the institution's institutional effectiveness program.
3. Coordinated and compiled vice presidents, division chairs, and directors' responses to address reviewers' recommendation regarding the institution's institutional effectiveness program.
4. Revised and streamlined/reduced the College's key performance indicators as per the recommendations of the institutional effectiveness subcommittee.
5. Assisted with the administration of a campus-wide survey on a student housing market research study.
6. Served on two search committees to hire a vice president for fiscal affairs and a testing coordinator.
7. Provided support and documentation to the Strategic Planning Committee in reviewing first year implementation goals and planning and developing second year implementation plan goals for the 2003-2006 Strategic Plan.
8. Assisted with DSC Title III grant accountability requirements by administering ACT's Academic Advising Survey to 500 randomly selected students.
9. Continued to provide and complete internal/external information requests, as well as coordinate the IPEDS Completions reports for Dalton State College.
11. Continued to administer assessment tests as well as conduct surveys and reports to gather information to use in identifying strategic areas needing improvement with regard to College programs and services.
12. The Director served on the following committees during the 2003-2004 planning period:
  - Academic Council
  - Administrative Council
  - Completion, Advising, and Retention (CAR) Committee
  - Social Work Professional Advisory Board
  - Strategic Planning and subcommittees.
16. Continued to represent the College at the Administrative Council of Institutional Researchers of the University System of Georgia.
17. Continued to serve as faculty advisor for the College's International Students' Association (ISA).
18. Continued to instruct a one-credit hour Sociology course (SOCI 1000: Diversity and Multiculturalism in American Society).

## COMMUNITY & SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

- Invited to serve on the RossWoods/Hamilton Adult Day Services Board of Directors.
- Submitted and accepted for publication three refereed articles:
  1. (with Marilyn Helms). A Retention Assessment Process: Utilizing Total Quality Management Principles and Focus Groups. Forthcoming in: *Planning for Higher Education*.
  2. (with Donna Mayo and Marilyn Helms). Reasons to Remain in College: A Comparison of High School and College Students. Forthcoming in: *International Journal of Educational Management*.
  3. Africa(ns) in the Canadian Educational System: An Analysis of Positionality and Knowledge Construction Construction. Forthcoming in: Wisdom J. Tettey & Korbla P. Puplampu (Eds), *The African Diaspora in Canada: Analyses of Race, Identity, and Integration*. Calgary, Alberta: The University of Calgary Press.

### **Section C: Annual Progress in Strategic Planning**

#### *Goal*

Reexamine both the College's institutional effectiveness and strategic planning process.

#### *Objective/Action Plan*

With the assistance of the office of institutional research, external evaluators will be invited to complete a review of the structure of the institutional effectiveness program at DSC and provide recommendations on ways by which the institutional effectiveness program can be improved upon and, where possible, streamlined.

#### *Success Indicator*

A number of recommendations will be submitted to the President for review and implementation through a review of the structure of the institutional effectiveness program by way of the DSC web site and interviews with key stakeholders, including division chairs, vice presidents, IE subcommittee, selected staff and faculty, director of institutional research, and president.

#### *Evaluation Review*

Findings: Following the president's guidelines for the IE review, the two external evaluators provided a combined report from reviewing and evaluating the institutional effectiveness program at Dalton State College.

Recommendations: The report provided commentary and recommendations on ways by which the institutional effectiveness program can be improved upon and, where possible, streamlined. Recommendations were provided in the following areas: amount of IE data, academic program assessment, administrative program assessment, the IE subcommittee, college-wide assessment, Planbuilder software, and how to enhance the planning and assessment process at DSC.

Conclusion: The review process helped the College determine whether the size and scope of the IE program is appropriate for the size and complexity of the institution. It addressed the overarching issue of the amount and usefulness of IE data collected and recommended ways on which certain aspects of the IE program can be pared down.

#### *Level of Achievement*

√ Exemplary

Adequate

Minimal

√ Review Completed

*Continuous Improvement Summary*

Unit Performance: This goal and its results helped the institutional research office address campus concerns about the amount of work required by divisions, faculty, and staff to carry out their institutional effectiveness activities. It provided campus-wide opportunity for all stakeholders to review their planning and institutional effectiveness activities and provide feedback on how the program can be streamlined and made more meaningful for their respective units. For the institutional research office, the goal afforded the opportunity to review the data collection and reporting requirements contained within the IE program and look for ways to reduce the amount of data collected and a consequent refocus on those measures most directly supporting college-wide goals.

