AQIP report on Systems Portfolio Feedback Report
May 28, 2010

Upon receiving the Systems Portfolio Feedback Report, the Category Working Groups were charged with reviewing the feedback and creating a two or three page response to the category feedback. They were asked to describe or elaborate on any area where they think the reviewers may have missed something, misinterpreted something, or where the campus may have missed presenting or emphasizing information. Additionally, they were asked to provide a list of actions they would suggest the campus take as a result of the feedback (what new processes should be implemented, what existing processes should be improved, etc.). The AQIP Co-liaisons and AVCIER then independently evaluated these responses for commonalities and then met to compare these findings. A unified thematic analysis of the responses is provided in this report.

Bulleted items indicate current or potential action items to address concerns raised.

Thematic analysis of Category Working Group response to AQIP Systems Appraisal Report

The responses seemed to fall into one of seven themes below:

1. It is evident we need to do a better job in ***determining stakeholder needs***. This is reflected in Category 3 (e.g., 3P3), Category 6 (e.g., 6P1b), Category 5 (5P3, 5P7), Category 7 (e.g., 7P1b), and Category 9
    a. This is something we need to address systematically, i.e., determining who the important stakeholders are and creating a systematic plan for gathering input/feedback from them as well as communicating regularly with them in meaningful ways.
        - A group in Academic Affairs is working on developing an Institutional Effectiveness plan that includes suggestions for how we can improve our efforts in this regard.

2. The feedback indicated that we can do a better job in ***developing distinctive objectives*** for the campus as well as integrating curricular and co-curricular objectives for the campus (2P5, 2R1b, 2R3, 2R4, 2I1, 1P16b).
    - Student Affairs is working to develop co-curricular goals during Summer 2010
    - Distinctive Objectives of the campus as we move forward would most logically be developed during Strategic Planning

3. Many times we simply did not adequately "***tell our story.***"   This is reflected in Category 1 (1P5, 1P8, 1P14, 1P16b), Category 2, Category 3 (3P2b, 3P5b, 3P6), Category 4 (4P2, 4P9, 4I2), Category 7 (7R2, 7R3).

- For these, it is suggested that the portfolio be updated to reflect these (i.e., suggest a living—but not expanded—portfolio so that it is never a "start from scratch" project)
- Some information in the portfolio was password protected and so the reviewers couldn't access it. As we move forward, we will need to solve this problem for subsequent portfolios.

4. On some occasions, the Portfolio Reviews' ***feedback was unclear or confusing***. This occurred for example in Category 1 (1P6), Category 5 (5P10), Category 6 (6P1b, 6R2b).

      b. Not sure what can be done other than clarifying information in the portfolio.

5. Sometimes ***responders simply disagreed with the feedback***. This occurred in Category 1 (1P9), and Category 4 (4R2).

      c. Perhaps this is a function of #3 above; however, it is likely that the next portfolio will highlight different things anyway.

6.   Most importantly, this theme was one of ***not systematically using data for improvement*** (especially of processes we currently have in place); this included systematically collecting data, benchmarking, and using data for improvement. Includes assessment of student learning outcomes as well as process improvement in non-academic areas. This occurred throughout the feedback.

      d. Increase/continue assessment of student learning outcomes (new Action Project)

      e. Increase comparisons with/benchmarking to our peer institutions
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research will play a key role in meeting this need.

      f. Develop a systematic plan for evaluation of academic and non-academic processes (program evaluations, process mapping, adding/deleting non-academic as well as academic programs, advising, budgets, succession planning, faculty hiring, student complaints, faculty grievances, etc, etc.)
- AVCIER has been charged with developing the plan to move forward in this regard
- Enhancements to Advising models – Advisors Council, Degree Audits
- Mentoring for new faculty – modifications planned for new faculty orientation 2010, plans in development for a faculty mentoring program
- Need to set targets for Performance Measures for 2010-11

7. In many cases the responders simply ***agreed with the feedback*** and this was usually related to the reviewers citing our lack of #6 above.