



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

SERVICE UNIT NAME: POLICY & PLANNING DIVISION (P²)
PHONE: 972-599-3117

SERVICE REVIEW CONTACT: DR. SCOTT J. PARKE
EMAIL: SPARKE@COLLIN.EDU

GUIDELINES

Time Frames:

1. Scope:

The time frame of service unit review is five years, including the year of the review.

Data being reviewed for any item should go back the previous four years, unless not available.

2. Deadline Dates:

January 15th – Service Unit Review Document due to Department Dean for review

February 1st – Service Unit Review Document due to Program Review Steering Committee

3. Years:

Years 1 & 3 – Implement Action Plan of (CIP) and collect data

Years 2 & 4 – Analyze data and findings, Update Action Plan

Year 5 – Write Program Review of past 4 years; Write Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) and create new Action Plan

LENGTH OF RESPONSES: Information provided to each question may vary but should be generally kept in the range of 1-2 pages.

EVIDENCE GUIDELINES: In the following sections, you will be asked to provide evidence for assertions made.

a. **Sources:** This evidence may come from various sources including IE Student Service Unit Satisfaction Surveys, Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Surveys, IE Faculty/Staff Service Unit Satisfaction Surveys, IPEDS Data, unit-level data and surveys. This evidence may be quantifiable and/or qualitative. If you are unfamiliar with any of these information sources, contact David Liska (dliska@collin.edu, 972.985.3714). Use additional data sources of which you are aware.

b. Examples of Evidence Statements:

1. Poor example: Core values are integrated into coursework. (Not verifiable)

2. Good example: Core values are integrated into coursework through written reflections. (Verifiable, but general)

3. Better example: Core values are integrating into coursework through written reflections asking the student to describe how s/he will demonstrate each of the core values in his or her professional life and demonstrated through service learning opportunities. (Replicable, Verifiable)

FOR MORE INFORMATION: Any questions regarding this review, including forms, calendars & due dates, should be addressed to Scott Parke (sparke@collin.edu, 972.599.3117) or David Liska (dliska@collin.edu, 972.985.3714) in Policy & Planning/Institutional Effectiveness.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Section I. *Are We Doing the Right Things?*

1. WHAT DOES YOUR SERVICE UNIT DO?

A. What is the service unit and its context?

This section is used to provide an overview description of the service unit, its relationship to the college and the community it serves. Keep in mind the reviewer may not be familiar with your area. Therefore, provide adequate explanation as needed to ensure understanding.

Suggested Points to consider, but not limited to:

- *Unit's objective/purpose*
- *Services and products*
- *Service across campus/departments/district/community*

Unit's Purpose

Collin College's Policy & Planning Division (P²) has District-wide responsibility for strategic planning, institutional research, and institutional effectiveness. The division provides training for assessment, program review, and continuous improvement planning. P² facilitates reporting, the analysis of and recommendations for improvements that emanate from Continuous Improvement Plans (CIPs). P² serves as the official records office for all strategic planning, program review, and continuous improvement reports and files in support of accreditation and other reporting requirements. Additionally, P² is charged with implementing and overseeing the College's new Data Warehouse and Zogotech Business Intelligence System which will advance data-driven decision making. Additionally, P² is responsible for managing the process of recommending board policies, with a focus on improving student outcomes and success. The Division is overseen by the Vice President for Policy & Planning.

Within P², the mission of Collin College's Institutional Research Office (IRO) states, "We use the tools of research, planning, and evaluation to help people achieve the College's mission." This purpose statement was adopted in spring 1995 and has provided the focus for all activity within the office since then. The five full-time and two part-time current IRO staff members are aware of this purpose statement and they embrace and support it. It remains relevant to the department and its functions. It appears on the standard departmental memorandum template and it has regularly been discussed at departmental planning retreats.

IRO's vision statement is an aspirational expression of the department's role that was adopted at the same time as its purpose statement. It says, "We are the bridge between the oracle and the college community." This statement metaphorically suggests that contemporary data sources parallel, to some degree, the ancient Greek oracles as useful sources of information and prediction. However, like the ancient oracles, contemporary data resources are not always accessible to the College's decision makers. The idea



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

behind the vision statement is to suggest that IRO is the intermediary that accesses these data sources, extracts relevant information, and distills it in comprehensible ways providing a basis for effective making decisions.

The Director of Data Warehousing and Business Intelligence is a new position that was filled on January 3, 2017. Consequently, that role is still evolving.

Unit's Services and Products

P² and its subunits (IRO and the Director of Data Warehousing/Business Intelligence) have District-wide responsibilities, so all their services cut across campuses, division, and departments.

P² oversees and facilitates District-wide strategic planning and monitors planning-related activities for reporting to the administration and the Board of Trustees. The Division also oversees program review/assessment and institutional effectiveness activities to ensure that the organization's instructional and support units are maintaining high standards of quality and striving to improve. The Division also works with the administration to ensure that District policies are current and meet institutional needs.

IRO prepares, verifies, and submits all Coordinating Board Management (CBM) reports to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) by the prescribed deadlines. This represents a total of about 30 reports per year. Some reports are submitted every term, some are submitted annually, and some are submitted on an as-needed basis.

The department prepares, verifies, and submits 13 federal IPEDS reports each year by the prescribed deadlines. There are submission deadlines in August, October, February, and April.

IRO maintains an annual calendar (see Appendix) of recurring reports, surveys, and meetings that various members conduct or in which they participate. (See Appendix.) The annual calendar includes over 120 distinct entries, a number of which include multiple activities. Some of the regular projects included on the annual calendar are required by governmental or other external agencies (such as Supplemental Follow-Up Reports, Licensure Reports, Legislative Budget Board (LBB) Performance Reports, or the Common Data Set), but most are initiated by in-house decision makers who need specific information every year.

The department also responds to ad hoc request for data and analysis. The attached monthly activity reports (See Appendix C.) that are submitted to the administration indicate that, over the past six months, IRO has addressed a total of 87 ad hoc projects or an average of about 15 ad hoc projects per month. The number of ad hoc requests over the past six months is representative of any six-



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

month period except for specific periods such as when the department is called upon to support periodic efforts such as accreditation, state audits, master planning, strategic planning, or changes in leadership.

Service Across Campuses, Departments, the District, and the Community

Service across Campuses, Departments, and the District

P2 and IRO staff serve on various standing committees of the College and play important roles in discussions and activities related to those committees' efforts.

- The VP for Policy & Planning sits on the Administrative Technology Committee;
- The Associate VP for Institutional Research chairs the Data Standards & Quality Assurance Committee, another staff member serves on the Committee, and the Executive Assistant for Policy & Planning serves as the recorder;
- IRO Reports Coordinator serves on the Curriculum Advisory Board;
- Institutional Effectiveness Data Coordinator and IRO Reports Coordinator serve on the Banner Maintenance Committee;
- Three P² staff members serve on the Program Review Steering Committee. The VP for Policy & Planning and the Institutional Effectiveness Data Coordinator serve as permanent members providing data resources and supporting and facilitating the group's processes and activities. The Associate VP for Institutional Research represents P² on the Steering Committee;
- The Director of Institutional Research serves on the QEP Steering Committee;
- Two P² IRO members serve on the Banner Maintenance Committee;
- The P² IRO Reports Coordinator serves on the Calendar Committee;
- Because of their ability to provide and interpret data, P² IRO staff members are frequently invited to consult or to serve on interdepartmental and District-wide task forces and short-term *ad hoc* groups established to address specific projects or problems. These types of activities are documented in P² IRO's monthly activity reports. (See Appendix C.)
- Three P² IRO staff submitted Innovation Challenge Grants to strengthen college operations and/or promote student success.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Service across the Community

- The Institutional Effectiveness Data Coordinator has been a volunteer for each of the last two years helping with the Plano Balloon Festival.
- IRO Reports Coordinator tests Texas Connection Consortium Banner Updates to minimize the likelihood that Consortium institutions will have problems with updates once they are through beta testing and are installed on institutional systems.
- The VP of Policy & Planning and Associate VP for Institutional Research currently serves on the national Higher Education Benchmarking Institute's national Technical Advisory Board. The AVP chairs a subcommittee that is developing new financial measures for the National Community College Benchmarking Project.
- Associate VP for Institutional Research annually meets with the City of Plano Planning Department, Plano ISD, and Frisco ISD to share data and to discuss trends, events, and emerging issues that might affect any or all the participating organizations.
- Associate VP for Institutional Research currently serves on the City of Plano's Oak Point Special Area Plan Stakeholder Committee.
- Associate VP for Institutional Research currently serves as Vice President of the Mockingbird Poetry Society, the Collin County affiliate of the Poetry Society of Texas. Noting that the Mockingbirds have, for 45 years, sponsored an annual county-wide poetry contest for elementary and secondary school students and adults; and noting that the annual awards ceremony associated with the contest attracts approximately 250 people including primary and secondary school students and their parents; the Associate VP for Institutional Research saw an opportunity to bring these people on campus to expose high caliber students and their parents to campus to expose them to the College while recognizing their successes. This natural partnership has been embraced by the English faculty at the Central Park Campus who offered to host the awards ceremony and the CPC Conference Center, as well as by the College's administration when it was agreed to waive the facility rental fee for the event. Thus, on Sunday, April 23, 2017, Collin College will host, for the first time, the Mockingbird Poetry Society's annual Poetry Contest Awards Ceremony.
- Associate VP for Institutional Research currently serves as Membership Coordinator for the Heard Nature Photographers, a large group of nature photography enthusiasts from all over north Texas affiliated with McKinney's Heard Natural Science Museum & Wildlife Sanctuary.
- P²'s Executive Assistant volunteered for nine years at the Collin County Adult Clinic providing secretarial, clerical, and reception services one evening per week.
- Associate VP for Institutional Research served for two years as Chair of the City of Plano's 2010 Census Complete Count Committee.
- Associate VP for Institutional Research served as a *pro bono* consultant for Frisco Family Services and Food Pantry providing survey research and data analysis expertise.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

B. Executive summary: briefly summarize the topics that are addressed in this self-study, including areas of strengths and areas of concern. (Information to address this Executive Summary may come from later sections of this document; therefore, this summary may be written after these sections have been completed.) Using the questions in the template as headings in the Executive Summary can provide structure to the overview document.

WHAT DO WE DO?

Collin's P² has District-wide responsibility for strategic planning, institutional research, and institutional effectiveness functions. The Division also is charged with implementing and overseeing the College's new Zogotech Data Warehouse and Business Intelligence. The Division is overseen by the Vice President for Policy & Planning.

HOW DO WE SUPPORT THE COLLEGE MISSION, CORE VALUES, AND STRATEGIC PLAN?

Collin's P² is a support unit whose mission is to assist line units and decision makers who either have direct contact with students or have direct impact on students through their decisions. Through the Division's leadership and support for strategic planning, institutional effectiveness, and institutional research, P² supports every aspect of the College's mission and strategic plan. Documentation is provided that demonstrates how P² staff members actively embrace and support all aspects of the College's core values.

WHY DO WE DO THE THINGS WE DO?

P²'s leadership of strategic planning keeps the College focused on timely and important aspects of its mission. The Division's leadership of institutional effectiveness activities ensures that the Collin maintains its quality and complies with SACS COC core requirements. Timely and accurate state reporting ensure that Collin College receives tens of millions of dollars in funding from the State of Texas. Compliance with federal reporting requirements helps preserve the College's ongoing eligibility for federal financial aid and avoids, potentially, tens of thousands of dollars in fines. Data provided by P² support regional and professional accreditations. Fulfillment of other external requests for data by Collin's P² division supplies facts pertaining to the College's operations and performance, as well as meeting the College's obligations under state and federal freedom-of-information act laws. Regular and *ad hoc* projects and reports support the College's Mission, core values, strategic plan, and institutional effectiveness efforts, and support effective data driven decision making throughout the College.

HOW DO WE IMPACT STUDENT OUTCOMES?

Though Collin's P² has limited direct contact with students, departmental efforts nonetheless contribute to student outcomes. As a result of regular, mandated reports generated by P² IRO, the College receives over \$30 million in state funding which allows programs and facilities to exist which otherwise could not. P² IRO also provides timely registration and enrollment statistics which allows administrators to schedule sections to meet the needs of students, ensuring that as many as possible can take the classes necessary to



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

achieve their academic goals. In support of the College's Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), P² IRO surveys students to gauge their perceptions about the college and monitor academic completion. P² IRO engages in an ongoing program of regular survey research that for example, collects data related to students' perceptions of their own learning gains, employers' perceptions of Collin students' readiness for the workforce, students' satisfaction with the aspects of their Collin experience, etc. P² IRO also collects and shares data describing students' graduation rates, employment rates, course completion rates, etc. All this information is used to identify obstacles students face and is used by decision makers to improve student outcomes.

HOW EFFECTIVELY DO WE COMMUNICATE?

The most common avenues of communication utilized by Collin's P² with the greater Collin community are its three intranet sites: Institutional Effectiveness, Institutional Research, and Strategic Planning. The frequency by which these sites are updated varies according to the time in which new projects are completed and the cycles in which recurring reports are refreshed. Feedback on these sites is routinely solicited from P² IRO clients through usual professional interactions, faculty/staff surveys, and from discipline leads during annual Program Review kickoff meetings. While there has been high satisfaction regarding the quality of the information provided through these sites, some users have suggested that labyrinthine navigability sometimes makes it challenging for users to find the resources they need, particularly pertaining to IRO reports. To address this concern identified by data users, P² will undertake revisions to its intranet site in an attempt to create a more user-friendly interface and create additional "Collin By the Numbers" Brief Reports as one of its goals in its latest Continuing Improvement Plan.

HOW WELL ARE WE LEVERAGING PARTNERSHIP RESOURCES AND BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS?

P² has formal partnerships with three entities: the Higher Education Benchmarking Institute (HEBI), the North Texas Community College Consortium's (NTCCC) Research & Institutional Effectiveness Committee (R&IEC), and ZogoTech, Inc. The partnership with HEBI provides the College with a useful means to benchmark itself against the 400+ community colleges nationwide that participate in the National Community College Benchmarking Project. The NTCCC R&IEC partnership provides a useful means of networking with other institutional research and institutional effectiveness professionals in the North Texas region, to engage in ongoing professional development (the primary mission of NTCCC). We are also collaborating with other institutions to create and test a new completer follow-up survey that aims to provide useful local feedback and benchmarking capacity about students' perceptions of their learning gains and the institution's learning environment. The ZogoTech partnership is new, and is expected to add value to the institution by giving data users and decision maker's on-demand access to data, and support data-based decision making by allowing users to drill into data to more seamlessly probe complex questions regarding student characteristics and outcomes.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

ARE WE HIRING QUALIFIED STAFF, ARE WE SUPPORTING THEM WELL WITH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT?

Appropriate education and ongoing professional development are critical to staff within Collin's P² division. Of the nine staff members in the division, the highest levels of academic award completion include two individuals with doctorates, two with master's degrees, one with a graduate certificate, three with bachelor's degrees, and one with an associate's degree. All members of P² staff have been actively engaged in professional development as recently as 2016, with eight members having presented at formal conferences.

ARE WE SUPPORTED WITH ADEQUATE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT?

P²'s budget and facilities currently provide adequate support for the Division to accomplish its mission. As the new data warehouse/business intelligence system becomes a reality, and as decision makers embrace and become comfortable with it, it is likely that additional analytical tools will be needed to help them visualize and explore the data which may require additional resources.

GIVEN OUR PRESENT STATUS, HOW DO WE INTEND TO CHANGE IN WAYS THAT HELP US ADVANCE?

Collin's P² has established two goals within its continuous improvement plan that address identified weaknesses. One goal is to improve institution-wide faculty/staff satisfaction with the user friendliness and efficiency of IRO's procedures. The other goal is to improve the ability of IRO data users to navigate, search for, and find information on the IRO intranet site.

HOW WILL WE EVALUATE OUR SUCCESS?

The first goal will be evaluated by means of one or more focus groups. Additional improvement and evaluation activities will be based on what is learned in the focus group(s). The second goal will be evaluated by means of a pre-survey that will be administered before any changes are made to the IRO intranet site and a post-survey that will be administered after changes are made to the site.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

2. HOW DOES THE SERVICE UNIT SUPPORT THE COLLEGE MISSION, CORE VALUES AND STRATEGIC PLAN?

- **Provide evidence of actions that the unit supports the college mission:** *“Collin County Community College District is a student and community-centered institution committed to developing skills, strengthening character, and challenging the intellect.”*

Collin College’s P² Division is a staff support unit that has limited direct contact with students. Yet, everything the Division does impacts the College’s mission. Several examples of how the Division supports the College’s mission follow.

- Every four years, the Vice President for Policy & Planning oversees and facilitates the processes that lead to development of the College’s strategic plan that focuses institutional effort on specific aspects of the mission. Every year, the Division collects and summarizes the data used to monitor the degree to which the College’s mission-related strategic goals are accomplished enabling college leadership to keep the Board of Trustees apprised of progress. These resources and processes are documented on the P²’s intranet site.
- Every year, the P² Division oversees and facilitates the program and service assessment processes designed to ensure that the College’s various units effectively function in ways that support the College’s mission. Institutional Effectiveness and Institutional Research staff annually generates extensive data resources that are posted to the intranet for programs to use in their assessments.
- Based on its annual project calendar and upon demand, P² IRO provides data that allows decision makers to monitor the degree to which Collin College and its organizational units fulfill their missions. These data resources are documented on the P² IRO intranet site and in the monthly activity reports (See Appendix C.) submitted to leadership.
- Without adequate financial resources, the College could not fulfill its mission. Through its state reporting role, P² IRO works to maximize the College revenue streams from the State of Texas. P² IRO’s state reporting was the basis of more than \$33 million in state funding during FY2016. P² staff recommended changes to the three peat process at Collin College that allows students who were previously turned away to remain at the college to finish their education and pay an extra fee to offset lost state reimbursement. The modified “3Peat” policies will have an ongoing annual impact of ~ \$428,000 for the college. P² submitted an Innovation Challenge Grant on Student Success Text Nudges -- Illuminating Pathways & Strengthening Engagement One Text at a Time aims to reduce “Summer Melt”; prompt positive within-course progress; and encourage cross-college efforts to promote retention and advancement. Key results with a 2% improvement across the board can yield 552 students making progress toward their goals. Summer melt is reduced by 2% (154 students, FT), retention is elevated by 2% (292 students, 8 Credit Hrs.) and the number of students dropped for nonpayment that do not re-enroll is reduced by 2% (106 students, 8 Credit Hrs.) Additionally, these 552 students generate ~ \$516,000 flowing to the college through tuition and fees and state reimbursements. Another Innovation Challenge Grant called Finish Strong Collin aims to re-engage 250 near completers (50+ earned credits, who left in



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

good standing and who have not re-enrolled elsewhere). Through the project the services of a student success coach will be invested in to provide wrap around services that help students overcome any remaining obstacles to graduation.