Goal Attainment: The external review report contributed to completing the college goal of reexamining its institutional effectiveness and strategic planning process.

Effect for Next Period: The effect of this goal will be incorporated into next year's planning cycle as it will be time to "implement revised/modified institutional effectiveness program."

Benefits to Organization: The external peer review process afforded the college an opportunity to reexamine its institutional effectiveness program and engage in an ongoing quest for quality and continuous improvement.

*Level of Impact on Selected Review Area*

√ Exemplary

Adequate

Minimal

√ Summary Completed

### **Section D: Annual Progress in Assessing Institutional Effectiveness**

During the 2002-2003 year, a formal evaluation of the College's institutional effectiveness program was undertaken by two external evaluators. As institutional effectiveness is a primary function of the institutional research office, the external review was in a way, an assessment of the effectiveness of the institutional research office in carrying out DSC's institutional effectiveness activities. Under the terms of the review as stipulated by the President, the reviewers visited the campus and interviewed key stakeholders in the IE program, including division chairs, vice presidents, the IE subcommittee of the strategic planning committee, and selected faculty and staff in addition to the president and director of institutional research. The official guidelines for completing the review were:

1. to complete a review of the structure of the IE Program at DSC through the DSC web site and interviews with the IRP Director and selected faculty and staff;
2. to complete a review of the data collection and reporting requirements contained within the IE program;
3. to identify any instances of significant gaps or duplication in the overall structure of the IE program;
4. to determine whether the size and scope of the IE program is appropriate for the size and complexity of the institution;
5. to ascertain faculty and administrative perceptions regarding the degree to which the IE program actually contributes to the improvement of programs and services at DSC; and
6. to provide recommendations on ways by which the IE program can be improved upon and, where possible, streamlined.

After reviewing and evaluating the institutional effectiveness program, the two reviewers issued a combined report with recommendations for action (see Appendix A). The recommendations were directed at the whole college community but two were specifically directed at the institutional research office. They were:

1. The Office of Institutional Research & Planning will conduct a College-wide survey that will list all assessment data elements and ask for feedback on the value or usefulness of these elements.
2. The Office of Institutional Research & Planning will conduct a College-wide survey of faculty, staff, and administrators to determine which data elements are used and to what extent. The result is to pare down the list of assessment data.

As part of assessing its institutional effectiveness, the institutional research office conducted the above surveys. What follows are a summary of the survey results. (Note: no specific survey or other assessment instrument was used during the 2003-2004 year to determine the effectiveness of the institutional research office as in previous years.)

**Definitions of Key Elements in Planning and Evaluation**

Very useful	13	29.5%
Somewhat useful	17	38.6%
Not useful	13	29.5%
No reply	1	2.3%

**Ten-Year Quick Statistical Overview**

Very useful	19	43.2%
Somewhat useful	19	43.2%
Not useful	6	13.6%
No reply	0	0.0%

**Organizational Chart**

Very useful	20	45.5%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	10	22.7%
No reply	0	0.0%

**Senior Administrative and Academic Personnel**

Very useful	10	22.7%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	14	31.8%
No reply	2	4.5%

**College Mission and Statement of Institutional Purpose**

Very useful	25	56.8%
Somewhat useful	13	29.5%
Not useful	6	13.6%
No reply	0	0.0%

**Structure of the Planning Process**

Very useful	7	15.9%
Somewhat useful	22	50%
Not useful	11	25%
No reply	4	9.1%

**College and Divisional-Departmental Planning**

Very useful	9	20.5%
Somewhat useful	23	52.3%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Linkage between System Planning and College Goals**

Very useful	12	27.3%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	11	25%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Legislative Accountability Demands**

Very useful	11	25%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	14	31.8%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Linkage between Planning and Budgeting**

Very useful	10	22.7%
Somewhat useful	9	20.5%
Not useful	22	50%
No reply	3	6.8%

**An Illustration of the Linkage between Planning and Budgeting**

Very useful	8	18.2%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	18	40.9%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Physical Master Plan**

