IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

Full Cabinet Retreat
July 31, 2012
The Lodge at Welch Allyn
WHAT IS INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT?

- The systematic and ongoing practice of gathering, analyzing and using information from various sources about an administrative unit, using measured outcomes, in order to improve services.
- Measuring critical administrative processes in order to gather data that provides information about how well the institution is meeting its mission and goals.
  - Also relevant to the unit level
Accountability
- To demonstrate that we are doing what we claim
- As a basis for resource allocation and program decisions
- To continually improve our efforts

Accreditation
- MSCHE
At its session on March 1, 2012, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education acted:

To commend the institution on the quality of the self-study process. To reaffirm accreditation and to request a progress report, due April 1, 2013, documenting (1) that assessment results are shared and discussed with appropriate constituents and used in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal to improve and gain efficiencies in programs, services and processes, including activities specific to the institution's mission (Standard 7); and, (2) that student learning assessment information is shared and discussed with appropriate constituencies and is used to improve teaching, learning, and curriculum, in both educational offerings and general education (Standard 14). The Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2017.
Administrative unit action needed

- Complete or update assessment reports for 2012
- Make needed changes in 2012-13 as indicated by 2011-12 evaluation of assessment data
- Collect data as planned throughout 12-13
- Evaluate data as planned in spring 2013
- Complete assessment reports for 2013
- Repeat every year
## Administrative Unit Assessment Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>DATE DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative unit assessment data analysis</td>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>June, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative unit assessment reports to supervisor</td>
<td>Administrative Unit Heads</td>
<td>July 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional assessment advancement</td>
<td>Cabinet</td>
<td>July 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors approve 2012 reports for posting to web</td>
<td>President, VPs</td>
<td>August 8, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Administrative unit assessment reports posted to web</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td>August 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative unit updates of assessment matrices for 12-13</td>
<td>Unit Heads</td>
<td>September 30, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated 12-13 plans posted to web</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td>October 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ACADEMIC YEAR 2012-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>DATE DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment data collected</td>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Unit Assessment data analysis</td>
<td>Administrative Units</td>
<td>June, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative unit assessment reports to supervisor</td>
<td>Administrative Unit Heads</td>
<td>July 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors approve reports for posting to web</td>
<td>President, VPs</td>
<td>August 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Administrative unit assessment reports posted to web</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td>August 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative unit updates of assessment reports</td>
<td>Unit Heads</td>
<td>August 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated plans posted to web</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
<td>August 31, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VALUE OF GOOD ASSESSMENT
(OR WHY THIS IS A GOOD IDEA BESIDES THE AO ASKED FOR IT)

- Decisions based on fact rather than assumption
- Success in meeting stakeholder expectations
  - Reliability
  - Efficiency
  - Quality
  - Cost
  - Delivery
- Identification of areas for improvement
- Optimum progress toward institutional vision
Findings

- Assessment matrix needs to be improved
  - Timing sequence unclear
  - Intended content of cells in matrix not clear to all
- Unit assessment reports
  - Some just think this way
  - The rest of us are still figuring it out

Goals for today’s IA session

- Increase understanding of overall assessment process and timing
- Increase understanding of exactly what is needed in each box of the assessment matrix
- Improve the content of each box of matrix
# Assessment Worksheet Update

## Work Sheet for Unit Level Institutional Assessment
### Results July 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Goal</th>
<th>Link to ESF Goals (by #)</th>
<th>Method(s) of Assessment and Targets</th>
<th>Results of Assessment (Data)</th>
<th>Implementation Plan (Changes resulting from Assessment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Unit Name: |
| Unit Mission: |

## Work Sheet for Unit Level Institutional Assessment
### Results 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Goal</th>
<th>Vision 2020 Goal #*</th>
<th>Institutional Priority Code (A-G)**</th>
<th>Actions taken from 10-11 assessment</th>
<th>Check If Done</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Target(s) (desirable level)</th>
<th>Results of Assessment (Data)</th>
<th>Actions to take in 12-13</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Target(s) (desirable level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2013 Objectives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* | | | | | | | | | | |
**Addition of Institutional Priorities:**

A) Sustainability; B) Improve the Quality of Entering Students and Modest Enrollment Growth; C) Improve Visibility; D) Financial Stability; E) Community Engagement; F) Strengthen and Refine Assessment Practices; G) Invest in Human Resources and Physical Facilities

