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Topics for this Session

- Institutional Effectiveness Defined
- Reasons for Institutional Effectiveness
- IE in the Principles
- Keys to Effective IE Processes
- Common Problems in IE

Institutional Effectiveness

“Institutional effectiveness is the systematic, explicit, and documented process of measuring performance against mission in all aspects of an institution. ... A commitment to continuous improvement is at the heart of an ongoing planning and evaluation process. It is a continuous, cyclical process that is participative, flexible, relevant, and responsive.”

The Cyclical Nature of the IE Process

Purpose

Use of Results seeking Improvement

Goals/ Objectives/ Expected Outcomes

Assessment, then Evaluation

Reasons for IE

- Planning
- Improving Efficiency
- Improving Quality
- Accountability
- Maintaining Focus

IE in the SACSCOC Accreditation Process

- Explicit Standards
- Implicit Standards
Explicit IE Standards

CORE REQUIREMENT 2.5

The institution engages 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.

Explicit IE Standards

COMPREHENSIVE STANDARD 3.3.1

The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
3.3.1.2 administrative support services
3.3.1.3 educational support services
3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate
3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate

The Language of CS 3.3.1 and the Cyclical Nature of the IE Process

Purpose [implied]

Use of Results for Improvement

Expected Outcomes

Assessment, Analysis of Results
Implicit IE Standards [selected]

CR 2.10:
The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that promote student learning and enhance the development of its students.

CS 3.3.2:
The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that … (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement.

CS 3.5.1:
The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.

FR 4.1:
The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement including, as appropriate, consideration of course completion, state licensing examinations, and job placement rates.

Implicit IE Standards [selected]

CS 3.4.7:
The institution ensures the quality of educational programs and courses offered through consortial relationships or contractual Agreements … and evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the purpose of the institution.

CS 3.4.12:
The institution’s use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs...
Recent Compliance with IE Standards: CR 2.5 – Institutional Effectiveness
Percentage with a negative finding 2009 and 2010 Reaffirmation classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Process</th>
<th>Institutions with &lt;1,500 FTE</th>
<th>HBCUs</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Institutions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site Noncompliance</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Recommendation</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Monitoring Report</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent Compliance with IE Standards: CS 3.3.1 – Institutional Effectiveness
Percentage with a negative finding 2009 and 2010 Reaffirmation classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Process</th>
<th>Institutions with &lt;1,500 FTE</th>
<th>HBCUs</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Institutions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site Noncompliance</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Recommendation</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Monitoring Report</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEYS TO AN EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PROCESS

Strong Leadership
– Starts at the top: CEO, CAO
– Need for Advocates
KEYS TO AN EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PROCESS

Start with the End in Mind
- Purpose determines Objectives/Expected Outcomes
- Expected Outcomes determine appropriate assessment tools
- Evaluation of assessment results yield ideas for improvements

Appropriate Motivation
- Ownership of the process
- Reports are read by others
- Recognized internal benefits
- Sustainable process

Adequate Support
- Position within the organization
- Staffing
- Assessing AND Evaluating
- Continuity of resources
KEYS TO AN EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PROCESS

Actionable Data

– Data fits the outcomes, not vice versa
– Right degree of disaggregation
  ■ Not too general
  ■ Not too specific
– Local analysis of externally produced data

Common Problems

Dual IE Systems

– Real Process is not the Official Process
– Excessively complex IE Processes
– Symptoms:
  ■ Blank/partial reports
  ■ Nonsensical data findings
  ■ "Target met, no action needed"
  ■ "SACS Report" as a title
  ■ Software instead of substance

Common Problems

Ignoring Existing Possibilities

– Board Books
– Capstone classes
– Department meetings
– Using local codes in surveys
– Using consortia
Common Problems

Free Agents
- Programs versus Courses
- Misuse of Academic Freedom arguments

Some Really Good Resources