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</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Program Director Signature:</td>
<td>Angelina Hill</td>
<td>Date: 1-2-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 President Signature:</td>
<td>Kathy Smith</td>
<td>Date: 1-16-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.4 Primary Function:

Institutional Research (IR) is responsible for housing, analyzing, and reporting information to enhance decision making at the College of the Redwoods. IR provides support to academic, administrative, and service areas by working directly with faculty and staff to meet their data needs, and through committee interaction.

IR assists internal college assessment to improve student learning, inform planning, and promote institutional effectiveness.

IR prepares timely reports to outside Federal entities (e.g., IPEDS, Gainful Employment), State entities, and grant/contract agencies.

#### 1.4.1 State briefly how the program functions support the college mission:

IR supports all aspects of the college’s mission to continually assess student learning and institutional performance and practices. IR provides aggregated learning outcome data to assist academic assessment, common program review datasets to assist in program evaluation, and internal and external scans to inform strategic planning. IR also collects and reports on various performance indicators used to assess the institution’s progress towards strategic and education master planning goals and objectives.

#### 1.4.2 Program highlights/accomplishments:

IR supported planning through wide spread presentations of data. Environmental scans (external and internal) were performed for the strategic and education master plans. IR supported assessment by collaborating with the assessment coordinators and IT to roll out an updated version of the assessment website and reporting software. We also developed and presented the results of the first alumni/employment survey for CTE areas. Finally, through the team effort of Zach, Kathy Goodlive and Carla Spalding, the apportionment reporting (320) has become much more efficient.

We believe that we still have a lot of work ahead to get to a place where reliable data is accurately interpreted by a widespread audience to inform decisions, but with a record number of data requests and data presentations, we think we are moving in the right direction.
1.4.3 Program Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Full Time Employees</th>
<th># of Part Time Employees</th>
<th>Personnel Budget</th>
<th>Discretionary Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74,880</td>
<td>1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177,314</td>
<td>1,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2 - Data Analysis

2.0 List Service Area Metrics/Indicators and provide information on changes over time (Steady/Increasing/Decreasing, etc.)

2.1 Metrics/Indicators

- **Tickets (fulfilled data requests) by category (e.g., received, resolved)**
  - 2010/11: 80
  - 2011/12: 168
  - Observations: Completed tickets have risen since 2006-2007: 40 (06-07), 86 (07-08), 51 (08-09), 66 (09-10), 80 (10-11), 168 (11-12). All tickets in 10-11 and 11-12 were closed/resolved.

- **Monthly IR Website Hits**
  - Views: 5771
    - Avg time: 49 sec
  - Views: 6971
    - Avg time: 1min 16sec
  - Observations: Views increased over 20%. Average time on page increased by 55%. After the landing page, the enrollment reports had the highest hits (with success/retention & completion reports viewed most), followed by program review. The survey page had only 114 views in 2011-2012, up only two from 112 in 2010-2011.

- **Planning and Committee Member Survey Ratings to item: Discussions & decisions were data driven and supported by sound evidence**
  - 6.1% strongly agree, 48.5% agree, 27.3% neutral, 15.2% disagree, 3% strongly disagree
  - 27.5% strongly agree, 57.5% agree, 10% neutral, 5% disagree, 2.5% strongly disagree
  - Observations: The percent of members who agreed that decisions were data driven and supported by decisions went from 54.6% in 2010-2011 to 85% in 2011-2012. The data can’t be disaggregated by committee, but it demonstrates a substantial improvement in committees reliance on data.

- **Committee self-evaluation survey ratings to item: Engages in data-driven decision making.**
  - NA
  - Observations: All committees: 1=0%, 2=31%, 3=43%, 4=26%
  - This survey was administered for the first time in 11-12, so no trend info is available. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee gave the
2.2 Describe how these changes affect students and/or the program: Increased website use and requests for ad hoc data suggest that the campus is relying more on data to evaluate their programs. Planning committees are also increasingly relying on data to make systematic decisions. This impacts the demand on the program in a positive way.

2.3 Provide any other relevant information, or recent changes, that affect the program: Zach Deloach’s departure will greatly impact the program. Zach was in the office longer than anyone else and he provided a high level of support to the service areas. IR will look to database support from IT for additional resources to automate as many processes as possible, and to put easier reports in place, wherever possible.

Section 3 – Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities (2011/2012)

3.0 Describe Service Area Outcomes Assessed or reviewed in the current cycle: The website was overhauled after surveying faculty and staff to find that the most commonly used portions of the website were the overall section report and program review datasets. The website was revised to make the overall section report and program review datasets more readily available. Increased visitation to the website is encouraging, although we would still like to see these grow substantially, especially for viewing survey results and specific enrollment and achievement reports. A link to surveys is featured on the page that has been restructured by survey rather than year in hopes that it will attract more attention.

The results of the planning committees related to developmental progress of systematic use of data were positive overall, but resulted in lower than expected ratings from members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Following these results, the committee has been involved in improving the institutional effectiveness scorecard, and more work to provide consistent information to this committee is needed. Committee ratings are expected to increase when this survey is administered again this year.

3.1 Summarize the conclusions drawn from the data and the experience of staff working to achieve the outcomes:

We need to continue our progress working with the planning committees to provide and interpret data in a consistent, systematic manner. Committee members indicate that they are more comfortable relying on data, but we still have much room to improve.

IR has made annual revisions to the common data set for instructional program review, but we need to collect formal feedback this year from
faculty to determine which changes were helpful, and where further revisions are needed. This is only possible if we build on what we have, rather than overhauling the data sets each year. To make the most of the assessment process, we need consistency while targeting specific improvements based on feedback.