- **Provide evidence that supports the case that the unit and its staff contribute to fulfillment of the College's core values:** *"We have a passion for Learning, Service, Involvement, Creativity, Innovation, Academic Excellence, Dignity, Respect and Integrity."*

--Passion for Learning

- Several times per year, the P² IRO staff work and study together in departmental professional development activities that typically take half a day. Over the past few years, topics that have been addressed in these sessions include Excel macros, Power Pivots, the R programming language, and several on data visualization.
- The entire professional staff within P² has presented at professional conferences to share their knowledge and experiences with professional colleagues. Four P² IRO staff members are scheduled to present at the Texas Association for Institutional Research at the end of February, 2017.
- The VP for Policy & Planning and the Associate VP for Institutional Research both earned Ph.D. degrees. IRO's Research Analyst is enrolled in a Ph.D. program at UT-Dallas. The Director of Institutional Research holds two master's degrees. The part-time Research Analyst holds a graduate certificate in statistics in addition to a baccalaureate in statistics. All other Division staff hold baccalaureate degrees, including the Executive Assistant for Policy & Planning.
- Appendix A provides additional information about the P² staff's passion for learning to continually enhance their professional capacities via various professional development activities.

--Passion for Service and Involvement is documented in the "Service across the Community" portion of Section 1 related to service on page 4, above.

--Passion for Creativity and Innovation

- What is now the College's P² initially proposed and shepherded over a period of years the process that led to the Collin's recent decision to acquire and implement a Data Warehouse/Business Intelligence System. The Division will oversee the acquisition, design, and implementation of the ZogoTech system over the next several months. This system has profound implications for improving data availability for decision makers.
- As previously mentioned, the VP for Policy & Planning has submitted two Innovation Challenge proposals specifically intended to help increase students' likelihoods of success.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

- IRO's Research Analyst supported Innovation by contributing the "Extending Ph.D. Scholarships to all Staff Employees" Innovation Challenge project. The project was approved and implemented in the college in 2016.
- The Director of Institutional Research submitted an Innovation Grant Proposal, "Workforce Needs in Real Time." The focus of the proposal was to provide access to Collin's workforce education deans to JobsEQ, a software by Chmura Analytics, so that they could have latest market data at hand to make program decisions and to better sync the current programs with future market needs. The P² purchased 20 licenses for JobsEQ based on the recommendations of the Innovation Grant.

--Passion for Academic Excellence

- P² contributes to academic excellence through its leadership and support of the Program Review Process. By giving Service Units, Academic Programs, and Workforce Programs valuable quantitative and qualitative information in the form of statistics and survey reports, the programs have opportunities to identify areas to target for continuous improvement.
- The P² contributes to academic excellence by participating in benchmarking activities such as the National Community College Benchmark Project, the national Workforce Training Benchmark Project, and the North Texas Community College Consortium's Completer Follow-Up project. Providing data that allows academic administrators to benchmark the College against the performance of other similar institutions provides opportunities to identify areas that might benefit from attention for improvement. Benchmarking also allows for the identification of best in class performers that other areas of the College can emulate or adapt.

--Passion for Dignity and Respect

- The staff within P² demonstrate their understanding of and commitment to dignity and respect through their daily interactions with people. P² staff are always courteous to fellow staff members, to anyone to visits or calls, and to anyone with whom they interact with during meetings. This assertion is supported by data from the College's satisfaction surveys that are conducted every couple of years. In 2014, about 85% of respondents indicated that P² IRO staff are courteous. In 2016, the percentage dropped slightly, but in both administrations, fewer than 5% of respondents disagreed with that statement that P² IRO staff are courteous. It is P² IRO's goal to keep the positive percentage over 80% and the negative percentage below 5%.
- P² staff demonstrate their understanding of and commitment to dignity and respect through hiring practices that embrace diversity and finding the best person for the job. The department strives to maintain a gender mix, a racial/ethnic mix, and welcomes people from all nationalities and religious backgrounds. The Division has been a melting pot of people from American, African-American, Hispanic-American, Chinese, Ethiopian, German, Indian (from India), Mexican, Native American, and Pakistani backgrounds.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

--Passion for Integrity

P² staff embrace a strong commitment to integrity which, in addition to being one of the College's core values, is also the first and primary standard of accreditation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges (<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2012PrinciplesOfAccreditation.pdf>, pp. 11-13). Integrity also is a key element in the Code of Ethics of the Association for Institutional Research (<http://www.airweb.org/Membership/Pages/CodeOfEthics.aspx>). No member of the Division has ever been accused of any kind of policy violation or violation of law. There has never been a finding in any state or internal audit of IRO's work to suggest anything but the highest standards and expectations of performance. The P² IRO staff perform among the most thorough audits of any institution in Texas when reviewing state reports, and the staff meets reporting deadlines.

- **Provide service unit-specific evidence of how the unit supports the College's [strategic plan](https://www.collin.edu/aboutus/index.html):**
<https://www.collin.edu/aboutus/index.html>.

P² plays a pivotal role in the development of the District strategic plans. The VP of Policy & Planning oversees and is involved firsthand in the creation of the plans. Division staff provide key performance indicator data that are used to allow decision makers to monitor the degree to which the College's strategic goals are accomplished, and to enable the President to keep the Board of Trustees abreast of the College's goal attainment.

P² staff members also receive assignments for specific activities that support strategic priorities. Two examples follow.

- In the Vision 2016 strategic plan, P² was assigned responsibility to help bring the College into the 21st century in terms of data access and decision support by overseeing the acquisition and implementation of a data warehouse/business intelligence system. As a result of those efforts, the College has purchased ZogoTech, a new position (Director of Business Intelligence Systems and Data Warehouse) was created within P² to oversee implementation of ZogoTech, and the system is currently in the very early stages of implementation looking for full implementation in late 2017.
- In the Vision 2020 strategic plan, P² is assigned a leadership role for "Enhancing the College's system of program review for career and technical programs to ensure effectiveness and efficiencies." under Strategic Priority 4 "Expand Career and Technical Programs and Training Offerings in Alignment with Current and Future Labor Market Demand and become the Customized Training Provider of Choice for Additional Employers."



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

3. WHY DO WE DO THE THINGS WE DO?

A. Make a case with evidence to show that the **primary** functions/services of the unit are necessary, should be modified, or should be eliminated.

Suggested Points to consider, but not limited to:

- *What is the purpose and reason for the function?*
- *How has the function evolved during the 5-year cycle? How have the reasons for the function changed over time?*
- *What would happen if the unit no longer provided these functions and/or the functions were outsourced?*
- *What unit functions require the most resources including staff time? Which functions add the biggest value to the college? Discuss any discrepancies between the functions named in these two questions.*
- *What are the interdependencies with other unit functions and other units of the college? Is the unit duplicating any functions with other units?*
- *Is there a clear line of communication with other units involved in or supporting each of these functions?*
- *Does the unit or the college have alternate ways of providing any of these functions?*
- *Are the functions offered/conducted as efficiently as possible?*

State Reporting: P² IRO is responsible for the THECB's CBM reports that drive all state funding for contact hour reimbursement (\$29.3 million in funding for FY2015), performance funding (\$3.4 million in FY2015), Carl Perkins funding (\$511,550 in FY2015), and the Texas Nursing Shortage Reduction Program (\$300,000 in FY2015) for a total of \$33.4 million dollars in state revenues. While these reports require hundreds of hours of preparation, the data requested by the THECB is non-negotiable and must be gathered and calculated according to strict methodologies, eliminating the option for process modification.

Federal Reporting: Federal laws mandate that U.S. post-secondary institutions generate and submit IPEDS reports required by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) under the Department of Education. Failure to comply with the deadlines and other requirements can result in fines of up to \$35,000 per report and endanger the college's federal student financial aid. Like the CBM reports, these reports require many of hours of preparation, the reporting parameters are non-negotiable, and data must be gathered and calculated according to strict definitions and methodologies, thus eliminating any options for process modification.

Accreditation: SACS COC Core Requirement 2.5 (<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2012PrinciplesOfAccreditation.pdf>) makes clear that institutions must “engage in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.” P² IRO provides data to support the institution's regional accreditation and various professional accreditations. Failure to retain regional accreditation would result in loss of federal



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

student financial aid and would have a significant adverse effect on enrollment. Failure to retain professional accreditation in some programs could result in an inability of students to obtain employment upon program completion, particularly in healthcare fields.

State and Federal Freedom-of-Information Laws: The College is obligated by state and federal laws to provide certain types of information to the public within ten working days of an official request. Requests are submitted to the Public Relations Office. When the requests involve data, they are routed to P² staff who respond back to the PR Office within the designated time frame. Failure to provide adequate responses in a timely manner to freedom-of-information requests can result in legal sanctions being imposed on the College. Collin has never failed to comply with the requirements of the law, so no sanctions have ever been imposed.

Regular and *ad hoc* Projects and Reports: P² IRO engages in an ongoing cycle of regular projects as documented in its annual calendar. In addition to its regular project cycle, P² IRO receives frequent requests for *ad hoc* data, analysis, and reports from members of the College community and from outside the College. Both the regular and *ad hoc* projects are documented in P² IRO's monthly activity reports. (See Appendix C.) Failure to complete regular, ongoing projects or to respond in a timely manner would undermine institutional decision-making and administrative processes. There is always room for improvement in delivery of data for decision support to the College community in a timely manner. That is why P² IRO has expanded the availability of data and reports on its intranet site and was a primary driver of P²'s efforts to obtain administrative support for a data warehouse/business intelligence system (BIS). With the implementation of ZogoTech BIS, Collin enters an era of having a broader array of drill down-able data available on demand at any time. The BIS will eliminate wait times for many questions and may shorten others since the BIS will be able to handle many inquiries that currently involve querying the databases to answer. Alternatively, as more end users gain experience with available data through ZogoTech, the number of more detailed *ad hoc* requests could increase. This has occurred in other locations where BIS systems have been launched as the organization moved toward a more data informed culture of evidence.

Institutional Planning: Consistent with SACS COC Core Requirement 2.5, P² staff are assigned responsibility to oversee, facilitate, and monitor strategic planning at the institutional level. This includes working with a District-wide constituency to facilitate development of the strategic plans on a four-year cycle, identifying key performance indicators used to document the degree of attainment and institutional improvement relative to each institutional priority, collecting data relative to each key performance indicator, and reporting to the administration and Board of Trustees on the status of the plan at regular intervals. Failure to maintain an effective planning process would be a violation of SACS COC Core Requirement 2.5 and would result in either a recommendation, warning, or probation.

Institutional Effectiveness and Program Review: Consistent with SACS COC Core Requirement 2.5, P² is assigned responsibility to oversee, facilitate, and monitor program and service review at the institutional level. This includes working with a District-wide constituency to facilitate the annual program/service review cycle; to provide data necessary to enable effective assessment; to



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

document program and service strengths and weaknesses; to document program, service, and institutional quality; and to ensure that the institution and its units are effectively accomplishing the College's mission. P² also facilitates and promotes continuous improvement through the program review process. Failure to maintain an effective institutional effectiveness process would be a violation of SACS COC Core Requirement 2.5 and would result in either a recommendation, warning, or probation.

B. Benchmarking: Review two or three comparable, leading colleges for the way they accomplish these functions. Discuss lessons to be learned and new ideas for service improvement

The response for this section of the service assessment is based on two sources. First, during 2015, the Association for Institutional Research (AIR), the primary national/international professional association for post-secondary professionals involved in institutional research, planning, and institutional effectiveness, conducted a national survey of related offices to “collect information on the tasks, staff, organization, and resources” of offices that are responsible for these functions. A total of 1,609 responses were received reflecting the status of institutional research (IR), planning (P), and institutional effectiveness (IE) at 1,506 institutions across the country.

Second, during January 2017, the Associate VP for Institutional Research conducted a brief survey of two Texas peer institutions to determine to what extent the oversight of the IR, P, and IE functions at Collin College parallel those of in-state peer institutions. Houston and San Jacinto colleges were selected for the survey. While Houston is larger than Collin, both they and Collin College are large, urban/suburban, multi-campus community colleges that has single offices with district-wide responsibility for the IR, P, and IE functions. San Jacinto is the most similar Texas institution to Collin in terms of size and other attributes. Because of its similarities to Collin, San Jacinto College is the only Texas institution that is also included in Collin's national peer group. Like both Collin and Houston, San Jacinto College is large, urban/suburban, multi-campus community college that has single offices with district-wide responsibility for the IR, P, and IE functions. Additional information about the content of the survey appears later in this portion of the review.

Collin College Benchmarking Context

Collin College's P² is overseen by the VP for Policy & Planning. Reporting to the VP of Policy & Planning are an Associate VP for Institutional Research, the Director of Data Warehousing/Business Intelligence (as of 1/3/2017), and the Executive Assistant for P². Reporting, in turn, to the VP for Institutional Research, are the Director of Institutional Research, the Institutional Effectiveness Data Coordinator, the Institutional Research Reports Coordinator, and a part-time Secretary. Reporting to the Director of Institutional Research is a full-time Research Analyst, and reporting to the Institutional Research Reports Coordinator is a part-time Research Analyst. Thus, P² includes seven full-time professional staff members, one full-time support staff member, one part-time professional



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

staff member, and one part-time support staff member. This represents a total of eight full-time and two part-time employees or a total of nine staff FTE.

P² has district-wide responsibility for strategic planning, tactical planning, and performance measurement; state and federal reporting; data support for regional accreditation and, as requested, discipline-specific professional accreditation; institutional effectiveness processes at the district and unit levels; data support for decision making; and, most recently, implementation, management, and support for the new ZogoTech data warehouse/business intelligence system. P² also has responsibility for board policy. In addition to its District-wide responsibility, P² provides similar types of support at the Campus, division, program, and course levels. Under the oversight of the VP for Policy & Planning, the Division reports to the Senior VP for Organizational Effectiveness who, in turn, reports to the District President who reports to the Board of Trustees.

AIR National Survey Comparison

Turning, first, to the AIR survey results (See appendix B.), the survey found that only 13% of responding two-year institutions maintain staffs responsible for IR, P, and IE that are as large as the one at Collin College. However, only 11% of the responding institutions enrolled more than 10,000 FTE students. Thus, the fact that a slightly higher percentage of two-year institutions maintain IR, P, and IE staffing comparable to Collin than the percentage of institutions that are as large as Collin suggests that Collin's staffing is consistent with the its size.

Nearly two-thirds of two-year institutions that responded to the AIR survey indicated that the chief IR, P, and IE officer reports directly to either the chief academic officer or the President with the majority reporting to the President. Collin falls into the roughly one-third of two-year colleges where the chief IR, P, and IE officer is overseen by an administrator other than the CAO or CEO. Compared to respondents in the AIR survey, Collin College's P² has an unusually broad scope of responsibility. Collin's P² has responsibility in all areas that typically fall into the scope of responsibility for IR, P, and IE functions. Those primary responsibilities include: federal mandatory reporting, state mandatory reporting, responding to external surveys, generating official statistics, enrollment reporting and analyses, data sharing with internal and external constituencies, and developing and monitoring performance measures. In addition, P² also sole responsibility of shares responsibility with other Collin units that are consistent with shared responsibilities at the majority of institutions that responded to the AIR survey. Those share responsibilities include: contributing to accreditation studies, leading strategic planning, contributing to program accreditation, and contributing to learning outcomes assessment. Finally, Collin's P² has responsibility for several areas for which the majority of corresponding offices have no responsibility. Examples of those additional responsibilities include: institutional budget/finance modeling, scheduling/demand studies, space utilization studies and creating innovative approaches to advancing student success.

Collin's P² has good access to data that allow it to fulfill its responsibilities to the College community. There are significant pieces of information that Collin does not collect such as first generation status for all students, class attendance data, information about student



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

early warning alerts, intra-term classroom performance data, academic advising data, measurements of students' internal motivation (e.g., grit), and consistent access to high school transcript data. While these holes in the College's data infrastructure pose ongoing challenges to anyone who is serious about studying factors that affect student success, the College has given P² complete access to the data that are collected.

In summary, comparing Collin College's P² to the data in AIR's national survey, Collin's P² is staffed within normal parameters for an institution of its size. Reporting lines within the organizational structure are outside the norm (CEO/CAO). Collin's P² has a broader scope of responsibility than the typical counterpart at other community colleges. Compared to other institutions, Collin's P² has excellent access to the data necessary to successfully fulfill its primary functions.

Benchmarking Survey Questions

The survey consisted of five items.

- 1) What are the names of the offices at your institution that have responsibility for institutional research, planning, and institutional effectiveness functions?
- 2) At your institution, what are the titles of the people to whom these offices report?
- 3) How many people at your institution perform institutional research, planning, and institutional effectiveness functions?
- 4) What are the major functions for which the offices identified in item 1 are responsible?
- 5) At your institution, how the offices assessed that perform the institutional research, planning, and institutional effectiveness functions?

San Jacinto College Benchmarking Survey

The survey was directed to George Gonzalez, the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness at San Jacinto College. Mr. Gonzalez has several years of leadership experience with San Jacinto College and is intimately familiar with the institution and its organization structure and functions.

In response to item 1, Mr. Gonzalez indicated that their Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, the Office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Accreditation and Assessment, the Strategic Leadership Team, and the Institutional Effectiveness Council have responsibilities that correspond to IR, P, and IE.

In response to item 2, Mr. Gonzalez's office reports to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Accreditation and Assessment. The Associate Vice Chancellor, in turn, reports to a Vice Chancellor (not the Chief Academic Officer) who reports to the Chancellor who reports to the Board of Trustees.

In response to item 3, Jacinto College indicated that they have 9 full-time professional and 2 full-time support staff who oversee institutional research and institutional effectiveness. They have no part-time staff. The full-time professionals include Mr. Gonzalez and the Associate Vice Chancellor.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

In response to item 4, he said that the major functions for which the 7 people within his office are responsible include District-wide high-level institutional effectiveness, and federal IPEDS reporting. His office does not have responsibility for state mandatory reporting. The Office of the Chancellor is responsible for accreditation and program/service unit assessment. The District's Strategic Leadership Team and the Institutional Effectiveness Council oversee any strategic planning that occurs, but that appeared to be a less formal process than what occurs at Collin College with no single person having the primary duty of overseeing it.

