Institutional Effectiveness NIPR

2021

LASSEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. Randy Joslin, Director of Institutional Effectiveness

Contents

<div align="center">

Institutional Effectiveness NIPR

</div>

SECTION 1: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PLANNING

I. Program Overview and Objectives

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research provides resources to maximize the success of Lassen Community College students and the organization itself. These resources include raw data, data analysis, and a variety of concepts and ideas that lead to continuous improvement throughout all operational processes of the institution.

Description/Evaluation:

    a.   Describe and evaluate the program objectives against the LCC strategic plan, specifically the mission statement and strategic goals:

Mission: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research directly supports the mission of Lassen Community College by providing data and analysis to foster (1) the most effective learning environment possible for our students and (2) the most efficient and effective operation of the College.

Strategic Goal #1 - Institutional Effectiveness and #3 – Resource Management: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research directly supports these goals through significant engagement in most all areas of governance and planning to support the learning environment.

Strategic Goal #3 – Resource Management: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research directly supports this goal through significant engagement in most all areas of governance and planning to support the learning environment.

Strategic Goal #4 – Student Success: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research directly supports this goal by providing data and analytical assistance to support the most effective attainment of student educational goals.

  b. Evaluate any changes in the program since last review. Include summary of Annual Updates completed since last review.

In the years since the last program review (2016), the position of Associate Dean of Institutional Effectiveness and Research has been downgraded from an administrator position to a classified manager position—the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. Also since that time, there has been great turnover in the staffing of all administrator and many manager positions within the organization. These many changes have had great effect on the overall institutional effectiveness of the College. These effects culminated in the findings of the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) visiting team in March 2020. Most of the teams findings had previously been self-identified by the College were included in the Institutional Self Evaluation Report (ISER) that was submitted to ACCJC prior to the teams visit.

The visiting team report included requirements that the College improve institutional effectiveness and academic quality through more consistent engagement in a variety of planning processes. The identified process include program review, resource allocation, learning outcomes assessment and analysis, review and analysis of Institution Set Standards, and broad communication of activities and findings related to all of these processes.

The College has successfully applied for an Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative grant in the amount of $200,000. These funds are being used to engage a consultant, a subject matter expert, to assist with efforts to improve processes which directly relate to the ACCJC visiting team findings. The specific areas of focus of this IEPI grant include (1) Integrated Planning and Educational Master Plan (EMP), (2) Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) process improvements and application software, and (3) Professional Development that relates directly to SEM, Student Success, and institutional effectiveness.

The College has formed working groups specifically address both the accreditation findings and the IEPI grant. These groups have been productive, fostering many improvements related to all of the processes mentioned above. There is much work that is still ongoing which will affect all areas of integrated planning across the organization, with direct and positive effect on all institutional effectiveness activities.

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Student Services Planning, and/or Academic Planning tables at the end of the section for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

Work over the last 14 months has addressed improvements to institutional effectiveness, specifically in the areas of program review engagement and improvement of the processes that contribute to program review. Learning outcomes have been mapped, and that work continues which will lead to more stringent engagement in the reporting and analysis of outcomes. The Instructional Program Review (IPR) handbook has been updated to reflect positive changes, and will serve as the template for an updated and improved Non-Instructional Program Review Handbook. Other planning and analysis has and is contributing to improvements in curriculum review and all aspects of integrated planning, with focus on making that planning more meaningful and less burdensome to stakeholders.

II Administrative Unit and/or Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Student Learning Outcome Assessment

AUO and SLO assessment is important to maintain and improve institutional effectiveness and provide an effective learning experience for LCC students. Departments are expected to measure AUO and/or SLO annually; these records are maintained in WEAVE and are available for review at any time.

Description/Evaluation:

1. Identify and evaluate Administrative Unit and/or Student Learning Outcomes including the relationship to strategic goals for AUOs and institutional student learning outcomes for SLOs utilizing information from WEAVE.

