**Continuous Improvement Plan**

**Outcomes might not change from year to year. For example, if you have not met previous targets, you may wish to retain the same outcomes. *If this is an academic, workforce, or continuing education program, you must have at least one student learning outcome.* You may also add short-term administrative, technological, assessment, resource or professional development goals, as needed.**

**Date:** **Name of Program/Unit:**

**Contact name:** **Contact email:** **Contact phone:**

**Table 1: CIP Outcomes, Measures & Targets Table (focus on at least one for the next two years)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A. Expected Outcome(s)**Results expected in this unit(e.g. Authorization requests will be completed more quickly; Increase client satisfaction with our services) |  **B. Measure(s)**Instrument(s)/process(es) used to measure results(e.g. survey results, exam questions, etc.) | **C. Target(s)**Level of success expected(e.g. 80% approval rating, 10 day faster request turn-around time, etc.) |
| Establish consistent baseline experience for students enrolled in online course offerings across the district. | Analysis of successful completion of online ready training and online advisory board (OAB) course assessment for faculty teaching online sections. | 100% of online faculty have completed online readiness certification.100% of online courses are OAB approved preceding the start of the semester. |
| Streamline and Guarantee Consistency in Customer Support for students, staff, and faculty who contact the eCollin Learning Centers. | Creation and analysis of database / logs of each student, staff, and faculty support request and/or interaction with an eLC staff member. | Decrease in number of unanswered/open issues year-over-year, or to 0% both years. Decreased number of contacts made to the eLC for self-service information provided year-over-year. |

**Description of Fields from CIP Tables:**

**A. Outcome(s)** -Results expected in this program (e.g. Students will learn how to compare/contrast conflict and structural functional theories; increase student retention in Nursing Program).

**B. Measure(s)** -Instrument(s)/process(es) used to measure results

(e.g. results of surveys, test item questions 6 & 7 from final exam, end of term retention rates, etc.)

**C. Target(s)** -Degree of success expected (e.g. 80% approval rating, 25 graduates per year, increase retention by 2% etc.).

**D. Action Plan** -Based on analysis, identify actions to be taken to accomplish outcome. What will you do?

**E. Results Summary** - Summarize the information and data collected in year 1.

**F. Findings** - Explain how the information and data has impacted the expected outcome and program success.

**G. Implementation of Findings** – Describe how you have used or will use your findings and analysis of the data to make improvements.

**Table 2. CIP Outcomes 1 & 2 (FOCUS ON AT LEAST 1)**

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Outcome #1**

Establish consistent baseline experience for students enrolled in online course offerings across the district. |
| 1. **Measure (Outcome #1)**

Analysis of successful completion of online ready training and online advisory board (OAB) course assessment for faculty teaching online sections. | 1. **Target (Outcome #1)**

100% of online faculty have completed online readiness certification.100% of online courses are OAB approved preceding the start of the semester. |
| 1. **Action Plan (Outcome #1)**

Develop a step-by-step process on the eLC website to guide faculty teaching online through steps needed to certify themselves and their courses. Work with the OAB to implement the review checklist and process course submissions. Log online faculty and course certifications to verify that the targets have been met. |
| 1. **Results Summary (Outcome #1)**

100% of online faculty completion of online readiness certification – not met.100% of online courses are OAB approved preceding the start of the semester – not met. |
| 1. **Findings (Outcome #1)**

While both the certified online faculty and the OAB approved course numbers were above the 80% and 70% mark respectively, they still fell below the target of 100% before the start of each semester. Status checks were performed by members of the eLC leading up to and into the start of each semester. Courses and faculty who were not found to meet the target were notified so that steps could be taken to ensure that they would complete any remaining steps. Several challenges presented themselves during the course of this assessment, and these challenges contributed to not achieving the intended target before the start of each semester. First, many of the procedures involved in capturing data related to faculty and course certification are manual, and assessment of this data is also manual. Furthermore, there are two course assessments currently being performed – an OAB certification and a Distance Learning Certification check. These reviews overlap each other in many of their assessments, and also both are currently being performed in a mostly manual form. Ultimately the redundancy in processes and the large number of manual processes mean that the timeliness and efficiency with which the eLC can notify faculty and take the steps needed to bring the courses and individuals into compliance are limited by staff and their hours of availability. Sometimes the deans of the faculty who need to make corrections could not be contacted until after the start of the semester due to the limitations in the staff and their time. |
| 1. **Implementation of Findings**

