

CSCU | Students First

Planning Team	INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH/ASSESSMENT
Meeting Date	August 8, 2017
Members Present	Michael Ben-Avie, SCSU Caitlin Boger-Hawkins, Northwestern CT CC Michael Broderick, Charter Oak William Gammell, Director, Research & System Effectiveness, CSCU System Office Yvonne Kochera Kirby, CCSU Mark Lynch, Gateway CC Qing Mack, Asnuntuck CC David Nielsen, Manchester CC Laura Qin, Three Rivers CC Jenny Wang, Capital CC

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 two subcommittees summarized what IR activities had been identified for the CCCs and CSUs, and the commonalities found across campuses.
- The community college subcommittee decided to open up communication with all campuses. 9 people from various campuses were present for an 8/1/2017 meeting. The review teams reviewed IR activities inventories and categorized the different activities. The group decided that without knowing how restrictive the future campus structure will be, it is difficult to assign skill set.
- They shared that local and ad hoc requests are a part of IR (e.g. they are called upon to support Continuing Education). The 4-year institutions have a different system to collect data. CSU Continuing Education staff need to record data in the same way that for-credit programs are recorded. The time people spend on ad hoc work is varied at each campus but all agree it is very time consuming.
- It was emphasized that the need to be able to serve at the local level needs to be retained. All back office work, which includes IR, will be centralized. Remaining on campus saves time, frustration, and effort if IR staff don't have to be informed of campus background since something could be inadvertently left out. There was discussion of what would be lost and gained by such a configuration. For example, if a couple of people were designated to produce reports such as IPEDS, it would free up others to produce data for other requests.
- The question was asked would there be a system wide strategic plan. If we regionalize, for example, a president, oversees 3 colleges, he/she may want to know about each campus enrollments. Other things need to be straightened out, organizational wise, before a strategic plan can be implemented. What if institutions are tied together - the ambiguity of the future structure was seen by some as making it difficult to move forward. The chair suggested the team simply stick to what the group was charged with, which is consolidating the IR/Assessment functions. If every campus has its own strategic plan, then IR staff will have to support those other plans.
- See the list of expert areas discussed on the notes of July 2017 which include data mart, data report writers, analytic report writers, assessment experts, survey experts, support for various campus officers, and professional staff. It was mentioned that [the] ad hoc [tasks] takes the lion's share. There is a lot of value to having local knowledge to do ad hoc tasks well. There are 6 different data systems within the CSU System. What if all data was submitted to one robust system that is a data warehouse where one could live/work with common definition.
- SCSU is flipping the switch from Brio to Web Focus.
- One of the benefits of all CSUs being all on Web Focus is that when there is one query, it is a way to detect errors and improve process.
- Data governance team would be responsible for data stewardship.

- It was reported that the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness at SCSU had resigned, and two other people in IR had left before and had not been replaced. This stimulated discussion about how other CSU IR personnel could help if such a scenario were to occur again in the future. Assistance is not possible currently, but in the future assistance could be possible if we had a robust data warehouse. The CSUs have the ability to view each other's data in the IR Repository. It may make sense to have some cross-campus cross training; and leverage the IR Repository as a data resource. This would allow one campus to help another when short-handed.
- Recommendations from the 4-year institutions subcommittee that met on July 27, 2017 were shared. Refer to handout.
- Cooperation from the IT Department will be needed. IT will be an important partner going forward. There should be a slice of IT that serves IR.
- What kinds of skills are needed? We don't know how the support system will be structured, so, we can't determine at this time. The subcommittees tried to identify what teams exist. A few people commented they don't see this saving any money. Campus is still going to want to know the numbers locally in a timely manner. It was suggested that savings have been achieved through retirements and resignations that have occurred over the past few months.
- It would be good to be able to compare what we produce in reports with other campuses. The first step is to obtain more reliable data. That is why data governance is important because we need a common definition in the frozen data warehouse.
- It was mentioned that some existing initiatives will help when it comes to data reliability, access, etc. Jan Kiehne is working on two things: 1) Data Warehouse, and 2) Data standardization used for Banner on the Cloud. In addition, the IT Dept. has provided the BOR IR Dept. an IR Prod. Just started for CCCs and it is running successfully. [Note: the universities refresh Banner C-PROD nightly].
- Next Steps, the Charge, and the Goal:
Reflective Questions:
How do we make things more efficient?
What is the cost?
What does an ideal system look like?
Where are the cost savings?
- The current system is okay; however, to improve upon it we need resources to move ahead.

Next steps are to think about skill sets. Conversation followed about what the IR/Assessment Planning Team report needs to look like. It could start with a situational analysis (i.e. here is the situation and here is the recommendation). The report can outline the issues (analysis projection) and the problem statement will define where we are. We could back it up with our needs and who will implement it. These recommendations will be forwarded from this group to the Steering Committee, CSCU President and BOR. The goal is to come up with a recommended

solution. The timeline is for this IR/Assessment Planning Team report to be completed by the end of September.

It was suggested that the report focus on the charge and the value (e.g. more consistency, etc.), and challenges how changes will be made for the better and where there are obstacles.

Maybe, Bill (or another person) will start the report and a small team can contribute to it.

The subcommittee discussions were important. They are a good starting point for the report, but are not an end. A report section could include issues uncovered.

- Everyone was asked to think about skill sets involved included in the 3 different documents that were summarized.

The next meeting is August 22nd 1 - 3 PM.

DRAFT