ISLO	Strat Goal	AUO	ASSESSMENT MEASURE /TARGET
3	1, 2, 4	Provide appropriate decision-support research to facilitate the college's planning process associated with accreditation, benchmarking and institutional effectiveness activities	**Measure:** A survey that assesses the level of satisfaction with decision-support research **Target:** 70% of campus constituents will be satisfied with the overall performance of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
3	1, 2, 4	Provide appropriate support for research, effectiveness and planning activities that are carried out on campus.	**Measure:** A survey that assesses the level of satisfaction with support for research, effectiveness and planning activities **Target:** 70% of campus constituents will be satisfied with the overall performance of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
3	1, 2, 4	Maintain compliance of institutional reporting in response to questionnaires and both routine and non-routine requests for information from state, federal, and other external agencies	**Measure:** Benchmark on external reports completed **Target:** 100% of on-time delivery of external reports.

2. Attach an AUO and/or SLO assessment summary as provided by Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

A survey on campus constituent satisfaction with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) was conducted in September 2021. A significant portion of respondents (12 of 28, or 64.29%) were faculty members, with 1 Classified respondent (3.57%), 3 Managers (10.71%), and 6 Administrators (21.43%).

Survey respondents rated their level of satisfaction with the following elements:

Respondents Level of Satisfaction with Specific Institutional Effectiveness Activities

Activity:	Responses and Number of Respondents:					
	Very Satisfied or Satisfied		Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied		N/A	
Consultation	64.3%	18 of 28	0.0%	0 of 28	35.7%	10 of 28
Ability to meet requested deadl	60.7%	17 of 28	3.6%	1 of 28	35.7%	10 of 28
Accuracy of information	57.2%	16 of 28	7.1%	2 of 28	35.7%	10 of 28
Presentation of information	67.9%	19 of 28	3.6%	1 of 28	28.6%	6 of 28
Professionalism	64.3%	18 of 28	7.1%	2 of 28	28.6%	6 of 28

A majority of respondents (75%, or 201of 28) indicated that they had participated in a workshop or presentation for the SLO reporting process during the last three years. Nearly two thirds (60.71%) of respondents indicated that they had visited the Institutional Effectiveness web page.

While only 53.57%, or 15 of 28) of all respondents indicated that they had actually used the services of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE), many of the respondents had participated in that activities that the office is directly involved in:

Respondents Level of Participation in Specific Institutional Effectiveness-Related Activities:

Activity:	Participation Rate of Respondendents:	Number of Respondents:
Accreditation	50.0%	14
Master Planning	28.6%	8
Program Review	71.4%	20
SLO/AUO Assessment	67.9%	19
N/A (Did not participate in any)	10.7%	3

Respondents indicated their level of satisfaction with decision-support research (AUO #1):

Level of Satisfaction with Office of Institutional Effectiveness Role In:

Activity:	Responses and Number of Respondents:					
	Very Satisfied or Satisfied		Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied		N/A	
Analysis	53.6%	15 of 28	4.2%	1 of 28	33.3%	8 of 28
Reports	50.0%	14 of 28	8.3%	2 of 28	33.3%	8 of 28
Surveys	60.7%	16 of 28	8.3%	2 of 28	25.0%	6 of 28
Master Planning	57.1%	15 of 28	4.2%	1 of 28	33.3%	8 of 28
Accreditation	60.7%	16 of 28	4.2%	1 of 28	29.2%	7 of 28
Program Review	64.3%	17 of 28	4.2%	1 of 28	25.0%	6 of 28
SLO/AUO Assessment	71.4%	19 of 28	4.2%	1 of 28	16.7%	4 of 28

As can be seen in the table above, only one of these activities related to decision-support research achieved the 70% level of satisfaction. The position of the Director of Institutional Effectiveness was only filled on a part-time basis for the last 19 months. This position is now permanently filled on a full-time basis, which should foster an increase in future campus satisfaction results on the above activities.

Respondents indicated their level of satisfaction with support for research, effectiveness, and planning activities (AUO #2):

Level of Satisfaction with Support for research, effectiveness, and planning:

Responses and Number of Respondents:					
Very Satisfied or Satisfied		Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied		N/A	
66.7%	18 of 28	18.5%	5 of 28	12.5%	4 of 28

The data in the table above shows that the AUO #2 goal has not been met. This establishes a baseline for future continuous improvement, which again should be achievable with the Director position once again being staffed on a full-time basis. For AUO #3, current data shows that the target goal has been met.