Very useful	19	43.2%
Somewhat useful	12	27.3%
Not useful	11	25%
No reply	2	4.5%

**Dalton State College Foundation Strategic Plan**

Very useful	15	34.1%
Somewhat useful	11	25%
Not useful	17	38.6%
No reply	1	2.3%

**Elements of Dalton State College Strategic Plans**

Very useful	16	36.4%
Somewhat useful	15	34.1%
Not useful	11	25%
No reply	2	4.5%

**Planning Units**

Very useful	6	13.6%
Somewhat useful	20	45.5%
Not useful	15	34.1%
No reply	3	6.8%

**An Example of Planning and Evaluation Using Plan Builder**

Very useful	8	18.2%
Somewhat useful	17	38.6%
Not useful	17	38.6%
No reply	2	4.5%

**Strategic Planning Evaluation Process Form**

Very useful	5	11.4%
Somewhat useful	19	43.2%
Not useful	18	40.9%
No reply	2	4.5%

**Key Assessment Questions**

Very useful	11	25%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	15	34.1%
No reply	2	4.5%

**Statement on use of Assessment Results**

Very useful	13	29.5%
Somewhat useful	15	34.1%
Not useful	16	36.4%
No reply	0	0.0%

**Institutional Effectiveness Subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Committee**

Very useful	9	20.5%
Somewhat useful	23	52.3%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness at Dalton State College**

Very useful	12	27.3%
Somewhat useful	21	47.7%
Not useful	8	18.2%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Dalton State College Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)**

Very useful	15	34.1%
Somewhat useful	19	43.2%
Not useful	8	18.2%
No reply	2	4.5%

**KPIs Benchmarking for Annual Accountability Report Card**

Very useful	15	34.1%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Key Performance Indicators Data Inventory**

Very useful	10	22.7%
Somewhat useful	20	45.5%
Not useful	10	22.7%
No reply	4	9.7%

**Focus on Continuous Improvements**

Very useful	13	29.5%
Somewhat useful	21	47.7%
Not useful	6	13.6%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Focus on Continuous Improvements "Windows" (Plan Builders)**

Very useful	7	15.9%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	18	40.9%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Continuous Improvements "Closing the Loop" Summary Report**

Very useful	13	29.5%
Somewhat useful	15	34.1%
Not useful	13	29.5%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Assessment of Educational Programs**

Very useful	17	38.6%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	8	18.2%
No reply	5	11.4%

**Divisions & Departments**

Very useful	13	29.5%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Divisional/Department Goal Statements That Support College Mission**

Very useful	20	45.5%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	7	15.9%
No reply	1	2.3%

**Institutional and Program Accreditation**

Very useful	19	43.2%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	8	18.2%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Programs of Study**

Very useful	21	47.7%
Somewhat useful	17	38.6%
Not useful	6	13.6%
No reply	0	0.0%

**General Education Assessment at Dalton State College**

Very useful	12	27.3%
Somewhat useful	20	45.5%
Not useful	10	22.7%
No reply	2	4.5%

**General Education Statement of Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	11	25%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	12	27.3%
No reply	3	6.8%

**General Education Foundational Skills and Principal Core Courses**

Very useful	12	27.3%
Somewhat useful	20	45.5%
Not useful	10	22.7%
No reply	2	4.5%

**General Education Academic Outcomes Assessment Plan**

Very useful	11	25%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	12	27.3%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Procedures Used to Evaluate General Education Outcomes**

Very useful	12	27.3%
Somewhat useful	20	45.5%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	3	6.8%

**CAAP General Education Outcomes Assessment Plan for Dalton State College**

Very useful	7	15.9%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	17	38.6%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Academic Program Review**

Very useful	14	31.8%
Somewhat useful	12	27.3%
Not useful	14	31.8%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Academic Program Review Timetable for Dalton State College**

Very useful	12	27.3%
Somewhat useful	13	29.5%
Not useful	15	34.1%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Planning and Evaluation of Educational Programs**

Very useful	15	34.1%
Somewhat useful	12	27.3%
Not useful	13	29.5%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Methods for Analyzing Educational Programs**

Very useful	10	22.7%
Somewhat useful	19	43.2%
Not useful	11	25%
No reply	4	9.1%

**An Example of an Academic Course Outcomes Assessment Plan**

Very useful	13	29.5%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	11	25%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Procedures Used to Evaluate Educational Programs**

Very useful	12	27.3%
Somewhat useful	19	43.2%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Procedures Used to Evaluate Student Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	13	29.5%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Data Collected to Demonstrate Student Achievement**