Finally, in response to item 5, Mr. Gonzalez indicated that San Jacinto College uses a combination of annual and quadrennial processes to evaluate service units like the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness. It was not clear if the Office of the Vice Chancellor is included in any assessment processes. On an annual basis, the Office develops annual goals and measures the degree to which those goals are accomplished. They also conduct regular surveys to assess satisfaction with the department's efforts, they monitor the number of information requests that are submitted, and the degree to which projects are delivered on time. The four-year process goes into more detail and appears to be somewhat similar to Collin's five-year program/service review process.

A comparison of Collin's and San Jacinto's IR, P, and IE functions suggests that the two institutions have fairly similar structures and staffing, though the scope of responsibility appears to be broader at Collin and Collin has a very slightly smaller staff. In terms of processes to evaluate quality of service and products, San Jacinto uses a combination of annual and quadrennial review while Collin's P² engages in monthly reporting of its activities with a formal five-year in-depth review.

Houston Community College Benchmarking Survey

The survey was administered to Dr. Martha Oburn, Executive Director of Institutional Research, at Houston Community College (HCC). Dr. Oburn has been responsible for the Institutional Research Office at HCC for many years. She has extensive knowledge of the institution and its organizational structure and functions.

In response to the first survey item, Dr. Oburn indicated that there are three offices at HCC that have primary responsibility for the IR, P, and IE functions. They include the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Curriculum and Learning Initiatives.

In response to item 2, Dr. Oburn said that the two HCC Vice Chancellor's Offices identified in item one report directly to the Chancellor. The Executive Director of Institutional Research reports to the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology who, in turn, reports to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration who reports to the Chancellor. The Chancellor reports to the Board of Trustees.

The response to item 3 indicated that there are a total of 13 full-time professional employees who have responsibility for IR, P, and IE at HCC. There are 4 full-time professionals in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, 7 full-time professionals in the Office of Institutional Research, and 2 full-time professionals in the Office of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Curriculum and Learning Initiatives. In addition, one part-time professional staff member is employed in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Curriculum and Learning Initiatives. However, the 2 full-time professionals in the Office of the Vice



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Chancellor for Curriculum and Learning Initiatives have other responsibilities, so only 1 FTE is responsible for activities related to IR, P, and IE. In addition, there are a total of 3 full-time support personnel employed in the offices related to IR, P, and IE. Thus, there are a total of 12 full-time professional employees and 3 full-time support employees, or a total of 15 full-time employees, at Houston Community College who support the IR, P, and IE functions.

The major functions identified in item 4 for which these three offices have responsibility for include the following.

Office of Institutional Research

- Data and Analytics
- Data Warehousing and Business Intelligence
- State and Federal Reporting
- Survey Research and Responses to External Surveys
- Student Evaluations of Instruction
- *Ad hoc* Reporting
- Support for Initiatives (Achieving the Dream, Pathways, Gates Foundation, Texas Baldrige Award, etc.)
- Planning Data Support (report on key performance indicators, maintain dashboards, etc.)

Office of Vice Chancellor for Planning & Institutional Effectiveness (Vacant – search underway)

- Strategic Planning Oversight (Facilitate Development of Plans, Design Performance Measure, Reporting)
- Non-Instructional Unit Reviews
- District Institutional Effectiveness Activities and Initiatives

Office of Associate Vice Chancellor for Curriculum and Learning Initiatives

- Instructional Program Review

The response to item 5 indicated that HCC currently has no formal review process for non-instructional units. One of the responsibilities of the new Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness will be to design and initiate such a process. In the absence of a formal review process, non-instructional units are expected to administer an “Opportunities for Improvement Survey” every other year. In addition, the Office of Institutional Research submits an annual report to the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology, but there are no formal parameters for the report. Prior year reports serve as the template.

Comparing Collin’s P² to HCC, Collin consolidates the functions of three HCC offices into a single division. Collin’s P² appears to be more efficient than HCC is with its IR, P, and IE functions, since HCC has a greater number of full-time professional and staff support personnel performing those functions than does Collin. Finally, Collin College has a formal process for assessing and strengthening the performance of its service units, while HCC does not but plans to develop one.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

4. HOW DO WE IMPACT STUDENT OUTCOMES?

Make a case with evidence to show effects of the service unit on student outcomes.

Suggested Points to consider, but not limited to:

- *How does the service unit influence the student experience?*
- *How does the service unit influence the student environment and/or safety?*
- *In what way does the service unit influence student retention, persistence, and/or completion?*

P² IRO is a staff office that has limited direct contact with students. However, it provides much of the data used throughout the institution by line units that do have direct contact with students empowering decision makers to make decisions related to all aspects of the student experience and student outcomes.

Institutional Funding: P² IRO produces, verifies, and submits the THECB reports (CBM-001, CBM-002, CBM-004, CBM-009, CBM-00A, and CBM-00C) that generated over \$33 million in state funding during FY2015. In doing so over the years, Collin College has undergone multiple state audits to ensure the integrity of the reporting process without having received a single substantive finding while meeting all reporting deadlines. Without that funding, the College would be providing a substantially limited student experience and environment.

Enrollment: Throughout each registration cycle, IRO's "Registration Statistics," "Daily Enrollment Snapshots," and "Headcount Statistics" reports, provide the means for faculty, associate deans, deans, and Vice President Provosts (VPPs) to make decisions about when to close or add course sections. The "Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Contact Hour Report" generated twice each fall semester gives associate deans, deans, VPPs, and the Executive VP the information they need about variations in contact hour teaching loads by division and department to determine which programs need additional full-time faculty positions to cover the anticipated instructional loads during the next academic year. An enrollment history report ("Catalog Listing_2007-2016 Enrollment by Course") generated each year is used by Associate Dean Dr. Kathleen Fenton to work with deans to identify courses that should be dropped from the Collin College Catalog because they are not serving students effectively.

Student Success:

- P² IRO provides student outcomes data that reflect course completion, course success, and grade distributions ("Grade Distribution, Course Completion, and Course Success Rates by Term"), program completion ("Award Completion by Program," "Certified Awards by CIP Code, Award Type, and Year," and "Average Credit Hours upon Award"), university transfer and post-graduate employment ("Student Behavior after Enrollment by Declared Major" and "Gainful Employment"), "CB-116 Supplemental Follow-up Report", licensure and certification ("Licensure/Certification Exam Pass Rates"), and satisfaction of



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

employers with Collin's program completers (Employer Satisfaction Survey of Workforce Education Programs"). This information is used by decision makers to assess and strengthen courses and programs.

- P² IRO contributes to improving the student learning environment by virtue of its support to District's SACS COC Quality Enhancement Plan. P² IRO has administered 12 surveys between 2014 and October 2016 to gauge students' perception of their learning environment and to monitor completion of their academic goals (Academic Planning Experiences Surveys, Academic Planning Coach Feedback survey and Ruffalo Noel Levitz survey administered to the 2014 Full-Time FTIC degree-seeking cohort).

Support for Program and Service Improvement: P² IRO conducts surveys and research designed to strengthen instructional programs and support services as to assess students' perceptions of and satisfaction with those programs and services. The data are used by decision makers to refocus the missions and activities within associated organizational units. A few examples are provided.

- The Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory is administered to a representative sample of students every other spring during even-numbered years. It provides valuable information about the degree to which student's value specific aspects of the College's educational environment and support services. Data from this survey were used to begin addressing longstanding weaknesses in the College's academic advising program through the Quality Enhancement Plan.
- The Completer Follow-Up Survey is administered every other year to all program completers. It is designed to elicit information about students' perceptions of and satisfaction with their educational gains and specific student support services.
- The Former Student Survey was undertaken to get a better understanding of the reasons why students who were enrolled in the fall semester of a given year did not return the following spring (the last out of a series of five surveys, administered in 2012). The survey measured factors that contributed to withdrawal from college and the tipping points leading to withdrawal. Findings indicated that students tended to fall into one of three clusters (fledglings, externally impacted, and accomplished) and that that students within each cluster tended to stop out or drop out for reasons specific to the cluster into which they fell.

Section II. Are We Doing Things Right?

5. HOW EFFECTIVELY DO WE COMMUNICATE AND HOW DO WE KNOW?

A. Provide service unit Web site URLs. If no Web site is available, describe plans for creation of Web site.

The P² maintains four intranet sites: Institutional Effectiveness, Institutional Research, and Strategic Planning.

- The Institutional Effectiveness intranet site (<http://inside.collin.edu/institutionaleffect/>) provides extensive information pertaining to assessment at Collin College and its programs and service units with one page entirely devoted to the Program Review process.
- P² IRO maintains an extensive Institutional Research intranet site on which numerous reports and data resources are posted to support institutional decision making, planning, and evaluation. This site (<http://inside.collin.edu/iro/>) is maintained by the Executive Assistant for Policy & Planning and by the Institutional Effectiveness Data Coordinator.
- P² also maintains a Strategic Planning intranet site that provides a single location where those with access can turn for the latest information about the District's master plan, its strategic plan, and key performance measures associated with the strategic plan.
- P² IRO also maintains the "District Statistics" site on Collin College's Internet site: <http://www.collin.edu/aboutus/statistics/>. This site is maintained by the Reports Coordinator. The date of most recent update is posted at the bottom of the home page. As of the date of this writing, the most recent update was 12/9/2016.

B. Make a case that the printed literature and electronic communication are current, provide an accurate representation, and support the college's recruitment, retention and completion plans.

Suggested Points to consider, but not limited to:

- *Ask for feedback from relevant audience on your website and literature; incorporate these suggestions as appropriate.*

The two P² IRO Web sites cited above are the primary vehicle used by the P² IRO staff to communicate with the broader College community as a means of fulfilling its mission. In addition to the two Web sites P² IRO sends formal, printed reports to clients in response to their requests. Those reports are almost always sent in electronic formats, and they often end up posted on the P² IRO intranet site.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

The content of the “District Statistics” Web page is determined by the administration and by statutory requirements. For example, the U.S. Department of Education requires that institutions post “Student Right-to-Know” data that provides information to students, potential students, and their parents about the institution’s graduation and transfer-out rates averaged over four years.

The content of the P² IRO intranet site is determined by P² IRO staff and it includes reports on various measures and projects that the IRO staff completes and maintains. A site map of the P² IRO Web site follows, though many of the entries include links to multiple documents.

- Enrollment History since the College’s inception
- Student Outcomes data
 - Numbers of students who transfer to four-year institutions
 - Program completions
- Term enrollment statistics for fall and spring semesters
 - Enrollment by Site
 - Enrollment by Meeting Time
 - Enrollment by Gender
 - Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity
 - Enrollment by Age
 - Enrollment by Full-Time/Part-Time Status
- Common Data Set for the past several years (a set of institutional data agreed upon by many institutions and posted to answer many users’ questions without a need to submit a specific request)
- Student Right-to-Know data
- Licensure Pass Rates

The content of P² IRO’s intranet site is determined by the IRO staff. It consists of a large number of reports and data resources that are organized into five categories with numerous links within those categories and, in several cases, multiple links within links. A general site map is provided here, but the pages and their content should be accessible by visiting the

- CBM Edit Reports: Summaries of state reports generated over the past ten years
- Classroom Utilization: Reports on Utilization of Classrooms by Room, Building, and Campus
- Headcount Statistics
 - Fall Census
 - Spring Census
 - Maymester Census
 - Summer Census (Single Summer Term since 2015)



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

- Summer I Census (through 2014)
- Summer II Census (through 2014)
- Wintermester Census
- Unduplicated Annual Enrollment History
- Credit Academic Year Contact Hour History
- Credit Academic Year Headcount History
- Continuing Education Academic Year Contact Hour Comparison
- Continuing Education Academic Year Headcount/Contact Hour History
- Core Completers
- Field of Study Completers
- Occupational Skill Award Completers
- Program Completion (degrees and certificates)
- Planning Data
 - National and State Peer Groups
 - Enrollment Tracking of High School Graduates following Graduation
 - Enrollment by ZIP Code
- Program Review Data (2016-2017)
 - Measure 1a: Duplicated Enrollment
 - Measure 1b: Unduplicated Enrollment
 - Measure 2a: Award Completions by Program
 - Measure 2b: Certified Awards by CIP Code-Award Type
 - Measure 3: Gainful Employment
 - Measure 4: Average Class Size
 - Measure 5: Room-Space Utilization
 - Measure 6: Grade Distribution, Completion, and Success
 - Measure 7: Faculty Contact Hours Taught by Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty
 - Measure 8: Licensure/Certification Pass Rates
 - Measure 9: Student Behavior after Enrollment by Declared Major
 - Measure 10: Average Credit Hours upon Award
- Reports
 - Community Survey
 - Completer Follow-Up Survey
 - Drug Awareness Survey



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

- Employer Satisfaction Survey
- Market Penetration by ZIP Code
- Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory Results
- National Community College Benchmarking Project
- National Student Clearinghouse
- Workforce Training Benchmark Project
- CBM Edits
- Graduation Rates and Student Right-to-Know
- CBM-116 Supplementary Follow-Up
- Average Class Size
- Student-Faculty Ratios
- Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Contact Hours
- Licensure Pass Rates
- National Center for Education Statistics' IPEDS Data Feedback
- EMSI Student Resume Analysis
- Student Evaluation Information
 - Received Student Evaluation Packets
 - Student Evaluation Summary Reports by District, Campus, Division, Department, Faculty Employment Status, Core Area, and Course Rubric
- P² IRO Links
 - P² IRO Glossary
 - P² IRO Calendar
 - Professional, Federal, State, and Local Links

The Institutional Effectiveness intranet site page for Program Review is updated multiple times annually, to ensure that information regarding upcoming Program Reviews is current, and again at the conclusion of each year's Program Review, to ensure the Program Review Steering Committee's findings are made available to all college employees.

P² IRO staff members frequently seek informal feedback from users about their ability to find and access useful information on the P² IRO intranet site. Clients are generally very candid about both the strengths and the weaknesses of the two Web sites. In response to that feedback, the site has undergone periodic overhauls to find a way to make the information more accessible.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Response to the “District Statistics” Internet site is generally positive. It is simple to navigate and limited enough that it is easy to find things.

The most frequent concern expressed about the P² IRO intranet site is that users find it difficult to locate specific information. The volume of information that is posted on the P² IRO intranet site contributes to the problem, and the staff is constantly engaged in discussions to identify ways to make it easier to find information.

The next most frequent complaint from users is that the information they want is not available on the P² IRO intranet site. When P² IRO staff members become aware that a user is seeking information that is not available on the P² IRO intranet site, we look to see if the information is readily available in any other format. If it is, we post the information. That is how the College peer groups ended up on the P² IRO intranet site. If the information is not readily available, and the user submits an ad hoc request for the information, the IRO staff discusses its relevance to the greater College community. If it is determined that the information has broad relevance, it is posted to the P² IRO intranet site. That is how the Market Penetration by ZIP Code reports came to be posted on the IRO intranet site.

The other concern that is occasionally expressed about the P² IRO intranet site is that information is dated (too old to be useful for current decision making). Given the volume of information that is maintained on the P² IRO intranet site, it is unavoidable that, occasionally, some reports will fail to be updated. We attempt to monitor the postings and see that they are kept current, but we sometimes miss things. Whenever someone expresses concern about information on the P² IRO intranet site being dated, the P² IRO staff moves quickly to update data and remove old information. It also occasionally happens the latest information may appear dated to the client, but is, in reality, the latest available data; e.g., the latest CB-116 report relates to 2014-2015 graduates because the data has a time lag; the latest National Community College Benchmarking Project report relates to fall 2014, because the National Higher Education Benchmarking Institute must be sure that all data are available from all participating institutions; and the latest available data for tracking transfers to universities is based on students who were enrolled at Collin during the 2014-2015 academic year, because a year must pass to allow students time to transfer and to show up in the National Student Clearinghouse’s data base.

C. Describe the process used to keep all literature and electronic sites updated.

The Institutional Effectiveness intranet site page for Program Review is presented at a Program Review Kickoff meeting for Discipline Leads each August by VP of Policy & Planning and the Institutional Effectiveness Data Coordinator. The Program Review Kickoff also provides them with points of contact throughout the year if any questions, discrepancies, or other concerns arise.

All P² IRO staff members monitor the two Web sites. As any P² IRO staff member identifies information that is out-of-date, they make the appropriate person aware of that fact. Also, when we receive word from users that information is out-of-date, we work



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

quickly to update it. Finally, as P² IRO staff members update regular reports for clients that they know are posted to the P² IRO intranet site, they send a copy with instructions via email to the appropriate staff member for posting. The process works reasonably well in a situation where we are maintaining vast quantities of information with limited staff support. P² IRO staff update the division web sites in addition to all their other responsibilities.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

6. HOW WELL ARE WE LEVERAGING PARTNERSHIP RESOURCES AND BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS, AND HOW DO WE KNOW?

Partnership Resources: List any business, industry, government, college, university, and/or consultant partnerships to advance the service unit outcomes. If a contract is involved, indicate its duration.

Partnership Resources

Partner/Organization	Description	Contract Duration, if any	Briefly explain the Partnership's Value to Service Unit
Higher Education Benchmarking Institute (HEBI)	This institute is sponsored by Johnson County Community College in Overland Park, Kansas. It provides a framework for between 200 and 300 participating institutions to collect data based on common definitions that the institutions can use to benchmark themselves against the aggregate. The number of participating colleges varies by year. The Institute sponsors the National Community College Benchmark Project which focuses on credit instruction, and the National Workforce Training Benchmark Project that focuses on noncredit instruction, and the national Cost and Productivity project that focuses on benchmarks for discipline-level instructional costs.	Annual	Collin College currently participates in the National Community College Benchmark Project and the Workforce Training Benchmark Project. Data from are invaluable for comparing Collin's performance levels with those of other community colleges and identifying areas where Collin can improve. The data have been a rich source for accreditation reports, internal goal setting, and identifying areas of strength and weakness in planning and assessment processes.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Partner/Organization	Description	Contract Duration, if any	Briefly explain the Partnership's Value to Service Unit
<p>North Texas Community College Consortium (NTCCC), Research & Institutional Effectiveness Committee (R&IEC)</p>	<p>This is a regional consortium of institutions with a mission to promote collective professional development opportunities for faculty and staff; conduct consortium-wide activities in institutional research, planning, and effectiveness; and to improve communication and collaboration among member colleges. The R&IEC conducts institutional research projects of value to member institutions.</p>	<p>Collin College's President's Office pays an annual fee for Consortium membership.</p>	<p>The R&IEC has worked collaboratively on numerous projects over the years. Recent topics have included tuition/fee rates and distance learning. The group is currently working on developing a new Completer Follow-Up Survey that Collin has been pilot testing. The instrument is based on the Lumina Foundation's Degree Qualification Profile, the THECB Core Objectives, and SCANS.</p>
<p>ZogoTech</p>	<p>ZogoTech is a new College vendor that provides the software and support for Collin's new data warehouse/ business intelligence system.</p>	<p>Five years.</p>	<p>Members of P² have been working to move the College into the 21st century in terms of providing on-demand data access; data consistency through a data warehouse; and the ability for non-technical users to drill down to answer follow-up questions once they find answers to their overarching initial questions. This should encourage the development of a culture of evidence where decisions are made on a timelier basis.</p>

HEBI partnership was initiated by P² IRO to foster institutional benchmarking. Results from the annual project are shared with the Leadership Team. They provide useful context for understanding institutional strengths and weaknesses, and the data are used in



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

accreditation reports to demonstrate institutional effectiveness activities at the District level. Two P² staff members currently serve on HEBI's national technical advisory board: the VP for Policy & Planning and the Associate VP for Institutional Research.