Survey respondents also rated their overall level of satisfaction with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness:

Overall Level of Satisfaction with the OIE:

Responses and Number of Respondents:			
Very Satisfied or Satisfied		**Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied**	
85.7%	24 of 28	14.3%	4 of 28

It is the authors sense that the overall satisfaction level of 85.7% is indicative of the work that has been completed over the last 14 months related to accreditation. Much of this work has related directly to improving institutional effectiveness. While there is no way at this point in time to positively quantify this notion, future survey results will serve to more appropriately identify those areas that may still require improvement.

Lastly, there was an opportunity within the survey for respondents to offer suggestions and improvements, which are listed here:

Suggestions and Comments from Survey Respondents:

There needs to be tutorials on the information that is sent out -identifying what is important and the reports - what do the charts mean -how to decipher the information from the charts to have a meaning when doing an IPR -there should be a tracking system that automatically lets you know what was purchased in your department instead of keeping the invoices so that can be easily put into an IPR (example: purchase of books, computer or other equipment, what year, cost, how many ect) so you know when things should be on a rotation to update before they fall apart Putting tutorials on the canvas page for faculty We need video tutorials on the page for SLO's, SLO Mapping,ect and not the presentation just a straight forward video with demonstration

Website needs to be updated as it refers to a 2013-2016 effectiveness calendar. Link to Institutional Effectiveness just links back to the same overview page. Link to Institutional Research leads only to old reports (pre-2017). Regular reports (IPR data, regular enrollment reports, etc) need to be made publicly available on the department website so that all of campus has access to the info. Website should also include a link to the SLO reporting form as well as the assessment results so we can see trends in SLOs at any time without waiting for a report when the IPR is due.

The "department" is under staffed, and appears to be running behind all the time. In order for the campus to make data driven decisions we need an actual department of Institutional Effectiveness. Hire support staff, SLO and AUO assessments and results need to be user friendly. Have you thought about software? The information on the IE webpage is hard to find and is old.

I suppose the moral of the story is: I appear to get by without the Dept of Institutional Effectiveness.

You are doing great Randy! Let's get some software to make your job easier!

We are so much better in everything we are doing, LCC is on a good path right now! We have administrators who care and do what needs to be done, the atmosphere is positive.

The comments above are a mix of both positive and negative. While the positive comments are appreciated, the negative comments, those that can be considered constructive, will be used to foster near-term

improvements in the OIE web page, how institutional effectiveness documents are communicated, and can also serve to drive staffing improvements.

3. Provide an analysis of findings of the assessment results may be leveraged to support equipment, facility, staffing, or other budget and planning need and include the justification in your analysis.

Overall, the survey shows a need for improvement in many OIE processes. It is also indicative of a need to expand OIE staffing. The need for a full-time Research Analyst is document later in this program review, a need that is attested to thoroughly in the survey results and comments.

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and actions by the above evaluation of AUO and/or SLO results. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Student Services Planning and/or Academic Planning tables at the end of the section for any recommendations requiring institutional action. For any items needing Human Resources Planning, Institutional Technology Planning, or Facilities Planning action, please make sure to include the information within the appropriate section and table later in the program review document.

N/A

III. Equipment

Description/Evaluation:

1. List capital outlay equipment, age of equipment and replacement schedule.
2. Identify any existing equipment maintenance/service agreements.
3. Evaluate the condition of capital outlay equipment in light of the replacement schedule and available funds.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of and need for additional maintenance /service agreements.
5. Justify any proposed modification or additions to equipment available for students and/or faculty/instructional assistants within the program.

N/A

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Student Services Planning, and/or Academic Planning table at the end of the section for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

N/A

IV. Outside Compliance Issues (if appropriate for program)

Description:

If appropriate, describe the role of outside compliance issues on the program.

There are no outstanding compliance issues with outside agencies. All current reporting requirements are being met.

<u>**Evaluation:**</u>

Assess changes in compliance or identification of compliance-related needs and the impact on the program.

N/A

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Facilities Planning, Technology Planning and Human Resource Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

N/A

VI. Prioritized Recommendations

A. Prioritized Recommendations for Implementation by Program Staff

List all recommendations made in Section One that do not require institutional action (ie. curriculum development) in order of program priority.