Several opportunities present themselves that will allow the eLC to improve upon and achieve the target for this outcome in the future. Firstly, redundancies should be minimized such that a successful OAB review and a distance learning review would not overlap, or should they continue to overlap, then the distance learning review could be streamlined by incorporating the approved pieces from the OAB review. Additionally, where appropriate, portions of the course submission and review process should be automated so that eLC staff are only brought into the process when absolutely necessary. Caspio, a database and app development tool, can be used to automate course submissions, along with approval pipeline notification emails. In doing this, the eLC, deans, and directors will automatically be notified of courses and faculty who need to be brought within compliance well before the start of the semester, and only at the point during the approval process when that individual should be notified. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Outcome #2**

Streamline and Guarantee Consistency in Customer Support for students, staff, and faculty who contact the eCollin Learning Centers. |
| 1. **Measure (Outcome #2)**

Creation and analysis of database / logs of each student, staff, and faculty support request and/or interaction with an eLC staff member. | 1. **Target (Outcome #2)**

Decrease in number of unanswered/open issues year-over-year, or to 0% both years. Decreased number of contacts made to the eLC for self-service information provided year-over-year. |
| 1. **Action Plan (Outcome #2)**

Development of a collaborative database that includes logs of interactions with students, faculty, and staff and details which staff member met with them, how the issue was resolved, and additional details if needed. Add information to staff knowledge base for quick reference and resolution. Add information on the eLC website to allow for self-service. |
| 1. **Results Summary (Outcome #2)**

Decrease in number of unanswered/open issues year-over-year, or to 0% both years – met.Decreased number of contacts made to the eLC for self-service information provided year-over-year – met. |
| 1. **Findings (Outcome #2)**

0% of unanswered/open issues existed. By analyzing the contact data in the database, any unanswered questions were able to be identified monthly and were followed up on until the issue was closed. Thus, enabling the eLC to ensure that every issue was addressed and closed. A decrease in the number of contacts made to the eLC for self-service information was also discovered. By tracking contacts made to the eLC, the contact data was able to be analyzed and reoccurring contact patterned were found. From these findings, these commonly asked questions/issues were added to the staff knowledge base for level one quick view responses. Thus, giving the eLC staff a resolution guide for consistent messaging for the most commonly asked questions/issues. Furthermore, student, staff, and faculty on demand tutorials, semester checklists, and workshops were created to incorporate these findings/know gaps. For example, one of the most common eLC contacts by faculty realized in the data analysis was regarding Blackboard essentials. From this information, on demand videos, guides, and checklists were added to the eLC website for self-service. From analyzing the database for contacts, year over year, faculty contacted the eLC approximately 15% less in Fall 2015 than in Fall 2014 and approximately 17% less in Spring 2016 than in Spring 2015 regarding Blackboard essentials.  |
| 1. **Implementation of Findings**

By tracking contact information in a database, the eLC will be able to continually analyze, identify, and address common questions and/or issues. From this data, the eLC will be able to continue updating their level one knowledge base for resolution. Enabling the staff to continue to streamline and be consistent their customer support and resolution. In turn, the eLC will be able to determine areas needed by students, staff, and faculty for training to ensure the best support and knowledge is available. The database will also need to be periodically analyzed for best structure in order to provide the best key performance indicators (KPIs) in areas that need to be streamlined for more ease of quick data analysis. For example, consideration of adding closed date in addition to contact status and automatically calculating time to resolve issue field. |