---

**Changes to Worksheet**

Update based on previous year’s assessment

Previously “Methods of Assessment and Targets”

Previously “Implementation Plan”
NEW WORKSHEET: TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Goal</th>
<th>Vision 2020 Goal #*</th>
<th>Institutional Priority Code (A-G)**</th>
<th>Actions taken from 10-11 assessment</th>
<th>Check If Done</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Target(s) (desirable level)</th>
<th>Results of Assessment (Data)</th>
<th>Actions to take in 12-13</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicator(s)</th>
<th>Target(s) (desirable level)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Changed as Needed with VP or President Input

Updated based on previous year assessment

Set in Summer Year 1

Data Collected Throughout Year, Analyzed in June Year 1

Set in Summer Year 2
Update actions taken based on the previous year assessment

- Note if completed
Key Performance Indicators should be able to be measured in an easily understandable way with available resources

- Do the identified indicators make sense to assess the specific goal?
- How will data on this measure lead to improvement?
- Does the measure reflect an important performance dimension, such as an institutional priority?
- What kind of data will be needed?
Targets

- What is the desirable level of achievement?
Based on previous year’s assessment results, develop an implementation (assessment) plan. Actions to take can include new goals for the upcoming year. KPIs and Targets may be adjusted, or stay the same for the following year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions to Take in 2012-2013</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Targets (Desirable Levels)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012-2013 OBJECTIVES
General observations

- Most have acceptable mission and goals
- Not all measures make good sense with respect to their associated goal
- Most lack specificity of measures, results, and implementation plans
- The majority of reports was the lack of identification of acceptable levels of performance (TARGETS)
- Correspondence to metrics varies widely
Many goals will have multiple indicators of acceptable performance (Key Performance Indicators)

The indicators should directly reflect the goal or a particular aspect of it

Example
- Goal is to offer training to students or staff to educate about ....
- Measure - Event evaluations show satisfaction with training
HOW WELL DOES THE MEASURE REFLECT THE GOAL?

Example A
- Goal is to offer training to students or staff to educate about ....
- Measure - Event evaluations show satisfaction with training
Example B

- Goal is to offer training to students or staff to educate about ....
- Measure - Event evaluations indicate increased knowledge or skill level
Goal - Students will demonstrate an understanding of the services provided by offices that are involved in the intent to graduate process.

- Measure A - Students will successfully download the intent to graduate form
- Measure B - After the workshop session, students will achieve a 90% or higher on the related questions in the event evaluation form.

Which measure is better?
Goal - Unit will demonstrate increased timeliness in terms of processing x,y,z requests.

- Measure A - number served by unit will be tracked for three semesters
- Measure B - a log will be used to track date and time of each request and the time it was resolved

Which is better?
Each measure should specify, when possible, the desired level of performance

- Satisfaction level
- Productivity
- Efficiency
- Knowledge or skill level

Example

- Unit Goal - Raise the necessary gifts and pledges to Centennial Campaign to reach $20M goal in 2016
- Indicator - Total cash gifts and documented pledges as of June 30
- Target - Continue to execute campaign plan to raise additional $2M in 2012-13
RESULTS: BE SPECIFIC

- Repeat of measure is not enough
- Include data or refer to another document where the data can be seen
  - Can be located online (give hotlink)
  - Can be attached

Example
- Measure: Quantify number of proposals submitted annually
- Target: Increase by 3-5% annually
- Results: An increase in 7% in number of proposals submitted
Efficiency: Relationship Between Assessment and Metrics

- Metrics for annual Cabinet review should be part of assessment plan
- Adjust metrics as assessment plans improve
  - Several units currently doing so
    - ORP
    - OIGS
    - Physical Plant
- Spreadsheet identifies unit level correspondence between assessment reports and annual metrics
Remember our goals for today
- Increase understanding of overall assessment process and timing
- Increase understanding of exactly what is needed in each box of the assessment matrix
- Improve the content of each box of matrix

Questions on any part of the process?

Questions on any box in the assessment matrix?
NEXT STEPS

- Work on moving your report to the new expanded matrix
- Look for supporting documents at www.esf.edu/assessment
- After drafting your updated report, come to the IA Help Session
  - August 16, 10 am - 12 pm
  - 105 Marshall Hall
  - RSVP by August 14 (separate invite will be sent)
- Complete final 2012 assessment report by September 15
  - Send to VP/President for final review