N/A

B. Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in the Planning Process

List all recommendations made in Section One that should be included in Lassen College's planning and budgeting process, specifically in the Educational Master Plan, Student Services Master Plan, or Institutional Effectiveness Master Plan. Separate recommendations into the appropriate plan(s). Items to be included in the Human Resource Master Plan, Institutional Technology Master Plan, or Facilities Master Plan should be addressed in Sections Two, Three or Four in lieu of or in addition to inclusion in the Academic Master Plan. See Attachment C for Master Plan Overview to determine where recommendations are best placed.

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in Institutional Effectiveness Master Plan

Institutional Effectiveness - 2021

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	N/A			

Prioritized Recommendation for Inclusion in Student Services Master Plan

Institutional Effectiveness - 2021

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	N/A			

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	N/A			

Section Two: Human Resource Planning

I. Program Staffing

Description/Evaluation:

1. List the current staffing for the program include: managers, faculty positions, and classified staff.

   Director of Institutional Effectiveness

2. This section provides an opportunity for analysis and justification of projected staffing needs to support the program. Work-study student needs may be included.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness needs more than one person involved in meeting the reporting and analysis needs of the district. Under a prior director, the office relied on outside consultants to facilitate many of the reporting needs of the district. More recently, we hired an analyst to take on some of these duties, but this analyst left after a short tenure at LCC. The position has now been vacant for at least the past five years. The Director recommends that the district fill the research analyst position.

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Human Resources Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

The recommendation here is that the College hire a Research Analyst to facilitate the many reporting needs of the district. This position has now been vacant for at least the past five years.

II. Professional Development

Description/Evaluation:

1. Describe the professional development and professional activities of the program staff relevant to program improvements that has occurred during the period under review. (workshops, conferences, staff development, work experiences, etc.)

Since his hiring in August of 2018, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness has attended conferences directly relate to Institutional Effectiveness (IE) that were conducted by the Research and Planning (RP) Group and by the Association of Institutional Researchers (AIR). The Director has also completed online training courses through AIR that relate to learning outcomes assessment and general IE. Attendance at such conferences and training opportunities in the future will enhance and improve the services provided by the office.

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Human Resources Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness needs more than one person involved in meeting the reporting and analysis needs of the district. Under a prior director, the office relied on outside consultants to facilitate many of the reporting needs of the district. More recently, we hired an analyst to take on some of these duties, but this analyst left after a short tenure at LCC. The position has now been vacant for at least the past five years. The Director recommends that the district fill the research analyst position.

III. Administrative Unit and/or Student Learning Outcome Assessments

Description/Evaluation:

1. Describe any results from assessment of administrative units and/or student learning outcomes that affect human resource planning

The OIE survey results, with corresponding AUO results, display and support the need for the hiring of a full-time Research Analyst.

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning and Human Resources Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

N/A

IV. Prioritized Recommendation

Prioritized Recommendations for Implementation by Program Staff

List all recommendations made in Section Two that do not require institutional action (ie. curriculum development) in order of program priority.

N/A

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in the Planning Process

List all recommendations made in Section Two that should be included in Lassen College's planning and budgeting process. See Attachment C for Master Plan Overview to determine where recommendations are best placed.

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in Human Recourse Master Plan
Institutional Effectiveness - 2021

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
1, 3, 4	Research Analyst	2021-2022	$108,650	Full Time Research Analyst; Increased effectiveness and improved timeliness of IE reporting and analysis

Section Three: Facilities Planning

I. Facilities

Description/Evaluation:

1. Describe and evaluate the Lassen Community College facilities available to the program.

   The facilities currently utilized by the Institutional Effectiveness program are adequate to current needs, but will increase with the hiring of a research analyst.

2. Describe and evaluate additional facilities utilized off-campus by the program (attach any relevant rental agreements)

   N/A

3. Describe any facilities needs identified by assessments of administrative unit and/or student learning outcomes

   N/A

4. Justify any proposed modifications or additions to existing facilities that would better serve the program planned for the next five years.

   The IE program will need an additional office for a newly hired Research Analyst, preferably within close physical proximity to the Director.

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness, Facilities Planning, and Technology Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

- The IE program will need an additional office for a newly hired Research Analyst, preferably within close physical proximity to the Director.

