
Action Project

Institution:	Indiana University Northwest	Contact:	Kwesi Aggrey
Submitted:	2007-04-09	Telephone:	219-980-6966
Email:	kaggrey@iun.edu		

Timeline:

Planned project kickoff date: 04-09-2007

Target completion date: 12-31-2009

Actual completion date: --

A. Give this Action Project a short title in 10 words or fewer:

Measuring Institutional Effectiveness

B. Describe this Action Project's goal in 100 words or fewer:

The goal is to begin laying the groundwork for a coordinated and centralized approach to measuring effectiveness on our campus by establishing key measures of effectiveness (what to measure and how) at the university level, campus level and in some cases the unit/department level. The project objectives are: to identify key measures and benchmarks and to develop a structure, plan and process for 1) gathering data, 2) conducting analysis and 3) communicating results to the campus. The end goal is to begin to develop a culture of measuring effectiveness.

C. Identify the single AQIP Category which the Action Project will most affect or impact:

Primary Category: Measuring Effectiveness

D. Describe briefly your institution's reasons for taking on this Action Project now -- why the project and its goals are high among your current priorities:

Based on IU Northwest's Systems Appraisal Feedback Report (April 11, 2006), the Strategic Planning Team in collaboration with the Office of Academic Affairs and the AQIP Team has realized the opportunity the campus has for meeting our institutional effectiveness and assessment needs. In each of the AQIP Categories, opportunities related to measuring effectiveness and assessment exist: for example, • "Benchmarking with other institutions is not identified or reported." • "Some new processes are listed, but no results of these changes are given." • "Results on the effectiveness of faculty, staff, and administrators in meeting objectives are not provided." • "Systemic measures assessing leadership and communication processes are not reported." Thus, we concluded that we need to create a culture of effectiveness and assessment. We want to increase our capacity to make data-driven decisions. We need to measure institutional effectiveness and integrate assessment into our processes across the campus in a centralized and cohesive manner. In addition, after attending the January 2007 Strategy Forum, we concluded that our 2006 Action Project "Measuring Institutional Effectiveness" was too large and broad, and it needed to be divided into two projects representing one campus AQIP "campaign."

E. List the organizational areas - institutional departments, programs, divisions, or units -- most affected by or involved in this Action Project:

Every unit, department, and division will be affected by this Action Project as our efforts will extend across the campus.

F. Name and describe briefly the key organizational process(es) that you expect this Action Project to change or improve:

This Action Project will change and improve the processes of measuring effectiveness in every unit.

G. Explain the rationale for the length of time planned for this Action Project (from kickoff to target completion):

The rationale for the length of time planned for this Action Project relates to both the breadth and depth of the project itself. The large scope of the project means that it will take some time to create a comprehensive system that provides a centralized mechanism for institutional effectiveness at the same time that it builds a culture of assessment: **Phase I (complete by 12/31/2007) The project team will work with the university-wide Office of Reporting and Research at Indiana University-Bloomington to

identify key measures of institutional effectiveness that will be used university-wide.** **Phase II (complete by 6/1/2008) The project team will work with the IU Northwest Strategic Planning Team to identify IU Northwest specific campus level key measures of institutional effectiveness. ** **Phase III (Complete by 9/1/2008) The project team will • define the process for gathering data for each university and campus key measure (when it is done, how it is done and who does it) and • provide training to all those individuals who will be involved in the process.** **Phase IV (Complete by 5/1/2009) The project lead will coordinate the completion of • training, • data gathering, and • data submission.** **Phase V (Complete by 12/31/2009) The project team will • determine who will analyze, publish, and distribute results and how they will do so; • determine which data is for internal vs. external audiences; and • ensure that analysis, publishing, and distribution of the first set of key measures are completed.** Phase VI (Complete by 12/31/2009) The project team will recommend a process to the Strategic Planning Team for the on-going monitoring of the key measures of institutional effectiveness and action necessary in response to analysis of data collected from the measures.

H. Describe how you plan to monitor how successfully your efforts on this Action Project are progressing:

We will monitor the campus's progress in terms of the creation of a centralized and systematic structure and plan for measuring institutional effectiveness and the creation/revision and implementation of the processes related to measuring institutional effectiveness.

I. Describe the overall "outcome" measures or indicators that will tell you whether this Action Project has been a success or failure in achieving its goals:

The following outcomes will measure our success: 1. Strategic Planning team has approved a set of key measures of Institutional Effectiveness (June 2008); 2. All administrators, deans and directors have attended a training session on the key measures (May 2009); 3. The timetable for data gathering, analysis, and distribution for each key measure has been established, and work is on schedule. For those key measures where analysis is scheduled to be completed by early fall, we are able to determine how the campus stands in comparison to our benchmarks (November 2009); 4. All administrators, deans and directors have attended a presentation on how the campus is doing in relation to key measures and benchmarks and understand what feedback they are responsible for submitting (December 31, 2009); and 5. Key measures and related data are on the web for anyone on campus to review (December 31, 2009).

J. Other information (e.g., publicity, sponsor or champion, etc.):

Note: This Action Project is a revision of one that we had previously posted. We needed to divide and revise the project; therefore, we retired it, we created two new related projects, and we are posting both.

K. Project Leader and contact person:

Contact Name: Kathryn Lantz, Director of Institutional Research

Email: klantz@iun.edu

Phone: 219-980-5694 Ext.