3.2 Summarize how assessments have led to improvement in Service Area Outcomes (top three):

Assessment of our website using analytics and a survey told us that not enough faculty were familiar with the website, and the specific reasons that faculty and staff most frequently visit the site. We used this info to make revisions to the site, and we have seen visits and time spent on the website increase following these changes.

Extensive feedback was gathered during assessment software sessions at the assessment summit and other times of the year. This feedback was used to revise the first version of the assessment software. Revisions allowed for quantitative summary across courses, and the evaluation of one outcome at a time, which was needed for accurate reporting.

3.3 (Optional) Describe unusual assessment findings/observations that may require further research or institutional support:

Section – 4 Evaluation of Previous Plans

4.1 Describe plans/actions identified in the last program review and their current status. What measurable outcomes were achieved due to actions completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Provide faculty and staff with assistance with interpretation of reports. | Ongoing. Presentations on how to interpret the program review data set were given to all divisions and at multiple campuses.  
The Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard was introduced in detail to the Board and to all planning committees. The importance of consistent definitions was reinforced. | Provide data reports that are highly relevant to decision making and easy to interpret.                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Include a vetted set of reports on the IR website using faculty and staff input. | Ongoing. The Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard was revised following input from the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Advisors provided feedback that was used to revise a report used to determine how successful basic skills students will be in other | Provide data reports that are highly relevant to decision making and easy to interpret.                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
courses. The Program Review Committee provided feedback used in a revised common data set. A Completer (Alumni) survey was developed with input from the Assessment Committee that provided a consistent format for student ratings of general learning outcome gains. Many IR reports still require faculty and staff feedback before undergoing revisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published reports will no longer be created from data that changes daily. A new data warehouse strategy will be implemented so that data from the prior semester can be thoroughly checked for errors prior to publication, and prior to being permanently archived.</th>
<th>Complete. Published reports are no longer live with data that changes daily. This was allowing database errors to corrupt the data published to the web. Static reports for each semester are checked for errors before they are made public.</th>
<th>Improve data integrity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential data elements will be formally defined, and housed in a database where they can be more efficiently and accurately queried.</td>
<td>Initial stages. The strategic planning indicators are currently being collected/revised in a way that they can be easily queried, and progress is being made to collect the education master planning indicators. Much work is still needed to finalize the indicators, and report them effectively.</td>
<td>Improve data integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CR community, including individual faculty and staff, departments and divisions, and committees will use the same set of agreed upon indicators and definitions.</td>
<td>Ongoing. Indicators in the Institutional Effectiveness Scorecard, and indicators in new plans are being developed in a consistent manner. While the scorecard indicators and KPIs have become relatively permanent, the indicators in the plans are new and will need to go through at least a few cycles of evaluation before they are</td>
<td>Better define key indicators that are consistently used by campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 (If applicable) Describe how funds provided in support of the plan(s) contributed to program improvement:

Section – 5 Planning

5.0 Program Plans

(2012/2013)

Based on data analysis, service area outcomes and indicators, assessment and review, and your critical reflections, describe the program’s Action Plan for the 2012/13 academic year. If more than one plan, add rows. Include necessary resources. (Only a list of resources is needed here. Provide detailed line item budgets, timelines, supporting data or other justifications in the Resource Request).

5.1 Program Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action to be taken:</th>
<th>Relationship to Institutional Plans</th>
<th>Relationship to Assessment</th>
<th>Expected Impact on Service Area Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administer and evaluate the Student Satisfaction Inventory</td>
<td>Used as indicator in Strategic and Education Master Plans</td>
<td>Assessment of Service and Educational Outcomes of the Institution</td>
<td>Increase campus knowledge of student perceptions, increase familiarity with interpretation of survey data.</td>
<td>$3500 for standardized instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement query and reporting tool</td>
<td>III.A. in 2012-2013 Annual Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase efficiency obtaining data for reports.</td>
<td>$300 recurring (not needed until next program review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate institutional survey results to a broad audience</td>
<td>Survey results used to assess institutional plans</td>
<td>Broader communication will allow more people to use the results in decision making</td>
<td>Increase the use of assessment data to inform decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Institutional Effectiveness Committee, promoting consistent evaluation of data</td>
<td>Informs the Institutional Effectiveness Report of all plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the use of assessment data to inform planning decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a vetted set of reports on the IR website using faculty and staff input (cont.)</td>
<td>Faculty and staff use the reports to assess programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase utility of data reports that are highly relevant to decision making and easy to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Provide any additional information, brief definitions, descriptions, comments, or explanations, if necessary.

Section 6 - Resource Requests

6.0 Planning Related, Operational, and Personnel Resource Requests. Requests must be submitted with rationale, plan linkage and estimated costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Check One</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Recurring</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (SSI) and Employee Satisfaction Survey (CESS)</td>
<td>Planning: x, Operational: , Personnel:</td>
<td>$3500 (rotating administration of CESS at $2100 and the SSI which is between $3500-$4000).</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Student and employee perceptions are used to evaluate planning. Noel-Levitz surveys provide peer comparisons that aren’t available with a survey administered in-house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7 - PRC Response by section (completed by PRC after reviewing the program review)

7.0 The response will be forwarded to the author and the supervising Director and Vice President:

S.1. Program Information:

S.2. Data Analysis:

S.3. Critical Reflection of Assessment Activities:

S.4. Evaluation of Previous Plans:

S.5. Planning:

S.6. Resource Requests: