

CSCU | Students First

Planning Team	INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH/ASSESSMENT
Meeting Date	August 22, 2017
Members Present	Michael Ben-Avie, SCSU Caitlin Boger-Hawkins, Northwestern CT CC (<i>via conference call</i>) Michael Broderick, Charter Oak Paula Bunce, CCSU William Gammell, CSCU System Office Mark Lynch, Gateway CC Qing Mack, Asnuntuck CC David Nielsen, Manchester CC David Pettigrew, SCSU Laura Qin, Three Rivers CC (<i>via conference call</i>) Jenny Wang, Capital CC Annie Davis, CSCU System Office

Team Charge

The Institutional Research/Assessment Planning Team is specifically charged with:

- Inventorying the activities in each IR office to determine overlap/commonality of tasks, as well as identifying those activities that are unique, yet essential, to individual campuses.
- Identify opportunities to have common activities done more efficiently for all institutions at the same time by functional/excellence teams assigned to areas of specialty.
- Ascertain staff skills/strengths available throughout the system.
- Identify technology, training support and other resources that may be needed to facilitate streamlining processes.
- Develop a hybrid organizational model, a structure that incorporates excellence teams, but allows IR professionals to continue to deliver service associated with the unique needs of their specific campus.

Meeting Notes

- The focus of today's meeting was to start discussion around determining the skill sets necessary for the functional teams.
- The target date for the submission of our report to President Ojakian/BOR is the end of September. A "writing team" which will include the team chair and two members will be formed and will be charged with the crafting of the report which will then be vetted by the planning team.
- There was a brief review of the draft meeting notes from the August 8, 2017 meeting. There were some suggested revisions provided and will be incorporated in the original draft which will be redistributed to the planning team for review.
- Two documents were provided in order to stimulate discussion of skill sets for the functional teams. After a brief review of the documents, the discussion/comments/suggestions included:
 - The skill sets appear to be too heavy; IR Assessment needs to be expanded
 - Suggestion of skill to be added to the assessment function – *The ability to initiate and conduct research study and the steps involved*
 - Look for experience in teaching
 - Survey research – discussion around the different surveys used; predictive analysis
 - Putting the skill sets on paper doesn't do them justice; there is a lot to take in
 - IR supports faculty-owned assessment; IR should be the driver of requests, asking the appropriate research questions to shed light on some of the fragmented requests
 - Academic quality/excellence – Is it our role to focus on academic quality? Are we the ones to be identifying academic excellence indicators and to identify what's best for CT students? Should the identification and focus of such indicators be put forth thru the Faculty Advisory Committee to the BOR?
 - There is a real need to have a relationship on campus so that data/data requests can be properly discussed. Relationships with other campuses very important.
 - Is IR influential on campus? IR has the ability to interpret data like no others. IR should be less in a silo.
 - There should be "a call for priorities" listed on the IR/Assessment Team report. The assessment piece will be expanded for the IR/Assessment Team report
 - Member rotation thru the functional teams will ensure cross-training in all areas
 - It is difficult to list actual "skills" without appearing as a "job description"
 - Specialty skills include proficiency in assessment software Tk20/Taskstream as well as statistical analysis in SPSS, SAS, SQL, Banner, etc.
 - Brief discussion around NSSE and CCSSE surveys and if they assist in campus improvement; there should be a critical analysis of what we're doing with these surveys
 - Will the skill sets at the system office level be different than the skill sets required at the campus/local level? We don't know what the organizational structure will be, however, we hope that separate missions will be kept intact.
 - Another important skill set is having the local knowledge in order to report and distribute WIOA policies, compliance reports, and legislative report card data.
 - Discussion around how the formation of functional teams will occur. How do we determine the tasks that will no longer be done – Will the tasks be given to the functional teams, (e.g. grad survey) if IR does the scheduling, what would the functional team do? The functional team could possibly administer the survey. If it is an in-person

survey, e.g. CCSSEE, it would require on-campus scheduling and in-class administration. This would make it difficult for functional team members off campus to coordinate.

- A robust data set is needed! If key metrics (e.g. HR profiles, 1st year students, IPEDS) are loaded into a Data Mart, then customized for each institution, it would be a great time saver.
- Some believe we are putting the cart before the horse regarding a data mart. We need to know skill set needed for use of a data mart as well as then get people up to speed.
- Discussion around Banner and the lack of Banner system centralization for the four CSUs. Banner Cloud was briefly discussed – The Banner system is huge; will the system office be able to run data from the Cloud?
- Data standardization was briefly discussed.
- Queries can be pulled from the IR Repository for CSUs. It was designed to keep institutional values the same – they are translated to the same thing in IR Repository. At CCSU, stats for their sports teams are not rolled up to the IR Repository. This should be reflected in the IR/Assessment Team report.
- How will a campus fit into institutional effectiveness under a new structure?
- Recommendations provided in the IR/Assessment Team report should be separated out to reflect short term and long term.
- The IT Department is working on a single identifier for transfer “floater” students. It was noted that there are many data definitions in the IRDB that are not in Banner.
- A question was asked about the system’s different bargaining units and whether there should be some sensitivity around this as it pertains to bargaining unit staff who may feel their contract has been violated due to perhaps having to perform more/new duties, thus affecting their job descriptions. It was stated that, 1) there is bargaining unit representation on the planning team; and 2) there may be reporting changes with the restructuring, however, there shouldn’t be significant job description changes. Some folks view the restructuring as an opportunity for professional development.
- A change in reporting relationships effect the budget. Professional development needs to be equitable and there needs to be funding available to support it. Reporting relationships will change, therefore, certain priorities will change.
- Next Steps:
 - Discuss organizational issues
 - Clarity of efficiencies

The next meeting of the IR/Assessment Planning team is scheduled for **Tuesday, September 5, 2017** from 1 pm to 3 pm at the **CSCU System Office, 61 Woodland Street, Hartford.**