II. Prioritized Recommendations

Prioritized Recommendations for Implementation by Program Staff

List all recommendations made in Section Three that do not require institutional action (ie. curriculum development) in order of program priority.

    N/A

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in the Planning Process

List all recommendations made in Section Three that should be included in Lassen College's planning and budgeting process. See Attachment C for Master Plan Overview to determine where recommendations are best placed.

Prioritized Recommendations for Inclusion in the Facilities Master Plan

Institutional Effectiveness - 2021

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
	N/A			

Section Four: Technology Planning

I. Institutional Technology

Description/Evaluation:

1. Describe and evaluate technology and technology support provided for instruction and instructional support.

Development and Implementation of improved SLO reporting and data structure is needed to become as effective as necessary in reporting and analysis of learning outcomes. Student learning outcome (SLO) assessments are reported at the end of each academic session and administrative unit outcome assessments are reported annually in May. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness will be responsible for monitoring outcome assessment. Currently, the college is using a locally developed system. The college is looking to select a new system to assist in the assessment of student learning and administrative unit outcomes next year. A challenge facing the college (indeed all California Community Colleges) is implementing systems to capture student level success in SLOs to support the disaggregation of SLO data to support disproportionately impacted students. Some of the work required to complete this action can be done in-

house, but much of it will require knowledgeable consultants to work on both CANVAS and the Data Warehouse.

2. Describe any technology and technology support needs identified by assessment of administrative unit and/or student learning outcomes.

   In addition to the SLO reporting and data structure mentioned above, the office will need an additional computer for a newly hired research analyst.

Planning Agenda:

List recommendations and necessary actions necessitated by the above evaluation. Complete Institutional Effectiveness Planning, Facilities Planning, Technology Planning and Human Resource Planning Forms as appropriate for any recommendations requiring institutional action.

Development and Implementation of improved SLO reporting and data structure to include (1) a convenient to use CANVAS structure for faculty reporting of SLO plans and assessment results, and (2) additional data tables within the Data Warehouse to house all Learning Outcomes (CSLOs, PSLOs, GESLOs, and ISLOs) data.

II. Prioritized Recommendations

Prioritized Recommendations for Implementation by Program Staff

List all recommendations made in Section Four that do not require institutional action (ie. curriculum development) in order of program priority.

   N/A

Prioritized Recommendation for Inclusion in the Planning Process

List all recommendations made in Section Four that should be included in Lassen Community College's planning and budgeting process. See Attachment C for Master Plan Overview to determine where recommendations are best placed.

Prioritized Recommendations Inclusion in Institutional Technology Master Plan

Institutional Effectiveness – 2021

Strategic Goal	Planning Agenda Item	Implementation Time Frame	Estimated Cost (implementation & ongoing)	Expected Outcome
1, 4	Development and Implementation of improved SLO reporting and data structure	2021-2022	$35,000	Less burdensome reporting of SLOs by faculty; More meaningful SLO data for analysis by IE
1, 4	Computer for Research Analyst	2021-2022	$4,500	Robust laptop computer with 2 external monitors

Lassen Community College Master Plan Overview

Six master plans comprise the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan. Recommendations from program reviews will be input into the selected master plans as determined by faculty in the prioritized recommendation spreadsheets. To better understand which master plan might be most appropriate for each program recommendation, a summary/objective of each plan is included below. More information can be found in the Shared Governance and Consultation Council Handbook and the Comprehensive Institutional Master Plan.

Institutional Effectiveness Master Plan (IEMP): the IEMP addresses college needs not addressed in other plans. These needs include research, governance, outcome assessment, and administrative operations.

Educational Master Plan (EMP): The EMP addresses the instructional planning needs of the college.

Student Services Master Plan (SSMP): The SSMP highlights the services needed to maximize the student experience through a variety of key student support services.

Institutional Technology Master Plan (ITMP): The ITMP addresses the technology needs of the campus.

Facilities Master Plan (FMP): The FMP addresses the physical infrastructure, facility, and maintenance needs of the campus.

Human Resources Master Plan (HRMP): The HRMP identifies and manages the administrative functions of recruitment, selection, evaluation, and professional development needs of the College to ensure a fully-staffed and highly functioning team of employees.