The NTCCC partnership was initiated and maintained by the College. However, P² IRO's participation in the R&IEC is completely initiated and maintained by P² IRO and its staff. The IR offices at a number of NTCCC member institutions opt not to participate. Two P² IRO staff members have served as chairs of the group. The tuition and fee study and the completer follow-up project were proposed and led by Collin P² IRO staff members. The former study was initiated on an annual basis to provide Consortium presidents and chancellors with information about institutional tuition and fees at a time when no other organizations were providing that information. It was abandoned when the Texas Association of Community Colleges began providing similar data. The Completer Follow-Up project was proposed after the tool that Collin College had used for completer follow-up was modified by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Memphis, it became unviable as an ongoing tool. The NTCCC project was proposed to provide a means for Collin and the other Consortium institutions to collect information about graduates' perceptions of their learning gains, to elicit feedback about the learning support environment, and to allow Consortium institutions to benchmark against one another.

The ZogoTech contract took effect in December 2016. A new Director of Business Intelligence and Data Warehousing began working on January 3, 2017. The relationship with ZogoTech and its product should help foster a culture of evidence and promote further data informed decision making at Collin College. The system should be functional by the end of calendar year 2017.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

7. ARE WE HIRING QUALIFIED STAFF AND SUPPORTING THEM WELL WITH PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AND HOW DO WE KNOW?

Make a case with evidence that staff are qualified, keep current, and fulfill roles that advance the service unit and the college. List service unit employees (full-time and part-time), their roles, credentials, and known professional development activity in the last four years.

Employee Resources

Employee Name	Role in Unit	Credentials	Professional Development since Last Program Review**
See Appendix A.			

**For convenience, if providing a listing of professional development activities, this list may be included in this document as an addendum.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

8. ARE WE SUPPORTED WITH ADEQUATE FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT, AND HOW DO WE KNOW?

Make a case with evidence that current deficiencies or potential deficiencies related to service unit facilities, equipment, maintenance, replacement, plans, or budgets pose important barriers to the service unit or student success. As part of your response, complete the Resource Tables below to *support* your narrative.

Suggested Points to consider, but not limited to:

- *The useful life of structures and equipment,*
- *Special structural requirements, and*
- *Anticipated technology changes impacting equipment sooner than usual.*
- *If you plan to include new or renovated facilities or replacement of equipment in your service unit improvement plan, be sure to justify the need in this section with qualitative and/or quantitative data evidence of the need.*

Facilities Resources

Room/Office Location and Designation	Description (i.e. Special Characteristics)	Meets Needs (Y or N):		Describe additional needs for any "N" answer
		Current	For Next 5 Years	
CHEC-201	Common office area (3 stations)	Y	Y	
CHEC-202	Conference room (Seats 12)	Y	Y	
CHEC-203	Storage room	Y	Y	
CHEC-204	Office (Reports Coordinator)	Y	Y	
CHEC-205	Office (VP, Policy & Planning)	Y	Y	
CHEC-206	Office (AVP, IR)	Y	Y	
CHEC-207	Kitchen	Y	Y	
CHEC-208	Office (Data Coordinator, IE)	Y	Y	
CHEC-209	Copy room	Y	Y	
CHEC-210	Office (Research Analyst)	Y	Y	
CHEC-212	Common work area (tables)	Y	Y	
CHEC-213	Office (Director, IR)	Y	Y	
CHEC-214	Office (Director, BIS/DW)	Y	Y	



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Equipment (\$5,000 or more)

Current Equipment Item or Budget Amount	Description	Meets Needs (Y or N):		For any "N", justify needed equipment or budget change
		Current	For Next 5 Years	
Sekonic SR 3500	Optical Mark Reader scanner	Y	Y	

Financial Resources

Source of Funds (i.e. college budget, grant, etc.)	Meets Needs (Y or N):		For any "N", explain why	For any "N", identify expected source of additional funds if needed
	Current Years	For Next 5		
College Budget	Y	TBD	See Below	See Below

Collin College's P² budget adequately meets the present needs and supports staffing levels and technology to address current demands. P² staff appreciate the support that the division receives. It is widely recognized that Collin College is undergoing a period of growth with the planned expansion to four additional sites within the next three to five years including: a CTE workforce center in Allen, a full campus at Wyllie and centers in Celina and Farmersville. At the same time, P² has taken on the responsibility of adding business intelligence capacity at the college. As Collin College strives to become increasingly proactive and agile, advance a culture of evidence, and enrollment grows, the possibility exists that additional technology or staff resources may be needed in P² to maximize the college's potential.

As Collin College moves into a new future with ZogoTech, President Matkin noted one of the limitations of tools like ZogoTech is that they generate OLAP cubes that are not a particularly visual way to analyze and explore data. Looking down the road, it may be useful to begin exploring options that present data and analytical tools that encourage decision makers to explore data intuitive ways. Examples of such tools that could be overlaid on ZogoTech are Tableau, Qlikview, Watson Analytics, and Alteryx. As users become familiar with ZogoTech and begin to feel more empowered to use and explore data, there may be a need to overlay ZogoTech one or more of these visual analytics tools. P² currently does not have the resources to fully maximize data visualization tools. As data users become more sophisticated, there may be a need to use additional financial and human resources to meet their data visualization needs.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Section III. Continuous Improvement Plan

9. GIVEN OUR PRESENT STATUS, HOW DO WE INTEND TO CHANGE IN WAYS THAT HELP US ADVANCE?

Based on the information, analysis, and discussion that have been presented up to this point, summarize the strengths and weaknesses of this service unit. There should be no surprise issues here! Describe specific actions the service unit intends to take to capitalize on the strengths, mitigate the weaknesses, and improve student success.

- In 2016, the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) released their *Statement of Aspirational Practice for Institutional Research* which expanded the consideration of institutional “decision makers” beyond the traditional understanding of administrative executives to incorporate students, faculty and staff. The statement calls for institutional research offices to make data and analytic tools available throughout their institutions to assist in decision making.
- Collin’s P² IRO provides data to its clients upon request, and in recent years has initiated plans to make more information available to College employees. Daily Enrollment Snapshots provide specific measures of enrollment to academic administrators for every class section scheduled for each day of each registration cycle. Registration Statistics are sent freely to anyone interested and provides a good summarization of enrollment trends.
- In 2013, in response to requests from Provosts for more information about course enrollments at specific days and times, P² IRO revised the Registration Statistics to include interactive breakdowns of enrollment by day of the week and time of day. In 2015, P² IRO again revised Registration Statistics to begin providing breakouts of enrollment by gender, age, and student type in response to requests from users to know more about what types of students were enrolling. New in 2016, in response to a P² IRO initiative to begin incorporating more data visualizations in its reports, Registration Statistics began providing a useful line graph that allows instant tracking of enrollment progress for the term along with comparisons to the four prior corresponding semesters.
- Collin’s P² IRO intends to continue these trends toward more data visualization and increasing data access by providing program dashboards and a new ZogoTech-based data warehouse, which should allow retrieval of more data from predefined templates.
- Based on results the College’s biennial Faculty/Staff Service Unit Satisfaction Survey, Collin’s P² IRO received high marks for client satisfaction (above 4.0 on a 5-point scale). However, results from two items (“The unit procedures are user-friendly,” and “The unit procedures are efficient,”), while reasonably high, are lower than corresponding responses received by other comparable service units. Thus, relative to other comparable service units, IRO’s clients appear to have some issues with the unit’s procedures. Consequently, P² IRO intends to explore ways to make its procedures more user-friendly and efficient. This will be a focus of P² IRO’s next continuous improvement plan (CIP).
- Based on feedback from Collin’s data users, Collin’s P² IRO also intends to investigate ways to make its intranet site more intuitive for locating information.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

10. HOW WILL WE EVALUATE OUR SUCCESS?

Complete the Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP) form that follows. From the discussion in #9, please select and focus on 1 or 2 service unit priorities. The action plan produced by the CIP will begin to be implemented during the next academic year. Include the data summary and findings on which the improvement action is based.

Department's Mission: We use the tools of research, planning, and evaluation to help people achieve the College's mission.

A. Outcome(s) Results expected in this service unit	B. Measure(s) The instrument or process used to measure results	C. Target(s) The level of success expected
Improved institution-wide faculty/staff satisfaction with the user friendliness and efficiency of IRO's procedures.	Institutional Effectiveness Faculty/Staff Service Unit Satisfaction Survey	Goals of a mean score better than 4.23 (out of 5) on future surveys for procedure user friendliness, and a mean score better than 4.18 (out of 5) on future surveys for procedure efficiency. These are the average means across all units on the Faculty/Staff Survey in 2016.
Improved ability of IRO data users to navigate, search for, and find information on the IRO intranet site.	Pre- and post-surveys of known frequent IRO intranet site users.	Improvement from pre- to post-surveys in perceptions of IRO data users regarding their ability to find information on the IRO intranet site.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

From Part ↔

A. Outcomes	D. Action Plan Years 5 & 2	E. Implement Action Plan Years 1 & 3	F. Data Results Summary Years 2 & 4	G. Findings Years 2 & 4
Results expected in this service unit	Based on analysis of previous assessment, create an action plan and include it here in the row of the outcomes(s) it addresses.	Implement the action plan and collect data	Summarize the data collected	What does data say about outcome?
Improved institution-wide faculty/staff satisfaction with the user friendliness and efficiency of IRO's procedures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a focus group and/or survey previous clients to determine which aspects of the procedures are most dissatisfying. • Implement other measures as a result of focus group or survey feedback. 			
Improved ability of IRO data users to navigate, search for, and find information on the IRO intranet site. Add context to data on the intranet site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer pre-survey to frequent users of IRO's intranet site prior to making changes to assess user satisfaction with their ability to find information. • Revise the layout of prepared reports on the IRO website to 			



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

<p style="text-align: center;">A. Outcomes</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Results expected in this service unit</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">D. Action Plan Years 5 & 2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Based on analysis of previous assessment, create an action plan and include it here in the row of the outcomes(s) it addresses.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">E. Implement Action Plan Years 1 & 3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Implement the action plan and collect data</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">F. Data Results Summary Years 2 & 4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Summarize the data collected</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">G. Findings Years 2 & 4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">What does data say about outcome?</p>
	<p>improve retrievability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create additional “Collin By the Numbers” brief reports to add context to data. • Administer a post-survey to the same users 3 to 6 months after changing the site. 			

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT? THE PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT PATHWAY

- A. Following approval by the Steering Committee,
 - a. Program Review Reports will be evaluated by the Leadership Team
 - b. Leadership Team will approve the reports for posting on the intranet.
 - c. At any point prior to Intranet posting, reports may be sent back for additional development.

- B. Service unit responses to the Program Review Steering Committee recommendations received within 30 days will be posted with the Service Unit Review Report at the request of the deans.

Leadership Team members will work with service unit supervisors to incorporate Service Unit Review findings into unit planning and activity changes during the next five years.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

APPENDIX A: EMPLOYEE RESOURCES

Employee Name	Role in Unit	Credentials	Professional Development since Last Program Review**
Nasreen Ahmad	Director, Institutional Research	M.A. – Sociology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conferences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Mexico Higher Education Assessment and Retention Conference: (2012) presented, “A predictive model of why students leave college.” AIR: Presented, “A predictive model of why students leave college (2012); Attended & facilitated (2013); Attended (2015), (2016). TAIR: Attended (2013); Presenter of half day workshop (2014). NACADA: Attended, Assessment of Academic Advising Institute (2014) NTCCC Outcomes and Assessment Conferences: Attended many • Prof Development/workshops:



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

			<p>Workshop Data Visualization by Edward Tufte</p> <p>Data Visualization, Presented internally to IRO</p> <p>Recommended data visualization book (the Do's and Don'ts of Presenting Data, Facts, and Figures, that was purchased for IRO library)</p> <p>AIR Post Conference Workshop: Attended Excel dashboards (2015)</p> <p>TAIR pre-conference workshop: Attended "Show Them the Money: How to use Wage Records to Inform Multiple Audiences" (2013)</p> <p>National Student Clearing House Workshop: Attended (2013)</p> <p>Certification of NIH Web based training, "Protecting Human Research Participants" (2013).</p> <p>NTCC IR Committee meetings (numerous meeting from 2012 to 2016)</p> <p>Completed year- long HR training on leadership (2013)</p> <p>R workshop (2013)</p> <p>ARGOS Data Block design training</p> <p>Adobe InDesign (2015)</p> <p>OrgSync Training (2014)</p> <p>OLAP cubes (2013, 2014, P2 IRO internal)</p>
--	--	--	---



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

			<p>Design Dashboards (2013) NVivo (2014) Qualtrics (2015) Listened to numerous Ted Talks (P2 IRO internal) Excel macros (IRO-internal) Attended 5 webinars related to SACSCOS compliance (2014) Attended numerous webinars</p>
Gwynith Best	Executive Assistant	B.S. – Computer Science	<p>Excel Graph/charts tutorial Snap Webinar Survey Design Webinar OLAP Cubes (Dept. PD) Dashboard (Dept. PD) SPSS (Dept. PD) R (Dept. PD) Data Visualization (Dept. PD x 2) Excel Macros (Dept. PD) NVivo – Transcription Webinar Creating web pages/folder in the new system for the intranet Budget Training (every year) Purchasing Training (every year) Concur Training National Student Clearing House Workshop (2013)</p>
Becky Hessing	Secretary (PT)	A.S. – General Studies	<p>IRO staff professional development session (4) Online tutorials for Magenta Forms Designer</p>
Kathy Ledzius	Research Analyst (PT)	<p>B.S. -Statistics Master’s Certification -Statistics SAS Certification</p>	<p>Conferences: TAIR 2015 (attended) TAIR 2016 (attended & presented)</p> <p>Professional Development: Adobe InDesign Argos Training</p>



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

			<p>Coursera R Dashboard Edward Tufte Data Visualization IPEDS – Pre-convention Workshop OLAP Cubes R for IRO (presented) SPSS Tableau</p>
David Liska	Data Coordinator, Institutional Effectiveness	<p>B.S. – Instructional Design & Technology A.A.S. – Microcomputer Technology A.A. – General Studies</p>	<p>Attended: AIR Annual Conference (2016), Dallas R Users Group events (X 2), DFW Data Visualization & Infographics events (X 8), IRO departmental training, NTCCC Outcomes and Assessment Conference (2014 and 2016), 2014 SACS-COC Annual Meeting, SACS-COC Summer Institute (2014), TAIR Annual Conferences (2014, 2015 and 2016; presented in 2016)</p> <p>Completed: Crystal Reports CE class (2014), EMSI Analyst Training (2015), Lynda.com courses (X 6), SQL Programming CE class (2014)</p>
David Malone	Director, Business Intelligence Sys	<p>A.S. – General Sciences B.A. – History</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conferences: AIR (x3); TAIR (x4); TACRAO (x4); TACRAO Summer Meeting(x4); TCC (x1); • Prof Development: Lynda.com (Tableau 9 Essential Training, SPSS Statistics Essential Training)



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

<p>Thomas Martin</p>	<p>Associate VP, Institutional Research</p>	<p>Ph.D. – Higher Education Administration with emphases in statistics, research methods, and organization studies</p> <p>M.A. – Speech Communication with emphasis in organizational communication</p> <p>B.A. – Speech Communication Education and minor in English Education</p>	<p>Current Professional Affiliations and Conferences Attended over the Past Five Years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Association for Institutional Research: 4 • Texas Association for Institutional Research: 5 • Higher Education Benchmarking Institute: 1 <p>Publications & Presentations (past five years)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations at Professional Conferences: 7, with 2 more scheduled for Feb/Mar 2017 • Publications: 1 (Book Chapter) <p>Workshops, Seminars, & Webinars (past year): 9</p> <p>IRO Professional Development Sessions (past four years): 13</p> <p>Work-Related Reading (past two years)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Books (5) • Journal/Periodical Articles (past year): Too many to count <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Journal of Higher Education ○ Change ○ The Chronicle of Higher Education ○ New Scientist ○ Fast Company ○ Wired ○ Utne Reader ○ Collin County Business Press
----------------------	---	---	---



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Numerous Web Sites and Web Publications
Salma Mirza	Research Analyst	B.S. – Business Administration M.S. – Political Economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conferences: TAIR (x2) AIR (x2) NTCCC Outcomes and Assessment Conference (x1) • Prof Development/workshops: Data Visualization by Edward Tufte AIR Conference Workshop on Excel dashboards ARGOS Data Block design training Lynda.com sessions on Excel and data visualization (x2)
Scott Parke	VP, Policy & Planning	Ph.D. – Higher Education Administration Ed.S. – Educational Leadership M.S. – Ed Educational Leadership B.A. – English & Technology Education	<i>Promoting Innovation & Continuous Improvement.</i> Nasreen Ahmad, MA, Director of Institutional Research, Collin College. Salma Mirza, MBA, Research Analyst, Institutional Research Office, Collin College. Scott J. Parke, PhD, Vice President of Policy & Planning, Collin College. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 28, 2017. Texas Association for Institutional Research



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

			<p><i>National Webinar: Accessing and Matching Industry Certification Data.</i> John Haigh, Scott J. Parke, Gretchen Koch, Vladimir Bassis, Pradeep Kotamraju, Paula Nissen, Catherine Imperatore, Robert G. Sheets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• August 10, 2016. US Department of Education, Office of Career and Adult Education, Division of Academic and Technical Education. https://s3.amazonaws.com/PCRN/uploads/CertificationDataProject-Webinar-8-10-16.pdf <p><i>New Frontiers: Third Party Industry Certification Data Exchange Project.</i> Scott J. Parke, Gretchen Koch, Vladimir Bassis, Pradeep Kotamraju.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Association for Institutional Research. New Orleans, LA. June 1, 2016. <p><i>Performance Funding 2.0 – Developments in Three States (IL, TX, FL).</i> Scott J. Parke,</p>
--	--	--	---



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

			<p>Thomas K. Martin, Nathan R. Wilson.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• National Higher Education Benchmarking Institute. Overland Park, KS. May 4, 2016. <p><i>Certification Data Exchange Project: The Impact of Industry Credentials.</i> Gretchen Koch, Pradeep Kotamraju, Scott Parke, Catherine Imperatore.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• OCTAE Data Quality Initiative. Baltimore, MD. November 4, 2015. <p><i>Developmental Education Reform in Florida: A Progress Report.</i> Scott J. Parke, Jesse Coraggio, Kathyrine L. Scheuch.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Southern Association for Institutional Research. Savannah, GA. October 12, 2015. <p><i>Pursuing Close Encounters: Third Party Industry Certification Data Exchange Project.</i> Scott J. Parke.</p>
--	--	--	--



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Southern Association for Institutional Research. Savannah, GA. October 13, 2015. <p>Current Professional Affiliations and Conferences Attended over the Past Two Years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Association for Institutional Research: 2• Southern Association for Institutional Research: 2• Higher Education Benchmarking Institute: 2• Florida Association for Institutional Research: 1
--	--	--	--



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Appendix B: AIR National Survey of IR Offices

NATIONAL SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICES

2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Association for Institutional Research (AIR) is thankful for the host of individuals who participated in this national study of the field. Darlena Jones managed the data collection and analytics with skill and good humor. Randy L. Swing proposed the project and served as Principal Investigator with daily assistance from the grant leader, Leah Ewing Ross. The work was crowdsourced and improved by a host of AIR members and advisors. We are particularly appreciative of the subject matter experts who assisted with the design of the survey instrument: Eric Atchison, Marlene Clapp, Kevork Horissian, Ann Lehman, Rigoberto Rincones-Gómez, Laura Rittner, Mary Sapp, Jeff Stewart, Meiling Tang, and Kristin Yates.