Very useful	20	45.5%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	1	2.3%

**KIPS for Assessing Efficiency and Effectiveness of Academic Divisions**

Very useful	17	38.6%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	9	20.5%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Transfer programs Outcomes Assessment Plan**

Very useful	6	13.6%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	16	36.4%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Learning Support Outcomes Assessment Plan**

Very useful	7	15.9%
Somewhat useful	20	45.5%
Not useful	13	29.5%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Faculty Academic Outcomes Assessment Plan Summary Report Form**

Very useful	8	18.2%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	15	34.1%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Assessment of Educational Programs**

Very useful	15	34.1%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	12	27.3%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Business Administration Division Program and Student Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	8	18.2%
Somewhat useful	8	18.2%
Not useful	25	56.8%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Health, Physical Education & Recreation Department Student Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	5	11.4%
Somewhat useful	11	25%
Not useful	25	56.8%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Humanities Division Student Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	6	13.6%
Somewhat useful	10	22.7%
Not useful	25	56.8%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Natural Sciences & Mathematics Division Student Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	7	15.9%
Somewhat useful	8	18.2%
Not useful	26	59.1%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Nursing Division Program and Student Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	7	15.9%
Somewhat useful	10	22.7%
Not useful	24	54.5%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Social Sciences Division Student Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	11	25%
Somewhat useful	12	27.3%
Not useful	18	40.9%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Technical Education Division Student Learning Outcomes**

Very useful	9	20.5%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	19	43.2%
No reply	2	4.5%

**Assessment of Administrative & Educational Support Services**

Very useful	12	27.3%
Somewhat useful	13	29.5%
Not useful	14	31.8%
No reply	5	11.4%

**Planning and Evaluation of Administrative & Educational Support Services**

Very useful	10	22.7%
Somewhat useful	17	38.6%
Not useful	11	25%
No reply	6	13.6%

**Procedures Used to Evaluate Administrative & Educational Support Services**

Very useful	8	18.2%
Somewhat useful	17	38.6%
Not useful	15	34.1%
No reply	4	9.1%

**KIPS for Assessing Efficiency and Effectiveness of Administrative Units**

Very useful	9	20.5%
Somewhat useful	14	31.8%
Not useful	17	38.6%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Administrative & Educational Support Department Heads and Units**

Very useful	11	25%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	13	29.5%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Administrative Unit Purpose Statements That Support College Mission**

Very useful	14	31.8%
Somewhat useful	16	36.4%
Not useful	11	25%
No reply	3	6.8%

**Administrative & Educational Support Units Performance Assessment Plans**

Very useful	8	18.2%
Somewhat useful	15	34.1%
Not useful	17	38.6%
No reply	4	9.1%

**Calendar of Scheduled and Planned Surveys Used in Assessment**

Very useful	7	15.9%
Somewhat useful	18	40.9%
Not useful	16	36.4%
No reply	3	6.8%

**NEXT STEPS**

1. Report and recommendations were presented to division chairs, vice presidents, and directors for reaction. Additional feedback was also sought from faculty and staff.
2. Sought consensus and approval for college response and action.
3. After approval, an implementation strategy was planned to effect changes recommended. Each division, department, and administrative unit was asked to propose and present an implementation plan to the President for review and approval.
4. Implement plan to begin fall, 2004.

### **Section E: Overall Divisional Health and Plans for the Upcoming Year**

As like previous years, data collection, analysis, dissemination of results, responding to internal and external demands for information, maintenance of longitudinal databases, as well as *ad hoc* and special studies and reports continue to place demands on the activities of the office, not mentioning additional work to assist with retention and graduation efforts. All the same, the office manages to stay afloat and doing well. Just before the beginning of the new fiscal year (2004-2005), the office received much welcoming news that a permanent assistant will be budgeted for the offices of institutional research and institutional advancement. This is a positive development and will free the director from “maintenance” and “housekeeping” duties and projects and focus on more substantive research studies to assist the College meet some of its critical goals such as retaining and graduating students. The office is very grateful to the President for this new development.

