

# CSCU | Students First

<b>Planning Team</b>	INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH/ASSESSMENT
<b>Meeting Date</b>	July 19, 2017
<b>Members Present</b>	Michael Ben-Avie, SCSU Michael Broderick, Charter Oak Paula Bunce, CCSU William Gammell, Director, Research & System Effectiveness, CSCU System Office Jan Kiehne, Institutional Research Specialist, P20 WIN Program Manager, CSCU System Office Yvonne Kochera Kirby, CCSU Mark Lynch, Gateway CC Qing Mack, Asnuntuck CC David Nielsen, Manchester CC David Pettigrew, SCSU Jenny Wang, Capital CC Annie Davis, CSCU System Office, Support Staff

## **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

- Bill will be providing an update to Alice Pritchard, Chief of Staff, so that she may update the planning team leaders at their next meeting (Bill will be on vacation and not in attendance). The update will include:
  - Review of the IR/Assessment Planning Team charge
  - Inventory of Activities – first step
  - Template created, approved, disseminated to all 17 institutions for completion
  - Completed templates received from all 17 institutions and System Office
  - Start review of templates to identify commonalities, activities which are campus specific, overlaps.
  - Formed two review teams (Team 1 = 2-year institutions; Team 2 = 4-year institutions/Charter Oak) to review templates and report back to planning team.
  - Begin to think about ad-hoc data requests and determine if there is a way to pool resources.
- There has not yet been a meeting of the review teams.
- Observations of the templates include: some activities are similar but are named differently campus to campus; there are a lot more ad-hoc activities than regular/unique to campus activities; similarities in campus fact books; NEASC activities are time-consuming and sometimes require ad-hoc reports.
- A robust website would minimize the ad-hoc requests.
- Discussion regarding NEASC – The response to address NEASC standards may vary from campus to campus; the reflective essay, which requires institutional memory, addresses academic effectiveness; would a NEASC functional team help?
- Ad-hoc reporting discussion: Ad-hoc reporting is time consuming in that one must find the data, massage the data, make queries, build the report, and build the template. Can ad-hoc requests be more scrutinized, e.g. perhaps some requests are already answered via standard reports.
- Surveys discussion: Better dissemination of survey results is needed; should there be a Survey functional team (to assist with NSSE, CCSSE/SENSE, campus specific surveys, identify people with survey knowledge).
- Functional Team(s) discussion: Some functional teams may have a greater work load due to their knowledge and skill sets – We must be mindful of work equity. To address work equity, it was suggested to have team skill sets be staggered from novice to expert which will allow the sharing and spreading of knowledge. Functional teams should meet and work together to ensure quality control.
- The need for a data warehouse was reiterated and discussed.
- There was a discussion on what appears to be a lack of coordination of Web Focus training. It was suggested that perhaps as a pilot utilizing the IR Repository, a SASR page 1 be created for the 4-year institutions. This could enable a limited common database for all four CSUs.

- BRIO will no longer be supported in the near future.
- The suggestion of the development of common Identification #s across the system was made and everyone concurred.
- David Nielsen provided for discussion a draft of notes on functional areas and account executive model. The team discussed.
- Common definitions were discussed.
- There was a brief discussion regarding the differences between the reporting function and the research function. The Reporting function deals with more common elements while the Research function really varies from project to project and is campus specific.
- The importance of the academic experience and maintaining academic excellence, as well as class size and its impact on student success was discussed.
- How do we obtain a better relationship with IT? We discussed how CCSU has some people designated as “power users” who are granted greater IT access. It is important for people to realize we provide research for the entire organization.
- Next steps:
  - The review teams will meet to review the IR activities inventory templates and develop one consensus document.
  - Start to think about skill sets/qualifications required for each functional team.
  - We need support to make things happen, i.e. IT support.
- The next IR/Assessment Planning Team meeting is *Tuesday, August 8th, 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm.*