Every AIR staff member contributed over the course of this project. We especially acknowledge Ashley Ivey, designer of the report, and Jason Lewis, both as Chief Finance Officer and Interim Executive Director The National Survey of Institutional Research Offices and this report are based on research funded in part by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Swing, R. L., Jones, D., and Ross, L. E. (2016). *The AIR National Survey of Institutional Research Offices*. Association for Institutional Research, Tallahassee, Florida. Retrieved [date] from <http://www.airweb.org/nationalsurvey>.

Web: www.airweb.org
Email: air@airweb.org
Phone: 850.385.4155
Fax: 850.385.5180

The **Association for Institutional Research** (AIR) is the world's largest professional association for institutional researchers. The organization provides educational resources, best practices and professional development opportunities for more than 4,000 members. Its primary purpose is to support members in the process of collecting, analyzing, and converting data into information that supports decision-making in higher education.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

OVERVIEW OF THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICES

A national survey of a professional field is an appropriate and logical undertaking for a professional membership association. It would be easy to miss the real importance of this effort as it could be justified for its obvious usefulness in program reviews of institutional research and in its value to presidents and provosts for making resource decisions about institutional research offices. A deeper look reveals how this project fits together with a second project, the *Statement of Aspirational Practice for Institutional Research*, both of which were supported by a grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. These initiatives are independently useful, but collectively are far more important to the future of postsecondary education.

National Survey of Institutional Research Offices. The initiative is the most comprehensive survey of offices of institutional research ever undertaken. The goal was to collect information on the tasks, staff, organization, and resources of offices of institutional research as they exist in 2015. The data provide a detailed picture of IR offices and, in disaggregation, a nuanced perspective of those offices by sector and other institutional characteristics.

Statement of Aspirational Practice for Institutional Research. The initiative presents a vision for institutional research as an institution-wide function rather than a concrete domain of a single administrative unit. The aspirational statement calls for institutional capacity for data-informed decision-support for a broad range of decision makers, including students. Offices of institutional research will continue to fulfill many of their current roles while sharing expanded responsibilities in data and analytics with a broad array of faculty, staff, and administrators.

Together these initiatives establish a vision for the future of institutional research that stems from the successes of the field over the past 50 years, and document the current foundation from which the new vision is launched. Readers are encouraged to review the *Statement of Aspirational Practice for Institutional Research* to place the findings of the National Survey of IR Offices in that perspective. Simply put, how ready are colleges and universities to pursue a student success-focused mission informed by data?

Not surprisingly, this work confirmed much of what was already believed about institutional research; there are vast differences in IR capacity and organizational arrangements that are idiosyncratic to individual colleges and universities. The survey data allow us to understand these differences more clearly. **The results challenge the common notion that structures and resources explain observed variances in institutional research capacity and efficacy.** Like much in life, the amount of resources we have matters less than what we do with our resources and how high we set the aspirational bar.

Randy L. Swing, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
Darlena Jones, Ph.D.
Director of Assessment and Research
Leah Ewing Ross, Ph.D.
Grant Manager



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICES

RANDY L. SWING, DARLENA JONES, LEAH EWING ROSS

There is no shortage of published scholarship and institutional documents offering definitions of the field of institutional research. Yet the popularity of a joke within the field that “even our families do not understand what we do” is evidence of the great variation of skills, responsibilities, and expectations in IR. It is not that the field has failed to mature in its 50-year history (AIR was founded in 1966); rather, IR reflects the changing landscape of higher education, the impact of evolving technologies, and an insatiable appetite for data to inform management decisions. The fluidity of the core IR mission is a compliment to the dedication and flexibility of institutional researchers, yet the institutional variations extract a toll on further developing the field to serve decision makers. Examples of challenges include:

- o Searching for and hiring the best talent for IR positions at all levels
- o Developing degrees and certificate programs to prepare students for IR careers
- o Providing professional development for IR leaders and staff
- o Evaluating performance of offices and individuals
- o Establishing appropriate salary ranges for IR staff
- o Managing and defining workloads for IR directors and staff
- o Transferring IR knowledge between institutions
- o Setting expectations for service and outputs
- o Envisioning and strategically planning for the future of the field
- o Preparing senior-level managers for the IR office

The purpose of this study is to capture a “real time” snapshot of the resources and capacities of institutional research offices. While the *Statement of Aspirational Practice for Institutional Research* calls for IR to be an institution-wide function, no one is anticipating the demise of institutional research offices as specific units charged with significant data-related tasks. IR as a function may have left the IR office, but the IR office has not gone out of business. Understanding how IR offices change as postsecondary institutions increasingly use data to inform decisions will provide opportunities to contribute to effectiveness and efficiency in support of institutional missions.

This research is only a first step in creating a full picture of institutional research at this point in time and setting an agenda for its future development. The study narrowly focuses on resources of IR offices; it does not attempt to identify the institution-wide capacity for IR, which is a task reserved for future exploration. The current effort does not attempt to measure the quality or value of products created by IR offices.

This report contains three major sections: key findings from the 2015 study, interpretation of key findings with comparison to a survey from 2008, and the study methodology. Readers are advised that all survey results may be viewed from the AIR website: www.airweb.org/nationalsurvey.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

FIRST LOOK AT THE NATIONAL SURVEY DATA

When two institutional research professionals exchange descriptions of their offices of institutional research (OIRs), the conversation frequently begins with descriptions of organizational structure, staffing, and scope of responsibility. The National Survey of Institutional Research Offices focuses on these items as key indicators of IR capacities. The following section presents survey findings as the current state of IR capacity at responding institutions. Institutions establish and support networks of data users and consumers who share good practices and collectively advocate for the data, tools, and dissemination methods required to meet the institution's needs.

Although institutions from all sectors were invited to participate in this study, the findings that follow are specific to not-for-profit institutions (see the survey methodology section for more information.) The dataset used in this report reflects a 52% response rate from not-for-profit institutions for which valid contact information was available. As authors, we have high confidence in these findings as this response rate is very high for national research studies. Using the IPEDS Universe of not-for-profit institutions as the target population, respondents closely match the characteristics of colleges and universities overall (e.g., size and sector). Institutions that enroll fewer than 1,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students responded at a rate of 38%, which is still a high response rate, but less than the response rates of other groups of institutions. As such, we encourage readers to apply these findings with caution for small enrollment institutions.

Reporting Structures

Half of OIRs report to the chief academic officer and 25% to the office of the president. Other IR reporting lines reflect a wide array of arrangements, including institutional effectiveness, enrollment management, development, business affairs, student affairs, and information technology (IT).

OIR reporting lines vary for 2- and 4-year institutions. At 2-year institutions, 22% report to the chief academic officer and 40% to the president. With 38% reporting elsewhere, 2-year institutions are more likely to break from traditional reporting lines. At 4-year institutions, 63% report to the chief academic officer, 18% to the president, and 19% elsewhere. For all institutions, the most common arrangement is for OIRs to report directly to the chief-level positions of the units they report to (73%) rather than to assistant- or associate-level positions.

Anecdotal accounts have called attention to OIRs being reassigned away from reporting lines of the chief academic officer or president. For example, this survey found that at present, 3% report to IT, and an additional 3% report to business affairs offices.

Staffing

OIRs commonly consist of a full-time director and 2.6 full-time equivalent (FTE) professional staff members. Only one-third of OIRs have administrative staff support; even fewer have graduate or undergraduate student employees.

A popular conception that 2-year institutions are more likely than 4-year institutions to have very small OIR staffs is not supported by the current findings. 82% of total respondents report OIR staffs of fewer than 5 FTE (director and professional IR staff only). The proportions by sector are similar: 87% of 2-year



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

institutions and 80% of 4-year institutions report OIR staffs of fewer than 5 FTE. Larger offices (5 or more FTE) are not common at 4-year institutions (20%) or 2-year institutions (13%).

Director and Professional ORI Staff	Two-Year Institutions	Four-Year Institutions
Less than 1 FTE	1%	1%
1 FTE to Fewer than 2 FTE	17%	18%
2 FTE to Fewer than 3 FTE	41%	35%
3 FTE to Fewer than 5 FTE	28%	26%
5 FTE to Fewer than 10 FTE	12%	17%
10 FTE or More	1%	3%

N = 1,261 responses (394 responses from 2-year and 867 responses from 4-year institutions)

On average, OIR directors have been in the senior leadership role at their institutions for 6.5 years and have 11 years of experience in the field of IR. 89% have a graduate degree (master's 46%; doctorate 43%). Directors with doctorates are more common at 4-year institutions (47%) than 2-year institutions (33%), but do not constitute a majority in either sector.

Scale and Scope of Responsibilities

The greatest variance in OIRs pertains to the scale and scope of their responsibilities. OIRs report a relatively small set of tasks for which they are primarily responsible, and a far broader set of tasks in which they participate with other units in shared responsibilities.

The variance in levels of responsibility for tasks creates a distinct picture of the work of OIRs. The primary responsibilities of OIRs are dominated by reporting functions.

Primary Responsibility	Shared Responsibility	No Responsibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 83% data reporting – federal mandatory (81% primary responsibility for IPEDS reporting) • 81% data reporting – guide books/rankings • 81% institutional fact books • 80% data reporting – state mandatory • 74% enrollment reporting and analyses • 64% data sharing with consortia • 53% key performance indicators development/monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% contribute to accreditation studies • 62% contribute to strategic planning • 58% contribute to program accreditation • 53% contribute to learning outcomes assessment • Equally defining are the data tasks with which most OIRs are not involved. That is, these tasks are part of the • Workload of a minority of OIRs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 69% student financial aid modeling • 65% institutional budget/finance modeling • 61% student borrowing/debt studies • 60% class scheduling/demand studies • 60% space utilization studies • 57% salary equity studies

Much of the work of OIRs is in the role of service provider. Participating in tasks as a contributor or collaborator without primary responsibility accounts for much of the workload of OIRs.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

In combination, the relative size of these three components present unique “personalities” of OIRs. It is easy to discern three patterns:

Broad	Focused	Limited Responsibility
Units that have wide range of primary responsibilities, a moderate range of shared responsibilities, and few areas from which they are excluded have broad portfolios with clear sets of tasks for which they hold primary or secondary responsibility, if not leadership. They are engaged with nearly all data initiatives.	Units that have a moderate range of primary responsibilities, a moderate range of shared responsibilities, and a moderate number of areas from which they are excluded are focused on a concrete set of tasks and serve as the primary leaders for some, and as contributors for others. Outside of their focus is a significant set of activities for which they have no responsibility.	Units that have a small range of primary responsibilities, and small number of shared responsibilities, and a large number of areas from which they are excluded have limited responsibility , and that responsibility is largely centered on reporting functions. They have small sets of tasks for which they share responsibility, and they are excluded from many activities that other OIRs handle.

Access to Data

An additional indicator of the scope and scale of OIR responsibilities is the office’s unrestricted access to data sources. While OIRs are often referred to as “the” source of institutional data, this study reveals that many offices have only partial or restricted access to institutional data.

A majority of OIRs have unrestricted access to national survey data (86%), student collegiate academic records (80%), student satisfaction surveys (71%), and admissions records (60%).

Some data are not available to OIRs, or are provided with restrictions, which highlights the challenges many OIRs face when engaged in student success studies, cost-benefit analyses, and a wide array of institutional effectiveness projects. Examples include:

No Access	Restricted Access	Data Type
57%	15%	Class Attendance
49%	22%	Student Early Warning Alerts
43%	25%	High School Transcripts
43%	25%	Academic Advising Data
38%	29%	Human Resources Data
23%	36%	Financial Aid Data



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Financial Resources

Most OIRs (91%) manage funds specifically allocated to the unit through an institutional budgeting process. Few receive additional funding based on services provided (9% external grants; 4% internal grants; 5% fees for services). Most OIRs (68%) manage small budgets of less than \$25,000, not including salaries. A few OIRs have larger budgets (16% \$25,000–\$49,999; 11% \$50,000–\$99,999), but budgets of \$100,000 or more are rare (approximately 9%).

These data are confined to documenting budgets and do not reflect the total cost of operating an OIR, which would include technology support, space, and many other institutional costs that are not directly billed to administrative units.

Likely, after purchasing consumable supplies and unique software applications, most OIRs have limited funding for professional development and other elective spending choices. It is not uncommon for OIRs to seek “one-off appropriations” and one-time special requests of funds from their supervisors’ budgets.

Consumption of IR Products and Services

The major contribution of OIRs to decision makers across institutions is provision of routine and ad hoc reports, analyses, alerts, and forecasts. The survey results show that use of OIR data and analytics is nearly ubiquitous (80–97%) among consumers, including academic affairs, presidents, enrollment management, assessment, and academic colleges/departments. Wide use (50%–79%) is attributed to boards of trustees, student affairs, registrars, finance, human resources, advancement, athletics, and career services. Less use is reported for alumni affairs, veteran services, faculty senates, information technology, housing, and facilities.

The findings are confirmation that OIR products are widely used across an institution, and that OIR is depended on for a broad range of decision support, monitoring, and mandatory reporting.

Beyond the technical aspects of reporting and providing data, OIRs often seek to make higher order contributions by consulting with decision makers to interpret reports, translate evidence into action, and engage in the “use” side of IR products. The results of this study show only minimal activity for OIRs in the consulting role. From a list of 26 offices and functions (e.g., president, faculty senate, human resources, admissions), less than half of respondents report that OIRs provided any consulting services to those units in the last year. Even with reporting lines to presidents and chief academic officers, fewer than half of OIRs provided consulting (interpreting reports, translating evidence into action, and helping in the use of IR products) to their supervisors. Boards of trustees were among the least likely to receive consulting services from OIR with only 18% of respondents reporting that they provide such services. It is widely believed that decision makers are asking for more data and more support in using data, but this survey did not attempt to measure the institutional demand for such services. Additional research is needed to explore that demand, and to further illuminate the findings of this study to determine if they reflect a lack of resources, weak data cultures, or other factors.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

BEYOND STRUCTURES: CORE DRIVERS OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

RANDY L. SWING

Surveys tend to raise as many questions as they answer, which is certainly true for the National Survey of Institutional Research Offices. The first goal of this effort was to establish a reliable method to identify the resources, staffing, and task assignments of offices of institutional research (OIRs). In the absence of data, OIRs are viewed through unique lenses that often are colored by a few high profile exceptions rather than the norm. Based on the survey results, the following findings may be useful in advancing conversations about how best to support and create deep campus cultures for data-informed decisions.

Additionally, this research should be read in context of AIR's *Statement of Aspirational Practice for Institutional Research*, which calls for a senior-level officer to be charged with oversight of a campus data strategy, including a decentralized IR function that reaches all decision makers. Indications are that OIRs will be key components of such strategies. Readers are cautioned that the current research was singularly focused on dedicated offices of institutional research, and not the institution-wide function called for in the aspirational statement. Anecdotal reports indicate a growing movement in new organizational structures, but such was not a focus of this study.

Prior surveys of OIRs—though valuable and informative—were limited to convenience samples or targeted to specific regional groups. Readers may wish to consult Chapter 2 of the *Handbook of Institutional Research*, "The Structure and Functions of Institutional Research Offices" (Volkwein, Liu, and Woodell, 2012) for a brief overview of previous work in this arena. The most robust study was supported by AIR and conducted by Volkwein and colleagues (2008) using a convenience sample of 1,100 responses. Differences in the various studies' research methodologies and survey items limit the usefulness of comparisons in longitudinal perspectives, but several points of interest are included in the following review of OIR structures and subsequent discussion of their implications.

DO REPORTING LINES MATTER?

Across the 1,506 survey respondents, the most common reporting line for OIRs is to the chief academic officer, although direct reporting to the president is not rare. Different reporting lines were most frequently found in responses from 2-year institutions. In spite of anecdotal reports of OIRs being reassigned to units other than the chief academic officer or president, and specifically to information technology (IT), reporting to IT remains a rare arrangement.

The current results are similar to Volkwein's 2008 study referenced above, which noted that 22% of OIRs report to the president, 41% to the chief academic officer, and 11% to chief technology officer. Differences likely reflect the variation in survey design (e.g., the 2008 study employed a convenience sample) rather than indicate trends. Contrary to popular speculation, there is no support for the belief that OIRs have been significantly "downgraded" from reporting to presidents in the years since the 2008 study.