Looking ahead, acting and implementing the recommendations of the two external reviewers of the College’s institutional effectiveness program would result in streamlining and reducing the amount of data the office collects and analysis for planning and assessment. This is good. Again, to continue to provide relevant data for decision making, the office will work toward greater utilization of data retrieval/mining software (e.g., Crystal/Oracle Reports) to obtain data from BANNER in order to align data collection, analysis, data accuracy, reporting, and user access processes. The goal as presented below in my plans for the upcoming year is to “create a set of research reports for administrative use, which will be defined by senior administrative officers, as a mechanism for periodic decision-making purposes.” Other upcoming plans for the 2004-2005 year as approved by the President include:

1. Complete the task of refining the institutional effectiveness process at DSC to reduce redundancy and streamline reporting requirements.
2. Create a set of research reports for administrative use, which will be defined by senior administrative officers, as a mechanism for periodic decision-making purposes.
3. Assist in the implementation of the Title III grant by conducting retention and graduation research, both internally and externally.
4. Take the lead in organizing mechanisms to incorporate the news SACS principles into DSC’s planning and assessment programs.
5. Continue to assist planning unit heads and coordinate activities concerning implementation of the 2003-2006 *Strategic Plan*.
6. Continue to assist with the academic program review process for the baccalaureate programs.
7. Continue teaching sociology class and research/publishing in the areas of race and ethnic relations and multicultural education.
8. Continue as faculty advisor and involvement with the activities of the International Students’ Association.

# APPENDIX

## Appendix A

### INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAM REVIEW EXTERNAL REVIEWERS RECOMMENDATIONS WITH COLLEGE RESPONSE/ACTION

---

#### I. AMOUNT OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS (IE) DATA

##### Issue/Concern

*General lack of focus via the amount of IE data compiled and the associated perception about the usefulness of the quantity of data being collected.*

##### **Recommendation #1**

**Refocus on those measures most directly supporting college-wide goals. Determine the usefulness of the current data elements in order to pare down the process.**

##### DSC Response/Action

The President will appoint the Institutional Effectiveness Subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Committee to review all assessment data elements and measures, including their usefulness and recommend to the President those that should be kept or discarded. The subcommittee should consult with division chairs and administrative unit heads to carry out this activity.

##### **Recommendation #2**

**Design an instrument which would allow the College community to review list of data elements and rank their usefulness filtered through a shortened list of KPIs.**

##### DSC Response/Action

The President will appoint the Institutional Research Subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Committee to take a critical review of the College's 39 KPIs with a view of paring or reducing them.

The Office of Institutional Research & Planning will conduct a College-wide survey that will list all assessment data elements and ask for feedback on the value or usefulness of these elements.

##### **Recommendation #3**

**Provide a mechanism for effective reporting of useful data back to persons needing such data. A more effective means needs to be determined and refined for closing the loop by reporting aggregate and summary data back to the appropriate faculty and staff and ensuring their use to improve programs.**

##### DSC Response/Action

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning will begin reporting useful data to the Administrative Council and Division Chairs for planning and decision-making. Earlier in the summer, the director circulated and received feedback on a draft *Statistical Trend Data*

*for Planning and Decision Making.* The aim is to produce current and updated useful data to the President and Vice Presidents for decision-making. Division Chairs will also find useful data in the expanded *Facts and Figures* document produced by the institutional research office. The office is working with OCIS to make the information more accessible and user-friendly on the IRP website.

## II. ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

### Issue/Concern

*Faculty stated all courses are assessed for IE program every time that they are taught. This has led to a general agreement that assessment at the course level is too detailed. At the same time, there is much variance in the quality and amount of assessment between academic programs and divisions. As well, faculty complain of having to maintain duplicate data in course and faculty notebooks.*

### **Recommendation #4**

**Outcomes in terms of student learning for all academic programs and courses need to be made relatively consistent and streamlined down to between 3-5 objectives per year.**

### DSC Response/Action

Student course learning outcomes for general education programs in the divisions of math and science, humanities, and social sciences should be restricted to the College's general education learning outcomes, and no more. Division faculty must choose the general education outcomes that are appropriate to the courses they teach and assess. All others should be discarded. Furthermore, it is recommended that faculty work together as a team (preferably those teaching the same courses, e.g., history) and distribute the workload among themselves throughout the academic year. The idea here is to assess the course objectives or learning outcomes and not necessarily the number of faculty involved in the assessment process. It needs pointing out, however, that for SACS accreditation requirements, one course objective from the faculty group or team must be assessed for the fall, spring, and summer semesters. With the distribution of the workload among faculty, one could assess one learning outcome in the fall, another in the spring, and one other in the summer. This will obviously reduce the amount of assessment each faculty member does each year. In this manner, not every faculty member will assess a course for every semester and every academic year. At the end of the assessment period, the faculty group will issue one - and only one - assessment report for the course or courses they teach. It will contain the common elements: course, learning outcomes, criteria for success, assessment strategies, assessment results, and the use of results for improvement. Finally, the decision on who should constitute a faculty group or team will be left to the discretion of each division.

