CSCU | Students First

Planning Team	INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH/ASSESSMENT
Meeting Date	September 5, 2017
Members Present	Michael Ben-Avie, SCSU Caitlin Boger-Hawkins, Northwestern CT CC Paula Bunce, CCSU William Gammell, CSCU System Office Jan Kiehne, CSCU System Office Yvonne Kochera Kirby, CCSU *(via conference call)* Qing Mack, Asnuntuck CC David Nielsen, Manchester CC Laura Qin, Three Rivers CC *(via conference call)* 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

- The team recapped the meeting of 8/22/17 where skills sets, data resources, and leveraging data resources was discussed.
- It was noted that on 8/23/17 Michael Ben-Avie provided the team with an "Assessment/Accreditation" section to be part of the Assessment skills set.
- It was suggested that we add "Knowledge of General Ed (Framework 30) assessment" to the Assessment skills set, as well as "Knowledge of TAP Initiative".
- Discussion/Comments regarding an organizational model included:
  - This is an opportunity to be more effective; enhancing our collective ability to better answer questions and data requests we are all confronted with.
  - As an example/starting point, Bill Gammell distributed an example of the "four-quadrant analysis and framework" which was developed by Dr. Hirosuke Honda, Director of IR & Assessment at the University of Maine at Augusta.
  - Service delivery must be maintained at the local level.
  - NEASC standards were discussed. The System has not yet been approved by NEASC in regard to forming one state community college. It is unclear as to how IR will fit in the new one CC structure according to the NEASC standards.
  - Standards #2 and #8 are in tandem and encompass a lot of Institutional Research. The standards are not prescriptive.
  - Should the functional teams be a component of the organizational model?
  - Caitlin Boger-Hawkins and Yvonne Kirby have agreed to assist Bill Gammell with the writing of the IR/Assessment Team report. Once written, it will then be provided to the IR/Assessment Planning Team for review.
  - The consolidation effort will affect the CSUs and CCCs differently. There may be one IR team throughout all 17 campuses, however, there will likely be different reporting structure for the CSUs since they are not being combined.
  - While no one is being let go, we still need to utilize people effectively.
  - Will there be regional coverage for IR?   A regional IR office?
  - There should be a person "on the ground" at each campus; if not an IR "Director", then someone of a lesser position. Should there be an "analyst" on each campus? And that person would report to a regional person?
  - Regarding external reporting, campus relationships and campus history are a must.
  - An IR person should be at each campus location.
  - How do we assist the CSUs? With functional teams and data governance?
  - Perhaps there should be a work group or functional team for data consolidation and integrity.
  - We should anticipate other teams, e.g. Student Success, and Reporting.
  - We need to be flexible with the teams; can't anticipate every scenario.
  - A process of cycling up through the teams needs to be developed so that everyone has an opportunity to work on and learn about the different functional teams.
  - A change of job descriptions/Union contracts was once again discussed. It was reiterated that job descriptions shouldn't change, however, the reporting structure will change. Will there be a change in duties seeing as assessment is not in many IR Directors' job descriptions?
  - Taskstream and Tk20 have merged. AQUA (a new initiative) software licenses have been purchased by CSCU for all campuses.

- The CCCs need the right tools – Perhaps we need a functional team for Data Tools.
- The importance of our relationship(s) with the IT Department was extensively discussed. We need to have our ideas, timing, and connection to the IT Department meshed.
- There was a discussion around how we should focus on year 1, year 2, year 3, etc. as it relates to meeting critical needs, data mart/data warehouse, data standardization (WebFocus, Banner Cloud – should there be a working group?)
- Data standardization is a huge project already underway.
- The IR Repository can be "beefed up" for common definitions – We can add data elements to it. This will require IT support.
- Suggestions to be added to the IR/Assessment Team report include: the need for significant IT resources; the need to have a data warehouse for the system; the need to perhaps have an IT person dedicated to IR who understands the IR timeline and function; a new level of priority on IR from IT; the development of a programming environment to include the development of reports; the new initiative around AQUA – should there be a IR/Assessment AQUA expert team to meet the anticipated AQUA implementation and support?
- There was a discussion around the programming of WebFocus reports to be automatically received at the System Office. Unfortunately, sometimes reports contain erroneous data and there must be someone on campus to ensure the reports are correct.
- We can try to standardize as many reports as we can, however, Ad hoc reporting cannot be dropped. If we had the ability to do cyclical reporting, then maybe some ad-hoc reporting would diminish.
- Functional Teams should include Data Team (data mart and governance) and under IR a team for standardized reports and for ad-hoc reports.
- It was reiterated that a draft of the IR/Assessment Team report will be sent to the planning team to vet.
- A discussion around the Assessment function included: Assessment is an important function; how is the new structure student-centered; if our resources are pooled we will become more effective which will effect student success; there needs to be strong & organized data integrity; we must invest in technical resources; assessment looks at data thru a different lens, e.g. assessment uses rubrics, research uses metrics; IR supports assessment (a.k.a. "decision support").

The next meeting of the IR/Assessment Planning Team is scheduled for Tuesday, September 19th, from 1 pm to 3 pm, Conference Room 206 at the System Office.