The most important discovery related to structures is that reporting lines are not very predictive of how OIRs relate to senior leaders and the rest of the institution (e.g., services provided and consumed, tasks assigned, level of responsibility for tasks). These findings should inform long-standing convictions that OIRs that report directly to presidents have an advantage over those reporting elsewhere. Positional power may have less impact than other aspects of the OIR.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

DO STAFFING FTEs MATTER?

Most OIRs are 3-person organizations, which are small staffs compared to other administrative units at colleges and universities. Certainly additional staff members increase the possibility of OIRs serving more stakeholders and carrying larger portfolios of work. Given that mandatory reporting tasks are ubiquitous and time consuming for the OIR, efficiencies in handling those tasks may be as important as the number of staff in determining an office's capacity for other responsibilities. These findings illuminate common beliefs about reporting burden being a function of mandates rather than efficiencies. In terms of the range of tasks accomplished by OIRs—in addition to basic reporting functions—some small staff OIRs appear to outperform their peers, and some large staff OIRs appear to underperform compared to their peers. That is, some offices appear to be more productive based on number of tasks and FTE staff. More research is needed to understand what efficiencies and practices allow small OIRs to carry larger workloads than would be expected for their staffing levels.

With regard to graduate degrees held by OIR directors, findings of the current survey are similar to the 2008 study referenced earlier. In 2015, 43% of IR directors reported that they have doctorates, compared to 46% in 2008.

The current survey found that over the prior three years, most (52%) OIR staff sizes were unchanged, one-third (34%) increased, and 14% reported losses in staff positions. Volkwein and colleagues (2008) found a similar rate of change for the two-year period prior to their survey. These data do not support beliefs that increased data demands have been addressed with additional institutional research staffing. It is likely that the increased reporting demands placed on unchanging OIR staff sizes have further limited available time for any duties other than meeting reporting demands.

The field continues to have a mix of early career and late career individuals serving as directors of OIR. The 2015 survey found that 54% of directors had 10 or fewer years of experience, and the 2008 survey found that number to be 59% (likely a difference in survey populations rather than trend). The current study revealed that 29% of directors have 11 to 19 years of experience, and 17% have 20 or more years, which indicates that it is likely that leadership of OIR will be a slow change process.

HOW DO TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES VARY?

Previous AIR research (Lillibridge, Swing, Jones, and Ross, 2016) that included review of position descriptions for OIR directors found a very wide array of expectations and desired skills for IR directors. The current research further confirms that there is great variance in assignments and responsibilities across OIRs. Yet the survey also shows that there is a core set of tasks that are so common as to be useful in describing the field as it functions today. Reporting (routine, ad hoc, and mandated) is the base of the field. Only 2% of OIRs have no involvement in mandatory federal reporting, and 3% have no involvement in responding to rankings/guidebook surveys.

Furthermore, the Volkwein (2008) study and the current survey used different approaches in identifying tasks common in institutional research, yet both found that reporting tasks dominate the work of OIRs. For example, a majority of OIRs are primarily responsible for the production of institution fact books (73% in 2008; 81% in 2015), responding to guidebook/ranking surveys (68% in 2008; 81% in 2015), and federal data reporting (68% in 2008; 83% in 2015).



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

RETHINKING WHAT MATTERS FOR OIRs

This national review of the capacity of institutional research offices confirms that there is variation in OIR structures and available resources, but calls into question whether structures and resources are the most important differences in how OIRs function and serve institutions. Except for a small set of outliers, there is more consistency in size, resources, and task assignments across OIRs than is popularly believed. **It is time to focus on more than just resources as the way OIRs fit into the data ecosystems of institutions.** Office size and reporting lines do not explain why or how the various “office personalities” develop. Offices with fewer than 2 full-time equivalent (FTE) professional staff appear in each of the types identified earlier in this report (broad 22%; focused 43%; limited responsibility 35%), as do offices with 5 or more FTE (broad 30%; focused 52%; limited responsibility 18%). Offices that report directly to the president also appear in all groups (broad 31%; focused 45%; limited responsibility 24%). More research is needed to understand these arrangements and their impact on the success of their institutional research missions.

The highest degree earned by the director of the OIR and the years of experience in the field do not explain the various “office personalities” either. Offices with directors who hold doctoral degrees appear in each of the groups (broad 29%; focused 47%; limited responsibility 24%). Early career directors (5 or fewer years in the field) appear in each of the groups (broad 27%; focused 44%; limited responsibility 29%), and late career directors (20 or more years in the field) do as well (broad 28%; focused 43%; limited responsibility 29%).

There are several potential explanations for why and how OIRs vary in institutional impact and workload capacities. Testable hypotheses are that the management/leadership styles of senior IR officers, the comfort of senior institutional leaders in using data in decision making, and/or institutional data cultures shape the degree to which IR “plays well with others,” is trusted by the academic community, and has skills and capacities to contribute decision support in addition to acumen for reporting tasks.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

A 251-question survey was created to capture information about the structures and functions of Offices of Institutional Research (OIRs) in U.S. postsecondary degree-granting institutions. AIR members and staff were involved with the construction of survey. More than 70 AIR members suggested items for the survey in response to an open call for input; 10 individuals served as subject matter experts during in-person development meetings to identify critical areas and topics to include; 42 peer reviewers critiqued drafts of the survey instrument; and 26 institutions pilot tested the instrument and provided feedback, which shaped the final version of the instrument used in this study. This crowdsourcing approach ensured that the language and constructed items were understandable by, and reflective of, professionals working in institutional research and related data functions.

AIR staff identified contact information for senior leaders of institutional research at 3,291 post-secondary degree-granting institutions (65% of the 5,064 degree-granting institutions in the U.S.) Institutions of all sectors, types of control, and sizes were included in the target population.

An online survey system was used to collect data from August 18, 2015 through December 7, 2015. Multiple reminder emails were sent during this time to encourage responses. A total of 2,053 responses were received. Incomplete or duplicate responses (478) were removed from the dataset. Because of a low



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

response rate from the for-profit sector, the 52 responses from for-profit institutions are not included in this report. (An overview of the data from the for-profit sector is available at www.airweb.org/nationalsurvey.) Also, 17 responses from administrative units are not included in this report. The findings presented in this report are based on 1,506 responses, which represent 1,609 public and not-for-profit institutions (a small number of OIRs serve two or more institutions). The final dataset used in this report reflects a 52% response rate from not-for-profit institutions for which valid contact information was available.

The final pool of responses included in this report consists of 459 2-year and 1,047 4-year not-for-profit, public and private, degree-granting postsecondary institutions. The following chart groups the institutions by number of full-time equivalent (FTE) students.

Distribution of Responses	2-Year Institutions % of Total	4-Year Institutions % of Total
Fewer than 5,000 FTE Students	65%	67%
5,000 to Fewer than 10,000 Students	24%	14%
10,000 or More FTE Students	11%	19%

WWW.AIRWEB.ORG
EMAIL: AIR@AIRWEB.ORG
PHONE: 850.385.4155
FAX: 850.385.5180



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Appendix C: Six Most Recent P² IRO Monthly Activity Reports July 2016 through December 2016

Institutional Research Component Projects
July, 2016
<u>State Reporting:</u>
o Certified spring 2016 end-of-term reports for credit instruction: CBM-0E1, CBM-00S, CBM-002, CBM-008
o Certified quarter 3 end-of-term reports for noncredit instruction: CBM-00A, CBM-00C
o Final course-build correction email messages sent for summer 2016
o State report scripts for summer 2016 modified to avoid interference with three-peat processing
o Initial student correction email messages sent to Rhonda Bolton for summer 2016
<u>Business Office</u>
o Summer TPEG Estimate (Suzie Armstrong)
o Continuing Education FY2010 through FY2015 certified contact hours by funding category (Julie Bradley)
o FY2016 certified contact hours by funding category for Law Enforcement, CE Healthcare, and Fire Science (Suzie Armstrong)
<u>Student Evaluation of Instruction</u>
o Established time line for fall student evaluation process.
o Working on V-Lookup tables to simplify formatting course download file for divisions and instructors
o Began reviewing new organization chart and comparing to the DIV-ORG fields in the course download so that divisions can be properly identified for fall
<u>Registration Cycle Statistics</u>
o Preparing and distributing via email weekly fall 2016 Registration Statistics Reports. Added Tableau line chart to show comparison of 2016 enrollment with prior years.
o Extracting from Banner and posting to the i:\ drive summer 2016 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs.
o Extracting from Banner and posting on the i:\ drive fall 2016 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
o Continuing work on Tableau interface/dashboards to make daily enrollment snapshots more accessible and meaningful for deans and VPPs.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

<u>Quality Enhancement Plan: Working on Longitudinal Analysis of Academic Planning Experiences Survey (APES) data from December 2014 through May 2016.</u>
<u>National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP):</u>
o Received NCCBP 2016 Outlier Report. IRO us reviewing potential problems and making corrections as necessary.
o Tom Martin is chairing a subcommittee of the NCCBP's National Technical Advisory Committee that is working on developing more effective financial benchmarks for participating institutions.
<u>Completed final draft of the 2015 Community Survey final report.</u> Lisa Vasquez reviewed and approved the report. Sent copy to Scott Parke in preparation for he and Lisa to present a summary to President Matkin and the Leadership Team.
<u>Working on CYC Classroom Utilization report for quarter 4 2016.</u>
<u>Working on updating annual report to Kathleen Fenton on course enrollments.</u>
<u>2015-2016 Math Learning Outcomes Analysis</u>
o Data are cleaned and ready for analysis.
o SPSS program has been reviewed.
o Received 2015-2016 answer keys from Math Department.
<u>Nursing:</u> Upon receiving a request from Donna Hatch, sent additional reminders to respondents for the Nursing Employer Survey
<u>Dental Hygiene:</u> Final reports for the following Dental Hygiene surveys were completed, reviewed, and delivered to Christine McClellan, the Director of the Dental Hygiene program
o Senior Clinic Evaluation Survey
o Senior Curriculum Evaluation Survey
· Veterans
o Best for Vets Survey: Completed work on data collection required for the College's annual Best for Vets survey. Data were delivered to Meredith Martin on July 19.
o A report on the veterans' summer 2016 survey was completed and delivered to Shayne Brown, Collin's Veterans Transition Specialist.
<u>Innovation Challenge Grants</u>
o Tom Martin lead a Project Team Review to address additional information needed by the Leadership Team to before they can make a decision about whether or not to fund Nasreen Ahmad's Innovation Challenge proposal entitled, "Workforce Needs in Real Time." The team consisted of Nasreen Ahmad, Jennifer Blalock, Gary Hodge, Gaye Cooksey, Jim Barko, and Kathleen Fenton to work on the project. The team's response was sent to Dani Day on July 25.
o Tom Martin reviewed three Innovation Challenge proposals.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

<p><u>Completer Follow-Up Survey:</u> Work is proceeding on the analysis of 600 response from the last pilot test of the new instrument in preparations for further revisions and the next administration during fall 2016.</p>
<p>· Scott Parke Projects</p>
<p>o Numbers of Collin College students who transferred to four-year institutions in 2010 and 2011.</p>
<p><u>Ad Hoc Projects</u></p>
<p>o Public Relations</p>
<p>Fall 2015 service area enrollment (Lisa Vasquez)</p>
<p>Number of veterans served in 2015 (Heather Darrow)</p>
<p>Public Information Requests: (Marcy Cadena Smith)</p>
<p><u>Fall 2015 enrollment from students residing in the City of Murphy</u></p>
<p><u>IPEDS GRS transfer-out rate</u></p>
<p>o Listing of students' names and their email addresses for students who have enrolled for fall 2016 but have not yet paid their tuition (Doug Willis/Albert Tezeno)</p>
<p>o Unduplicated headcount by academic year and by gender for Respiratory Care and Dental Hygiene programs (Dani Day)</p>
<p>o Service are high school senior enrollment numbers by ISD (Sherry Schumann/Sarah Densmore)</p>
<p>o Licensure data (Sherry Schumann)</p>
<p>o Working on request from Abe Johnson for three years of program completer data to support the development of a federal grant proposal.</p>
<p>o Proportion of students enrolled in workforce education (Charity Lewallen)</p>
<p>· Meetings</p>
<p>o David Liska and Tom Martin participated in meetings of the Program Review Steering Committee's subcommittee on Template, Rubric, and Training Revisions on July 1, July 22, and July 26.</p>
<p>o Tom Martin made a presentation in one of the training sessions for the new associate deans. The presentation focused on the role of the Policy and Planning Division and where the new associate deans can find institutional data on the IRO intranet site and the Collin Web site's "District Statistics" page.</p>
<p>o Salma Mirza met with Linda Qualia to discuss the Drug Awareness Survey that will be administered to students during the first week of October in compliance with federal law. They discussed how to improve the response rate, the sampling methodology, revisions to the report design, and revisions to invitation letters. Salma followed up by sending Linda some samples of new invitation letters.</p>



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

<ul style="list-style-type: none">o TACRAO Summer Workshop: David Malone and Tom Martin attended the two-day meeting on July 14-15 in Austin for the latest updates from THECB staff regarding changes to interpretations of statutes and changes in rules and guidelines for state reporting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Nasreen Ahmad participated in a QEP Steering Committee meeting on July 22.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o David Malone and David Liska attended Banner Maintenance Committee meeting on July 28.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o David Liska met with Indalita Holt to monitor progress for her portion of the Program-Based Course Performance Report and to answer her questions about the project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o David Liska met with Kathleen Fenton to discuss decisions regarding comment editing and the completed 2016 Faculty & Staff Service Unit Report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Tom Martin met with the Committee of the Whole on July 18.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Tom Martin attended a Tableau Users' Group Meeting on July 19 in Irving.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o David Liska and Tom Martin met with Scott Parke to discuss measures and data element definitions for data resources that IRO generates in support of the program/service review process.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Annual performance review meetings with Tom Martin and David Liska, David Malone, and Nasreen Ahmad.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">· Professional Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o David Liska is reading Beautiful Evidence by Edward Tufte and Tableau Your Data! By Daniel Murray to increase his capacity with data visualization and data visualization tools.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Tom Martin participated in a Tableau Webinar on July 28 to learn how several award-winning data visualizations were generated.
<u>Library Surveys</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Final draft of faculty survey report was completed and delivered to the three Library Executive Directors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Working on quantitative analysis for the student survey report. A total of 322 responses were generated.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Institutional Research Component Projects
August, 2016
<u>State Reporting:</u>
o Working on Summer 2016 credit census reports: CBM-001 and CBM-004
o Working on Fall 2016 credit census reports: CBM-001 and CBM-004
o Working on Quarter 4 2106 Noncredit Reports: CBM-00A and CBM-00C
<u>Federal Reporting</u>
o Completed 2016-2017 IPEDS Institutional Identification
o Completed 2016-2017 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics Header Report
Texas Association of Community Colleges: Generated and submitted preliminary enrollment data for fall 2016
<u>Registration Cycle Statistics</u>
o Preparing and distributing via email weekly fall 2016 Registration Statistics Reports.
o Extracting from Banner and posting on the i:\ drive fall 2016 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
o Continuing work on Tableau interface/dashboards to make daily enrollment snapshots more accessible and meaningful for deans and VPPs.
<u>Quality Enhancement Plan</u>
o Working on QEP Annual Report with Charity Lewallen and Kathleen Fenton.
o Drew and cleaned a random sample for the fall 2015 QEP degree audit based on first-time-in-college, full-time, degree-seeking students. Ensured that it was reasonably representative in terms of age, gender, race, and ethnicity to monitor completion and progress toward completion.
o Generated database and administered survey to faculty coaches who completed professional development during mid-August 2016.
<u>Student Evaluation of Instruction for Fall 2016</u>



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

o Paper/pencil
§ Developed new ID configuration for each division to reflect the academic restructuring
§ Working with deans to identify the new administrative assistants and their physical locations to determine where student evaluation packets should be delivered
§ Working on course lists
§ Assembling and disseminating student evaluation packets for early fall 2016 express courses
o Online: Worked with deans to ensure that they and they had access to spring 2016 online evaluation results for faculty members in their divisions.
<u>National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP):</u>
o Completed review of NCCBP Outlier Report and submitted final corrections.
o Tom Martin is on a subcommittee of the NCCBP's National Technical Advisory Committee that is working on developing more effective financial benchmarks for participating institutions.
Non-Credit Education & Workforce Training Benchmark Project: Gathering data in preparation for submission by the September 15 deadline.
<u>Surveys</u>
Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory: Executive summary is in final internal review, and preparing to post the report for the College's 2016 survey to the IRO intranet site.
CYC Classroom Utilization report completed and posted to IRO intranet site for quarter 4 2016.
Annual report completed for Kathleen Fenton on course enrollments. Updated course listings and enrollment for FY2016.
2015-2016 Math Learning Outcomes Analysis: Analysis of the data was completed and three reports were generated. The reports were sent to Bill Ardis.
Nursing: Initiated the fall 2016 implementation of the Nursing Profile Survey which is scheduled to be administered in early September.
Completer Follow-Up Survey: Working on analysis of 600 responses from the last pilot test of the new instrument in preparations for further revisions and the next administration during fall 2016.
<u>Dignity Initiative</u>
o Worked with Linda Qualia and Sherry Rhodes to design items for a brief new survey that will be electronically administered to participants at each Dignity Initiative event during fall 2016.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

o The survey has been laid out in Snap Surveys and is ready for administration.
o IRO provided a URL and a QR Code to the Dignity Initiative Committee.
o The Dignity Initiative Committee will design a promotional piece that will be given to each participant. It will encourage them to complete the survey by entering the provided URL into a Web browser or by using the provided QR code with a mobile device, either of which will connect participants to the survey.
o IRO will conduct the data analysis when administration of the survey is complete.
<u>Computer Configuration</u>
Nasreen Ahmad, Salma Mirza, David Liska, David Malone, and Tom Martin all received new computers that required configuration and software installation that took several days.
<u>Ad Hoc Projects</u>
o President Matkin: Prepared mid-week Registration Statistics and generated chart for President's All-College Day presentation.
o Public Relations: Public Information Request via Marcy Cadena Smith: Request from PJ's Bookstore for preliminary fall 2016 enrollment by course, campus, and course type
o Veterans: Completed data request from Meredith Martin to provide data for new veteran's survey.
o Samantha Dean: Generated report on FY2016 Continuing Education enrollment
o Todd Fields and Vicki Woolverton: Generated class listing for Maymester 2015 and Wintermester 2015-2016.
o Brian Lenhart: Working on report that provides an enrollment history for Weekend College.
o Jennifer Blalock: Report on program completers over the past five years.
o Abe Johnson: Report for grant application that broke out program completers by CIP Code, year, and level of award for nine specific programs over the past three years.
<u>Selected Meetings</u>
o Program Review Steering Committee's Subcommittee on Training, Template Revision, and Rubric Revision: Scott Parke David Liska and Tom Martin 8/1/2016, 8/3/2016 & 8/4/2016
o Program Review Steering Committee's Subcommittee on Charter and Guidelines Revisions: Tom Martin & Scott Parke: 8/10/2016
o Webinar on IPEDS Changes to IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey (GRS) on 8/1/2016: David Malone and Kathy Ledzius
o Board Meetings