For courses taught outside the general education program (i.e. technical division, nursing, baccalaureates in business and social work), the same procedures suggested above should apply. For course objective assessment, faculty in these disciplines must also work in

teams or course clusters (e.g., all technologically-related courses in the technical division) and distribute the assessment workload. Again in this case, not every faculty member teaching in these course clusters or teams will assess all the time, except that a learning outcome for a course must be assessed for each semester and one annual report produced for that particular cluster of courses.

Regarding program assessment objectives in the baccalaureate programs (four in most cases currently), the administration believes that they are sufficient enough to warrant ongoing annual assessment. For the technical division, DTAE program clusters and the results emanating from them should serve as the focus of assessment and reporting of results. All previous program assessment objectives or outcomes should be discontinued.

#### **Recommendation #5**

**Faculty will not be satisfied with assessment unless it is useful to them and have a voice in selection of both assessment objectives and methods. Faculty should determine objectives and methodology for assessing academic course and program outcomes.**

#### **DSC Response/Action**

Divisions and faculty will be given the discretion to determine the methodology for assessing course and program outcomes. This will include generating and reporting information that divisions and faculty deem useful in improving their courses and programs.

#### **Recommendation #6**

**Allow divisions to determine their own reporting cycle, provided every program is assessed in a timely manner and consistent with division and strategic planning reporting cycles.**

#### **DSC Response/Action**

The administration concurs with this recommendation and will allow divisions to determine their own reporting cycle regarding course and program assessment, but it must be aligned in some manner with the division chairs' annual reports as well as the institution's strategic plan.

#### **Recommendation #7**

**Chairs report that usable information from assessment is not getting back to the faculty. Division learning course and program outcomes, objectives for assessing these outcomes, the results of their assessment, and the use of these results should be made easily available, probably through the web.**

#### **DSC Response/Action**

It is the responsibility of division chairs to share information from assessment with their faculty. Information on the College's assessment program is always available on the

institutional research office's website. However, summary information on division learning course and program outcomes, objectives for assessing these outcomes, the results of their assessment, and the use of these results are not easily available and accessible. This will change. The institutional research office will work with division chairs, collect, and summarize course and program assessment results and make them available on the office's website. The office will send out a notice when the information become available and it will be up to the College community to apprise themselves of this information.

**Recommendation #8**

**Eliminate redundancy between external and internal program assessment methods and reporting. In this case, allow the Technical Division to use DTAE's program clusters as assessment methods.**

DSC Response/Action

The technical division will now use DTAE program clusters and the results emanating from them should as the only focus of program assessment and reporting. All previous program assessment objectives or outcomes will be discontinued.

**Recommendation #9**

**Eliminate data maintenance duplication in course and faculty notebooks by designating a single electronic data storage mechanism.**

DSC Response/Action

The institutional research office will consult with division chairs, and with assistance from OCIS, design a single electronic data storage mechanism that will house all assessment reports. This summary of course and program assessment results will be made available and easily accessible on the IRP website.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Issue/Concern

*Usefulness of administrative data collected.*

**Recommendation #10**

**Administrative staff should determine objectives and methodology for assessing administrative programs.**

DSC Response/Action

Like the faculty, administrative unit heads will have the discretion to determine the methodology for assessing their administrative goals and objectives. Already, administrative offices determine their own local administrative goals and objectives.

#### IV. THE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS SUBCOMMITTEE

##### Issue/Concern

*Currently all members of the IE Subcommittee rotate on and off together. Also, it appears that the valuable knowledge and experience acquired by the Chair of the IE Subcommittee during his or her term does not directly benefit the College after the term as Chair is over. This knowledge is so comprehensive that it seems a shame to waste it.*

##### **Recommendation #11**

**Stagger IE members' terms so that continuity is achieved. In this way, only some members need to be brought up to speed. A temporary assignment for the Chair of the IE Subcommittee to be a special assistant to the IRP Director would be possible for an additional year after the term is completed.**

##### DSC Response/Action

The President will recommend to the strategic planning committee that the chair of the previous institutional effectiveness subcommittee be appointed to serve on the current subcommittee on a rotational basis for one year after the beginning of a new strategic planning cycle.