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

§ 8/2/2016: Scott Parke & Tom Martin
§ 8/23/2016: Scott Parke, Tom Martin, & David Malone
o Administrative Technology Committee on 8/4/2016: Tom Martin
o Plano City Planning Department's Annual City Education Meeting on 8/5/2016: Tom Martin
o Meeting with Kathleen Fenton on 8/9/2016: David Liska met with Dr. Fenton on programs and units scheduled for Program Review during 2016-2017.
o All College Day on 8/12/2016: Scott Parke, Nasreen Ahmad, Salma Mirza, David Liska, David Malone, Kathy Ledzius, Tom Martin
o Meetings with Deans and Associate Deans to establish new division structures for IRO reporting in the wake of the academic reorganization: Tom Martin
§ 8/15/2016: PRC Academic Affairs
§ 8/16/2016: SCC Humanities & Business
§ 8/16/2016: SCC Mathematics & Sciences
§ 8/18/2016: SCC Fine Arts & Education
§ 8/23/2016: CPC Academic Affairs
§ 8/23/2016: Health Sciences & Emergency Services
§ 8/25/2016: PRC Workforce Education
o Meetings to discuss the possibility of Collin College partnering with the McKinney's Mockingbird Poetry Society to host the Society's awards ceremony for its annual poetry contest that would bring public school students and their parents to CPC
§ 8/16/2016: J.D. Isip and Tom Martin at SCC
§ 8/23/2016: Adam Miller and Tom Martin at CPC
o Curriculum Advisory Board meeting on 8/17/2016: David Malone
o QEP Assessment Committee on 8/19/2016: Nasreen Ahmad
o Webinar on new Ellucian Download Center on 8/26/2016: David Malone
o Banner Maintenance Committee meeting on 8/31/2016: David Malone and David Liska
o Program Planning Meeting on organized by Brenda Kihl on 8/31/2016: Scott Parke, David Liska & Tom Martin



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Institutional Research Component Projects
September, 2016
<u>State Reporting:</u>
Certified Summer 2016 credit census reports: CBM-001 and CBM-004
Working on Fall 2016 credit census reports: CBM-001 and CBM-004
<u>Working on FY2016 annual reports: CBM-009 and CBM-00M</u>
Working on Quarter 4 2106 NonCredit Reports: CBM-00A and CBM-00C
Submitted THECB's Fall 2016 Preliminary Headcount prior to the 9/23/2016 deadline.
Submitted error-free data for THECB's Nursing Shortage Reduction Program ahead of the October 1 deadline. Worked with the Nursing program and the Registrar's Office to identify and document an additional four nursing completers that were not initially captured by the program that generates the CBM-009.
Generated Preliminary FY2016 Program Completions report and included FY2015 THECB certified completions to share with deans and associate deans to help them identify programs where there may be completers who have not been identified in Banner.
<u>Texas Public Education Grants (TPEG): Generated final summer 2016 report for the Business Office.</u>
Federal Reporting



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Working on 2016-2017 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report
Working on 2016-2017 IPEDS Completions report
Working on 2016-2017 IPEDS 12-Month Enrollment report
<u>Registration Cycle Statistics</u>
Completed the Fall 2016 Registration Statistics reporting cycle
Extracting from Banner and posting on the i:\ drive fall 2016 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
David Liska is working on a Tableau interface/dashboards, as time is available, to make daily enrollment snapshots more accessible and meaningful for deans and VPPs.
<u>Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)</u>
Generated preliminary Fall 2016 cohort from which to draw a sample of 400 students who will be tracked to monitor progress on QEP.
Pulled data from Banner (hours attempted, hours completed, GPA at start of term, cumulative hours attempted, cumulative hours earned, and cumulative GPA and end of academic year) for the Fall 2015 QEP cohort. Merged Banner data with demographic and course data for students in the cohort. Data sent to QEP Director for monitoring students.
Completed professional development survey report and delivered the report to the QEP Director.
<u>Student Evaluation of Instruction for Fall 2016</u>



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Formatted, sorted, and distributed course listings to deans and associate deans for verification and assignment of student evaluation form types to course sections.
Collected course lists from division offices and revised master list based on feedback from the instructional divisions.
Formatted course list of online and paper-pencil student evaluations.
Submitted packet list for paper-pencil student evaluations to Survey Systems to enable the vendor to print forms and assemble packets.
Created 149 paper packets for clinical courses (36), express courses (123), and courses with ten or fewer students enrolled (260).
Online: Cleaned Evaluation Kit node path field for fall 2016 online courses.
<u>National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP)</u>
NCCBP subcommittee is working on developing more effective financial benchmarks for participating institutions.
Non-Credit Education & Workforce Training Benchmark Project: Collected and submitted data by the September 15 deadline.
<u>High School Graduate Tracking Report</u>
Collected data on the numbers of high school graduates from each service area high school from CPC Dean of Student and Enrollment Services Office. Working on fall 2016 report.
<u>External Surveys</u>



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Completed Peterson's Interim Expense Update for 2016-2017.
Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory: Completed revisions to the executive summary and posted the report on Collin College's spring 2016 survey to the IRO intranet site.
Employer Satisfaction Survey: Working on multi-year summary report.
Annual Unduplicated Headcounts for credit and noncredit enrollment were generated for FY2016 and sent to President Matkin, Lisa Vasquez, Brenda Kihl, Sherry Schumann, Kim Davison, Ken Lynn, Scott Parke, Dani Day, Albert Tezeno, Jennifer Blaylock, Mary McRae, Jon Hardesty, and Abe Johnson. The report was also posted to the IRO intranet site.
FY2016 Licensure/Certification Report: Data are being collected from programs
<u>Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Contact Hour Report</u>
Completed reprogramming SPSS syntax based on information collected during August in meetings with deans and associate deans about how the divisions should be structured for reporting purposes following academic restructuring.
Working with Information Technology to revise data extract for this report as a result of the transition from the old faculty load system to the new faculty load system.
<u>High School Dual Credit Enrollment Reporting</u>
Andrea Dahl: Working on request to update "High School Dual Credit Enrollment, Contact Hours, and Credit Hours by High School" report for fall 2016.
Raul Martinez: Working on request to update "High School Dual Credit Enrollment and Post-High School Enrollment at Collin College by High School and Term" report for fall 2016.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

<u>Completer Follow-Up Survey</u>
Working on analysis of 600 responses from the last pilot test of the new instrument in preparations for further revisions and the next administration during fall 2016.
Salma Mirza and Tom Martin are working on presentation using fall 2016 Completer Follow-Up Survey data for the North Texas Community College Consortium's 2016 Outcomes and Assessment Conference scheduled for October 21 in Fort Worth.
<u>Annual Report on Course Enrollments</u>
Investigated missing course termination dates in the annual report on course enrollments that was completed in August.
Enrollment numbers generated by the existing Argos query for this report were unduplicated within years, so re-generated the numbers using a revised Argos query that does not unduplicated within year enrollment numbers. Resulting changes were minor as a few enrollment counts saw very slight increases.
<u>Nursing</u>
Administered Nursing Profile Survey to all Nursing students
Completed report on spring 2016 Faculty Clinical Site Evaluation and sent the report to Donna Hatch.
Completed report on spring 2016 Student Clinical Site Evaluation and sent the report to Donna Hatch.
<u>Dignity Initiative</u>



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Online survey was administered following first Dignity Initiative event with 71 responses received.
Working on analysis of initial survey data.
Registrar's Office
Completed "Add After Census Report"
<u>Ad Hoc Projects</u>
Worked with Shayne Brown and Debbie Dunn to add three more items to the Veterans' Survey for its next administration in October 2016. The revised questionnaire and under final review and is being laid out in preparation for administration.
Generated a crosswalk of items from the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI).
Generated a report that tabulated certified associate degree awards since College's inception broken out by CIP Code.
Generated a report that tabulated FY2016 enrollment broken out by level of declared major
Completed Labor Market Inventories for potential new programs.
Financial Aid: FY2016 Credit Unduplicated Student Count
Jon Hardesty: Generated report for a grant proposal that summarized Nursing contact hours generated by term and year for FY2014, FY2015, and FY2016.
Sherry Schumann: Requested verification of fall 2015 male and female full-time student percentages for EADA annual report.
Brenda Kihl: Analysis and discussion of 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 IPEDS Core Expenses categories and their definitions in light of the addition of 14 associate deans.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Brad Baker: Provided two reports that showed ten years of enrollment history in all DRAM courses broken out by'
Course, course section, term, and year
Information Technology: Generated report on fall 2016 part-time and full-time enrollment numbers
Innovation Challenge: Working on a response to a second follow-up request for additional information related to Nasreen Ahmad's Innovation Challenge proposal. Response is due by 10/31/2016.
<u>Program Review & Institutional Effectiveness</u>
Working on generating data for 2016-2017 program review cycle. The target delivery date is 10/17/2016.
<u>Public Relations</u>
Freedom of Information Requests: Vice President of the Saudi Students' Association at UNT requested the number of Saudi students enrolled at Collin during fall 2016. The number was provided, and the request was forwarded to PR for processing as a public information request.
Heather Darrow: Fall 2016 enrollment change report
<u>Council on Excellence</u>
Worked with Dan Lipscomb and Kimberly Harris to design ballot for a special CoE election to fill one vacant seat in the Business & Computer Science Division.
Election was opened on 9/26/2016 and is running through 9/30/2016.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Institutional Research Component Projects
October, 2016
o State Reporting
Certified FY2016 annual reports: CBM-009 and CBM-00M
Certified Quarter 4 2106 Noncredit Reports: CBM-00A and CBM-00C
Submitted CBM-00N Student Number Change Report
Working on fall 2016 credit census reports: CBM-001 and CBM-004
Working on summer 2016 credit end-of-term reports: CBM-002, CBM-00S, and CBM-0E1
Working on the annual CBM-116 Supplementary Follow-Up report. Nasreen Ahmad, Gwyn Best, and Becky Hessing are contacting program completers and interviewing them to enhance Collin's job placement rates and university transfer rates.
o Federal Reporting
Locked the 2016-2017 IPEDS Institutional Characteristics report
Locked the 2016-2017 IPEDS Completions report
Locked the 2016-2017 IPEDS 12-Month Enrollment report
o Registration Cycle Statistics
Extracting from Banner and posting on the i:\ drive fall 2016 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
David Liska is working on a Tableau interface/dashboards, as time is available, to make daily enrollment snapshots more accessible and meaningful for deans and VPPs, thought this project has been put on the back burner while other projects take precedence.
o Quality Enhancement Plan: Began administration of the Academic Planning Experiences Survey to the fall 2016 FTIC cohort of full-time, first-time degree-seeking students. Thus far, a total of 373 responses have been collected.
o Student Evaluation of Instruction for Fall 2016
Paper/Pencil Surveys



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Received boxes containing 3,363 student evaluation packets for all face-to-face course sections. Verified that all packets were present and that all labels were correct.
Inserted 419 packets for clinical courses, express courses, and courses with ten or fewer students enrolled into the appropriate boxes for delivery to deans'/associate deans' offices.
Sent boxes to deans'/associate deans' offices for administration of fall 2016 student evaluations.
Online Surveys: Completed final preparations for administration fall 2016 student evaluations in online and Nursing courses.
o National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP): Tom Martin is chairing a subcommittee of the NCCBP's National Technical Advisory Committee that is working on developing more effective financial benchmarks for participating institutions.
High School Graduate Tracking Report: Completed Fall 2016 report.
Annual Update of President's Statistical Report: Completed annual update and sent to Shirley Harmon.
Completed update of FY2016 Licensure/Certification Report and posted it to the IRO intranet site.
Completed FY2016 Program Completers Report and posted it to the IRO intranet site.
o External Surveys
Completed Fall 2016 International Enrollment Hot Topics Survey.
Completed TACC After-Census Enrollment Survey for fall 2016.
o Employer Satisfaction Survey: Working on multi-year summary report.
o Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Contact Hour Report:
Completed work with IT to revise data extract for this report in the wake of the transition from the old faculty load system to the new faculty load system. Downloaded data file.
Cleaning data and programming code.
o High School Dual Credit Enrollment Reporting
Andrea Dahl: Working on request to update "High School Dual Credit Enrollment, Contact Hours, and Credit Hours by High School" report for fall 2016.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Raul Martinez: Working on request to update "High School Dual Credit Enrollment and Post-High School Enrollment at Collin College by High School and Term" report for fall 2016.

o Completer Follow-Up Survey: Completed first draft of fall 2016 reports

o Academic Services: Working on understanding why all course begin and end dates are not pulling from Banner for Kathleen Fenton's ten-year course enrollment history report.

o Math Outcomes: At request of Bill Ardis, the Math Outcomes OMR form for MATH1342 was redesigned to accommodate more responses. A total of 1,500 forms were printed and sent to Professor Ardis' office for use this fall.

o Dignity Initiative (Sherry Rhodes & Linda Qualia)

o Generated and delivered report on 71 responses after the first event.

Revised questionnaire following first event.

Generated a paper version of assessment survey and printed 300 copies.

o Registrar's Office: Added three more items to the Veterans' Survey as per the Registration Office's request. Printed and delivered 500 two-sided copies of the survey.

o Classroom Utilization Reports: Completed production of classroom, building/wing, and campus reports for fall 2016.

o Nursing:

Completed report on Nursing Employer Survey and sent report to Donna Hatch.

Completed report on the Nursing Graduate Survey and sent report to Donna Hatch.

Completed report on Faculty Evaluation of Clinical Sites and sent the report to Donna Hatch.

o Libraries: Report on Survey of Collin Students is under final revision.

o Drug Awareness Survey (Linda Qualia)



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

The questionnaire was updated and revised to reflect changes requested by Dr. Qualia. The questionnaire is ready for administration beginning on 10/31/2016.
The student sample has been drawn and is ready for administration.
Approvals were obtained for the cover letter and reminder letters.
o Innovation Challenge Proposals: Reviewed and rated all three of the proposals that were submitted during October.
o Ad Hoc Projects
Public Relations
Kirk Dicky: Report on veteran enrollment.
Marcy Cadena-Smith: McKinney (CPC & McKinney high schools) enrollment.
Marcy Cadena-Smith: Public Information Request from U.S. Air Force Recruiter MSgt. Jason Williams for enrollment data from Preston Ridge Campus.
Deanna Brown: Completed unduplicated enrollment report for 201615 through 201710.
Barbara Jindra: Completed FY2015 Part-Time/Full-Time/Online Enrollment Report.
Suzie Armstrong: Completed fall 2016 TPEG estimates.
Abe Johnson: Report on three years of program completers in designated information technology disciplines to support a grant application.
Doug Willis
Completed fall 2016 FTIC-only student analysis.
Fall 2016 enrollment by campus.
Fall 2016 international students
Vicki Woolverton: Excess DE Banner attribute report.
President Matkin: Maps showing residences of fall 2016 students and FY2016 program completers in and around Collin County.
Shellene Foster: FY2011 through FY2017 (to date) Honors eligibility and enrollment.
Sherry Schumann: Report on fall 2016 FTIC students.
Council on Excellence: Completed work on CoE special election on 10/3/2016.
Monica Barron: Report on percentage of course sections taught by part-time faculty members.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

<p>Albert Tezeno: A new questionnaire was designed regarding student perceptions and interests in intramural sports at Collin College. The instrument was tested and approved. Survey administration began on 10/28/2016 to a random sample of 12,000 students. The survey is being administered online using Snap Surveys.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Meetings</p>
<p>10/4 Scott Parke participated in a Strategic Planning Session at Spring Creek.</p>
<p>10/4 David Malone attended a meeting regarding the new Chart of Accounts.</p>
<p>10/4 David Malone attended a meeting overseen by Wendy Gunderson on 14-week semesters.</p>
<p>10/6: Tom Martin met with Albert Tezeno, Will Mitchell, and Doug Willis to discuss a survey on intramural athletics to be administered during fall 2016.</p>
<p>10/7: David Malone attended a Curriculum Advisory Board meeting</p>
<p>10/10 Scott Parke participated in a Strategic Planning Session at Spring Creek.</p>
<p>10/11: Scott Parke & Tom Martin participated in a THECB Webinar on the Community College Accountability System and 60x30TX.</p>
<p>10/12 Scott Parke participated in a Strategic Planning Session at Spring Creek.</p>
<p>10/12 Scott Parke participated in the Collin College and Texas A&M University-Commerce signing at Preston Ridge.</p>
<p>10/12 David Malone attended a meeting overseen by Jennifer Blalock to discuss professional development tracking in Banner.</p>
<p>10/12 David Malone attended a meeting overseen by Jennifer Blalock to address CE executive reporting and the possibility of generating something for CE enrollment that resembles the credit “Registration Statistics” reports.</p>
<p>10/14 Tom Martin met with Todd Fields to review the quarter 4 2016 CBM-00A and CBM-00C along with the FY2016 CBM-009 and CBM-00M reports.</p>
<p>10/14 Tom Martin met with Brenda Kihl to review the quarter 4 2016 CBM-00A and CBM-00C along with the FY2016 CBM-009 and CBM-00M reports.</p>
<p>10/19 Scott Parke met with Albert Tezeno and Student & Enrollment Services to help facilitate their Strategic Planning session.</p>
<p>10/19: Tom Martin met with Brenda Kihl to review the IPEDS Institutional Characteristics, 12-Month Enrollment, and Completions reports.</p>
<p>10/20: Scott Parke & Tom Martin participated in a meeting overseen by Brenda Kihl to discuss reporting within the context of a new chart of accounts.</p>
<p>1-0/21 Scott Parke participated in the Workforce Credentials Coalition national conference call.</p>
<p>10/21: David Malone attended a Curriculum Advisory Board meeting.</p>