#### V. COLLEGE-WIDE ASSESSMENT

##### Issue/Concern

*College-wide assessment is quite comprehensive, well presented and available through the Web. However, much of these data is never actually used.*

##### **Recommendation #12**

**Conduct a survey of faculty, staff, and administrators to determine which data elements are used and to what extent, enabling the paring down of assessment data elements and the concentration of resources and effort on assessment directly related to meeting planning goals.**

##### DSC Response/Action

The institutional research office will conduct a campus-wide survey of faculty, staff, and administrators to determine which data elements are used and to what extent. This could result in the paring down of the assessment data list and lead to data collection that directly contributes to meeting the strategic goals of the College.

#### VI. PLAN BUILDER

##### Issue/Concern

*Almost universally, the personnel who have used this product do not like it because they say it is difficult to use and navigate, contains too much redundant information, and the terminology used in Plan Builder is obscure, not matching the terminology otherwise used at the College.*

**Recommendation #13**

**Although problems raised with Plan Builder may be a symptom of personnel preferring their own formats rather than having to conform to an electronic format, it might be advantageous to investigate other, newer, such electronic reporting systems (e.g., TracDat).**

**DSC Response/Action**

For the sake of consistent and uniform reporting of planning data, the College will continue to use Plan Builder. Current budget restraints will not permit the purchase of a newer electronic version. Indeed, the trend in planning and assessment reporting is moving in the electronic direction and the College has invested so much time and effort in using Plan Builder that it will not be wise to go back to the old paper format. There is a new version of Plan Builder called Q Builder which will be in place for the first year reporting of the 2003-2006 strategic planning cycle. Hopefully, this will be more user friendly than the Plan Builder. Information about Q Builder to planning heads will go out shortly.

**Recommendation #14**

**If it is decided to continue using Plan Builder, it would be advantageous for the Director of Institutional Research to conduct periodic formal training classes on the use of the product.**

**DSC Response/Action**

It is recommended that division/department secretaries take over the responsibility of entering planning data in Plan Builder. This has worked very well with two faculty divisions. The secretaries in these divisions, who are now adept and comfortable using Plan Builder, will be willing to assist others in knowing how to use Plan Builder and the latest Q Builder. The director of the institutional research office is also ready and willing to provide formal training to administrative secretaries not used to the software and others who still need periodic training.

## VII. INVOLVING THE ENTIRE COLLEGE IN PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT

**Issue/Concern**

*Many of the faculty and staff interviewed say they feel “out of loop” regarding the College’s planning and assessment process and are unaware of college-wide strategic planning goals.*

**Recommendation #15**

**Hold annual meetings with faculty and staff, at which the administration presents and engenders “buy-in” to the goals being concentrated on that year and/or the key strategic or “over-arching goals.” This once-per-year “reach out” from administrators to all personnel would help build a stronger sense of community as well as provide needed information to all parties. Through the annual meeting proposed here, all persons’ input could be solicited toward ways to meet annual goals,**

**on the clarity of their vision for the College, and an excellent opportunity for senior administrators to communicate the “over-arching” goals to the campus.**

DSC Response/Action

Division chairs and administrative unit heads are all members of the strategic planning committee where College’s goals are formulated. It is expected that chairs, vice presidents, and directors will keep their faculty and staff apprised of strategic planning proceedings. At the same time, strategic planning goals are brought to faculty meetings for information, discussion, and approval. As well, the DSC strategic plan and goals are also available on the College’s website. These are all opportunities afforded the College community to inform themselves of the institution’s strategic goals. However, it appears there is still a perception that college goals are not communicated to the campus community and therefore do not engender “buy-in” to institutional planning. In view of this, the administration will explore the recommendation and at the appropriate faculty and staff meetings reach out to communicate and receive input and feedback on the key strategic or “over-arching goals” being concentrated on that year.

**Appendix B**

**PROJECT AND ACTIVITY LOG/CALENDAR**

See attachment.