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

10/24: Tom Martin met with Albert Tezeno to clarify some issues related to the intramural survey.
10/25 David Malone attended a Calendar Committee meeting.
10/25 Scott Parke, Tom Martin met and Le Anne Eaton met to discuss using Banner data to calculate expenditures for new program review dashboard.
10/25: Tom Martin & Scott Parke attended the Board of Trustees' meeting.
10/26 Tom Martin met with Brenda Kihl to discuss issues related to reporting within the context of a new chart of accounts.
10/26 Tom Martin met with Amy Gainor to discuss the possibility of the CPC English Department hosting the Mockingbird Poetry Society's annual awards ceremony at the CPC Conference Center as a means to get young poets and their families on campus.
10/27 Scott Parke participated in the Administrative Technical Advisory Committee Meeting at CHEC.
10/27 David Malone attended a met with Sadiqa Mustafa to work on a Low Enrollment Report.
10/27 David Malone attended a Banner Maintenance Committee meeting.
10/27 Tom Martin participated in a meeting overseen by Scott Parke and including Brenda Kihl, Sherry Schumann, and Kim Davison to work on the College's new strategic plan.
10/28: Tom Martin participated in a conference call meeting with members of the National Community College Benchmark Project's Technical Advisory Board's Subcommittee on New Financial Measures to select new financial measures for the NCCBP.
10/28 Scott Parke met with Albert Tezeno and Student & Enrollment Services on revisions to the Strategic Plan.
· Professional Development Activities
Tom Martin participated in an NVivo Webinar entitled "Using NVivo as a Research Tool" on 10/3.
Tom Martin participated in the monthly meeting of the DFW Data Visualization & Infographics Group at SMU-Plano on 10/18. The presentation was on "The New IBM Watson Analytics User Experience."
Salma Mirza, Nasreen Ahmad, David Liska, and Tom Martin attended the North Texas Community College Consortium's 2016 Outcomes & Assessment Conference at the Tarrant County South Campus in Fort Worth on 10/21. Salma Mirza and Tom Martin co-presented a session entitled "What Have Graduates Learned? A Completer Survey for Community Colleges."
David Liska is reading Beautiful Evidence by Edward Tufte and Tableau Your Data! By Daniel Murray to increase his capacity with data visualization and data visualization tools.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Institutional Research Projects
November, 2016
o State Reporting
Certified fall 2016 credit census reports: CBM-001 and CBM-004.
Work initiated on quarter 1 2016 CBM-00A and CBM-00C noncredit reports.
Certified summer 2016 credit end-of-term reports: CBM-002, CBM-00S, and CBM-0E1
Certified annual CBM-116 Supplementary Follow-Up report. Working on summary report for administration. Nasreen Ahmad, Becky Hessing, and Gwyn Best made hundreds of phone calls to contact program completers that the THECB was unable to track using their own data base and the Texas Workforce Commission's data base. IRO was able to contact 147 of 344 missing completers pushing up Collin's overall success rate from 87% to 92% and pushing 13 of 16 programs that had not initially attained the 76% success target over that target.
Posted 2016 quarter 4 noncredit CBM-00A and CBM-00C state edit reports to IRO intranet site.
Posted 2016 summer credit CBM-001, CBM-004, CBM-00S, CBM-002, and CBM-0E1 state edit reports to IRO intranet site.
o Federal Reporting
Working on IPEDS Graduation Rates Survey
Working on IPEDS 200% Graduation Rates Survey
Working on IPEDS Outcomes Measures Survey
Working with Financial Aid Office on IPEDS Student Financial Aid Survey
o Registration Cycle Statistics
Extracting from Banner and posting on the i:\ drive fall 2016 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
Extracting from Banner and posting on the i:\ drive Wintermester 2016-2017 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
Extracting from Banner and posting on the i:\ drive spring 2017 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
Distributing weekly Registration Statistics reports for Wintermester 2016-2017
Distributing weekly Registration Statistics reports for spring 2017



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Working on a Tableau interface/dashboards, as time is available, to make daily enrollment snapshots more accessible and meaningful for deans and VPPs, thought this project has been put on the back burner while other projects take precedence.
o Quality Enhancement Plan: Downloaded 507 responses generated by the fall 2016 cohort to the Academic Planning Experiences Survey. Working on analysis and report. Results are scheduled to be presented at the December 8 QEP meeting.
o Student Evaluation of Instruction for Fall 2016
o Paper/Pencil Surveys
· Regular pick-up of packets from campuses has commended and will continue past finals week. A total of 1,528 (45%) of the 3,361 packets have been returned thus far.
· Prepared replacement packets for divisions and faculty members that lost packets.
o Online Surveys: Opened online student evaluations for students enrolled in online Nursing courses in coordination with the beginning of the paper-pencil administration.
o National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP): Tom Martin is chairing a subcommittee of the NCCBP's National Technical Advisory Committee that is working on developing more effective financial benchmarks for participating institutions.
o High School Graduate Tracking Report: Posted fall 2016 report to IRO intranet site.
o External Surveys: Working on annual College Board Survey
o Employer Satisfaction Survey: A draft of a 2016 summary report had been completed and is currently under review.
o Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Contact Hour Report: Completed and disseminated first and second drafts for review. Final report to be disseminated on 11/30/2016.
o High School Dual Credit Enrollment Reporting
Andrea Dahl: Request to update "High School Dual Credit Enrollment, Contact Hours, and Credit Hours by High School" report for fall 2016 deferred until other, higher priority projects are completed.
Raul Martinez: Request to update "High School Dual Credit Enrollment and Post-High School Enrollment at Collin College by High School and Term" report for fall 2016 deferred until other, higher priority projects are completed.
o Completer Follow-Up Survey: First draft of report under review
o Academic Services: Need to determine why all course begin and end dates are not pulling from Banner for Kathleen Fenton's ten-year course enrollment history report. However, work on this project has been deferred until other, higher priority projects are completed.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

o Dignity Initiative (Sherry Rhodes & Linda Qualia)
Scanned surveys and cleaned data from 147 respondents who participated in November events.
Working on report for November events.
Printed and delivered 200 copies of the Dignity Initiative survey for future administration.
o Classroom Utilization Reports: Posted fall 2016 reports to IRO intranet site.
o Nursing:
Administration of Clinical Site Evaluations of Students completed on 11/18/2016.
Administration of Clinical Site Evaluations of Faculty completed on 11/18/2016.
Administration of fall 2016 Student Evaluation of Clinical Sites completed on 11/29/2016.
Administration of fall 2016 Faculty Evaluation of Clinical Sites completed on 11/29/2016.
o Libraries: Report on Survey of Collin Students was delivered on 10/31/2016.
o Drug Awareness Survey (Linda Qualia)
Questionnaire was administered to a random sample of 5,560 credit students 18 years of age and older on 11/1/2016.
A total of 444 responses received thus far which exceeds the target of 360.
o Working on estimate of fall 2016 average section size to post to IRO intranet site.
o Posted space utilization campus and building summary charts to IRO intranet site.
Ad Hoc Projects
o Public Relations
Eric Corder, City of McKinney: Public information request for fall 2016 total enrollment at Central Park Campus and Collin Higher Education Center.
SSgt Billy Smith, Air Force Recruiter, McKinney: Public information request for fall 2016 CPC enrollment broken out by gender and total number of FY2016 graduating class broken out by gender.
o Brenda Kihl: Update for FY2016 a table entitled "Enrollments, Contact Hours & Contact Hour Funding Generated, Credit Hours, Tuition & per-Credit Hour Fees Generated by Year, Term, and Residency Status, Collin College, FY2014 & FY2015" that was originally generated one year ago.
o Albert Tezeno: Intramural Sports Survey
Administered to 12,000 credit students for two weeks beginning 10/28/2016. Since they would be ineligible to participate in intramural sports, high school dual credit students were excluded from the sample.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

A total of 473 responses were received toward a target of 380 in order to generalize to the student population.
Final report was delivered on 11/22/2016.
o Susan Cannon: Analysis of Carl Perkins measure 4P1 (Student Placement) to determine how the THECB arrives at their estimates of institutional performance.
o Jon Hardesty: Request for District-wide contact hour enrollment for each of the last three academic years for BIOL, ENGL, HUMA, and PSYC rubrics.
o Donna Hatch: Enrollment data for Nursing professional accreditation report.
o Completed Banner Sandbox testing of system updates.
o Completed review of two Innovation Challenge proposals
Collin Social Services
Acknowledging the Service of Part Timers
Meetings
o 11/1: David Liska participated in an Academic Success Program Review meeting
o 11/4: David Malone participated in a Curriculum Advisory Board meeting
o 11/7: Tom Martin met with Todd Fields at SCC to review state reports (201630 CBM-002, CBM-0E1, CBM-00S)
o 11/8: Tom Martin met with Brenda Kihl to discuss issues related to new chart of accounts
o 11/10:
David Malone met with Bridget Payne to review third party funding procedures
Tom Martin and Nasreen Ahmad met to review CBM-116 prior to certification
o 11/18:
David Liska and Tom Martin participated in a Program Screening Tool status meeting with Scott Parke
o 11/21:
David Liska met with Le Anne Eaton to discuss possible data sources to track program expenditures for the program dashboard
o 11/28: Tom Martin met with Todd Fields at SCC to review state reports (201710 CBM-001 and CBM-004)
o 11/30:
Scott Parke and Tom Martin participated in a candidate interview for the Business Intelligence System Director position
David Liska and David Malone participated in a Banner Maintenance Committee meeting
Professional Development Activities



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

- | |
|--|
| o David Liska and Tom Martin participated in the DFW Data Visualization & Infographics Group session on “Microsoft Power BI and Excel: Better Together” at SMU Plano |
| o David Liska watched several online streamed sessions from the Tableau Conference |
| o David Liska completed the Lynda.com course “SQL Essential Training |
| o David Liska started the Lynda.com course “SQL for Data Reporting and Analysis” |
| o Davis Liska is reading the book <i>Beautiful Evidence</i> by Edward Tufte |
| o Nasreen Ahmad participated in a Webinar on “Improving Student Communication with Texting” |
| o Nasreen Ahmad and Salma Mirza participated in a Disney Institute on customer service |
| o Nasreen Ahmad completed the Collin College training course “FERPA for Higher Education” |
| o Tom Martin participated in the NTCCC’s GRIT Conference at Eastfield College |



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Institutional Research Projects
December, 2016
o State Reporting
Working on quarter 1 2016 CBM-00A and CBM-00C noncredit reports. Data cleaning is in process.
Initiated preparations for spring 2017 CBM-001 and CBM-004. Identified course errors and contacted division offices to start corrections.
Improved R program to add data to the “classification” field on the CBM-00A.
Completed Banner testing for several Texas Connection Consortium patches that affect state reporting.
Completed executive summary of results of IRO’s supplemental tracking efforts for the CBM-116. The summary report was posted to the IRO intranet site.
o Federal Reporting
Working on IPEDS Graduation Rates Survey.
Working on IPEDS 200% Graduation Rates Survey.
Working on IPEDS Outcomes Measures Survey.
Working with Financial Aid Office on IPEDS Student Financial Aid Survey.
o Registration Cycle Statistics
As of 12/8, completed Banner extractions and posting to the i:\ drive fall 2016 the daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
As of 12/19, completed Banner extractions and posting to the i:\ drive the daily Wintermester 2016-2017 enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
Continuing Banner extractions and posting to the i:\ drive the spring 2017 daily enrollment snapshots for deans and VPPs
Distributing weekly Registration Statistics reports for Wintermester 2016-2017
Distributing weekly Registration Statistics reports for spring 2017
Working on a Tableau interface/dashboards, as time is available, to make daily enrollment snapshots more accessible and meaningful for deans and VPPs, thought this project has been put on the back burner while other projects take precedence.
o Accreditation
Dani Day: Completed Fall 2016 SACS COC Institutional Profile.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Quality Enhancement Plan: Academic Planning Experiences Survey (APES) Fall 2016 Cohort
· Completed longitudinal analysis of fall 2016 APES
· Generated report and posted it to the i:\ drive for QEP Committee members.
· Presented results to the QEP Committee on 12/8.
· Updated QEP Assessment Plan Worksheet with results of the latest APES Survey.
o Student Evaluation of Instruction for Fall 2016
Paper/Pencil Surveys
· Prepared and disseminated replacement packets for those that were lost by faculty or in division offices.
· Completed collection of packets from campuses. A total of 3,361 (95%) of the original 3,361 packets were returned.
· Verified packets and shipped them to vendor for scanning and report generation.
· Initiated scanning of forms from clinical and self-paced sections.
Online Surveys: Closed online student evaluations for students enrolled in online courses and Nursing courses in coordination with the end of the paper-pencil administration.
o National Community College Benchmark Project (NCCBP):
Tom Martin is chairing a subcommittee of the NCCBP's National Technical Advisory Committee that is working on developing more effective financial benchmarks for participating institutions.
Contacted Dr. David Case at East Central Community College in Mississippi for information about definitions of terms for several measures from a composite financial index which he presented at a conference.
o External Surveys:
Completed Common Data Set.
Completed annual College Board Survey.
o Employer Satisfaction Survey: A draft of a 2016 summary report had been completed and is currently under review.
o Full-Time/Part-Time Faculty Contact Hour Report: Completed and disseminated final report to on 12/5/2016.
o High School Dual Credit Enrollment Reporting
Andrea Dahl: Sent final "High School Dual Credit Enrollment, Contact Hours, and Credit Hours by High School" report for fall 2016 on 12/12.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

Raul Martinez: Sent final "High School Dual Credit Enrollment and Post-High School Enrollment at Collin College by High School and Term" report for fall 2016 on 12/8.
o Completer Follow-Up Survey: First draft of report under review
o Academic Services: Need to determine why all course begin and end dates are not pulling from Banner for Kathleen Fenton's ten-year course enrollment history report. However, work on this project has been deferred until other, higher priority projects are completed.
o Dignity Initiative (Sherry Rhodes & Linda Qualia)
Completed report for October events and sent report to clients on 12/14.
Working on report for November events.
o Nursing:
Completed report on fall 2016 Students' Evaluation of Clinical Sites and sent report to client on 12/7.
Administration of Survey of Nursing Students' Employers began on 12/1/2016.
Administration of Nursing Graduate Survey began on 11/30/2016.
o Completed estimation of fall 2016 average section size by type of course and posted to IRO intranet site.
o Veteran's Survey (Debbie Dunn and Shayne Brown): Completed report based on data generated by students enrolling during the spring 2017 veterans' priority registration period. Response consisted of 143 valid responses collected from 10/24 through 10/26. Report sent to clients on 12/20.
· Ad Hoc Projects
o Brian Lenhart: Reviewed Fall 2017 part-of-term dates to ensure that the fall 2017 calendar for Weekend College would create no problems for state reporting.
o Kathleen Fenton: Generated and executed and Argos data block to pull data (attempted hours, earned hours, and term GPA along with cumulative attempted hours and earned hours) for a 400-student sample from among full-time, first-time-in-college, degree-seeking students for a degree audit enrolled during academic year 2015-2016. Sent data file to client.
o Collected reports, recommendations, and other information generated by GEO Forum II and sent it to Jon Hardesty.
o Mary McRae: Generated ten-year enrollment history by course for all fine arts courses under the direction of Dean Cooksey and sent the report to the client.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

o Worked with HR to review and revise the job description for the IRO Reports Coordinator position, obtained all requisite approvals, and saw a job announcement posted to replace David Malone.
o Brenda Kihl: Completed a request to provide total end-of-term credit hours generated during 2015-2016 broken out by in-District, out-of-District, and out-of-state residency status.
· Meetings
o 11/30 and 12/1: Tom Martin participated with Scott Parke and David Hoyt on a screening panel in 201 CHEC to interview finalists for the new position of Director of Business Intelligence.
o 12/2:
David Malone participated in the December Curriculum Advisory Committee meeting
Tom Martin participated in telephone meeting with David Williams, EMSI's VP of Client Services, to discuss Collin College's decision to use a difference vendor for workforce data.
o 12/5: David Liska and Tom Martin met with Scott Parke to discuss the status of the Program Dashboard
o 12/6: Tom Martin participated in November/December Board of Trustees' meeting.
o 12/8: Nasreen Ahmad participated in a QEP Steering Committee meeting.
o 12/9:
David Malone met with Programmer Sadiqa Mustafa to discuss processes needed to set funding codes on a per-course basis.
Nasreen Ahmad, Salma Mirza, and Tom Martin met in 26 CHEC to discuss and complete a National Higher Education Benchmarking Institute survey.
o 12/13:
Nasreen Ahmad, David Liska, and Tom Martin participated in a telephone conference call with EMSI to help them understand some of the shortcomings of EMSI's Analyst product and why Collin College opted to use a competitor's product after having used EMSI's Analyst for several years. The outcome of the meeting gave them some useful perspective about what they need to do to make their product competitive, and EMSI offered the College free use of their Analyst product for one year.
· Professional Development Activities
o 12/1: Nasreen Ahmad participated in a Webinar sponsored by NVivo entitled "Analyzing Social Networks" regarding the use of qualitative research methods to analyze information flow through social networks.
o 12/5: Tom Martin participated in the DFW Data Visualization & Infographics Group session entitled "Mystic: 3D Data Visualization in Space" at Dallas Entrepreneurs Center in downtown Dallas from 6:30 to 8:00 p.m.



SERVICE UNIT PROGRAM REVIEW

o 12/14: Salma Mirza, David Liska, David Malone, and Tom Martin participated in a National Student/AACRAO Webinar entitled “Time to Degree: A Discussion of the Enrolled and Elapsed Time for Associate and Bachelor's Degree Earners” from 1:00 to 2:00 p.m.
o 12/14: Tom Martin participated in the Tableau User’s Group meeting in Irving from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m.
o David Liska finished reading Edward Tufte’s book Beautiful Evidence about effective data visualization.
o Kathy Ledzius is studying a PHP tutorial on Lynda.com.
o Nasreen Ahmad completed a required Collin College training session entitled “EEO Laws and Discrimination Prevention for Higher Education.”
o Nasreen Ahmad completed a required Collin College training session entitled “EEO Laws and Discrimination Prevention for Higher Education: Supervisor Supplement.”
Fall 2016 Student Evaluation – Paper
Picked up packets weekly at PRC and CPC
Order, sort by associate dean, alphabetize, stamp packets received
Boxed packets
Boxes shipped out on 12/15 (35 boxes - 3,172 packets)
Surveys
CE Student Evaluation of Instruction (New) - Scanned 311 forms for Fall 2016 – Q1
Scanned 77 Dignity Initiative forms
Requests
Copied Key Activities, Measures and Milestones from Strategic Planning Inputs into the Caspio database.
Reviewed Innovation Challenge – Nudge documentation
Intranet Postings
Lists of evaluation packets receive/not received – Associate Deans