Annual Update: 2008-09-11

A. Describe the past year's accomplishments and the current status of this Action Project.

This Action Project is on track. Our accomplishments since the last update: 1. The project team met with Institutional Research Consultant, Denise Sokol as planned on September 12, 2007. Denise gave the team a thorough introduction to key performance indicators, discussed different indicators and dashboards. We discussed and decided an implementation process, technical issues and our next steps. 2. In the weeks following the retreat the team split up and met with key stakeholders on campus which included the deans from each school, Human Resources, Student Life staff, Office of Academic Affairs, Administrative and Fiscal Affairs, Information Technology, Enrollment Services, Faculty Organization and each Vice Chancellor on campus. Each person was given a brief explanation of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and asked what they considered to be the critical top 3 categories that should be measured. 3. The project team held a retreat on October 25, 2007. We reviewed the campus Strategic Outcomes, Voluntary System of Accountability, AAU Data Collection Recommendations, sample dashboards from AQIP institutions, and all input gathered from campus stakeholders 4. After reviewing all the input it became very clear that we had a strong campus consensus on what our top three dashboard categories should be, they are a) Admissions / Enrollment; b) Financial; and c) Student

Outcomes. 5. The project lead made a PowerPoint presentation to the campus Strategic Planning Team on November 12, 2007. It summed up the work to date on Performance Measures and made a recommendation that the campus move forward to develop performance measures in the three categories above. This would be phase I with a second phase to be implemented in two years where we will add two more dashboard categories. 6. The Strategic Planning Team approved our recommended dashboard categories and agreed that the team should move forward to recommend the measures under each category. 7. The project lead contacted consultant, Denise Sokol to discuss progress to date. A discussion as held on possible measures under each category. Denise offered suggestions and advice on many of the measures. 8. The Project Team held a second retreat in January 2008. We again reviewed in detail the input that was gathered in the fall from the campus and the input received via phone from Denise Sokol. At the end of the day we had decided on a set of measures for each category. We also reviewed the feedback received from the HLC on our Action Project Update. As a result we agreed to solicit input from students and the Chancellors group of business advisors (Chancellor's Society Members). 9. In the following months two project team members made a presentation to the Chancellor's Society members and two different meetings were scheduled and held with students. The student turnout was very light. 10. The Project Team met on April 24, 2008. We took a final look at our draft measures along with the additional input gathered from students and the Chancellor's Society Members. 11. The project lead, our Director of Institutional Research, then began gathering sample data for many of the draft measures and a PowerPoint presentation was created. 12. The project lead made a presentation on May 21, 2008 to the campus Strategic Planning Team (SPT) where all draft performance measures were introduced. The SPT made some suggested revisions and approved the measures. A discussion was held as to how targets will be set for the measures. The project team was tasked with making a recommendation for setting targets based on the discussion. The draft process is due to the Strategic Planning Team in September. 13. Our work to date was shared with the Associate Vice President for University Planning, Institutional Research, and Accountability at Indiana University, located at our main campus in Bloomington, IN. 14. Several members of the project team who also sit on Strategic Planning have drafted an initial process to set targets. The Strategic Planning Team is scheduled to meet in late August. We will wait until after that meeting to finalize our draft recommendation which will then be forwarded to the Chancellor in September and then on to the Strategic Planning Team.

Review (10-02-08):

Indiana University Northwest is 12 months into a 28-month-long project to bring about consensus on university-wide measures of effectiveness. These measures range from university-level assessment (i.e., institutional effectiveness) to department and unit level. The project is very ambitious and comprehensive one as it encompasses everything from defining the measures and setting benchmarks to actually doing the assessments and communicating the results. Surely such a project will greatly advance the degree to which IUN possesses the information needed to make data-driven decision, and "information," is a critical characteristic of high performance organizations. IUN is making solid progress. The team worked last year in a highly inclusive manner to achieve consensus on and approval of the institution's key performance indicators by close of spring semester 2008. The team is now working to formulate and recommend a process for setting targets for all measures. The process organized by the Action Project team for achieving this first institutional-level phase of the project is exemplary in terms of its clarity, thoroughness, and inclusiveness. In addition to the 26 members of the institution's Strategic Planning Team, students, alumni, community members, and experts from the main campus in Bloomington were involved. The project, overall, is greatly strengthened by the pains being taken all along the way to consult with a very wide range of stakeholders. While not all of these same stakeholders may come into play in defining measures and targets at program or unit level, the process the team is employing should transfer and make all subsequent efforts highly successful.

B. Describe how the institution involved people in work on this Action Project.

The project team is comprised of 10 faculty and staff members from across campus. Since the last update the team has engaged an additional 8 students and 8 community and alumni leaders (Chancellor's Society Members), and the 26 member campus Strategic Planning Team. Our draft proposal for setting targets will involve the campus faculty organization, AQIP Steering Committee

chairs, and campus deans and directors.

Review (10-02-08):

The thoroughly inclusive nature of this project was touched on above. It is worth noting here that the Action Project Team will take its draft proposal for associating targets with the institutional measures of effectiveness to a solid array of campus groups for input. These groups include the campus faculty organization, the AQIP Steering Committee chairs, campus deans and campus directors. It appears that IUN has a valuable asset in the people that comprise the project team.

C. Describe your planned next steps for this Action Project.

1. Our draft proposal for setting targets will be presented to the Chancellor and campus Strategic Planning Team by the end of September 2008. 2. Once the process is approved we will begin the work of setting targets for our Performance Measures. Concurrently the Office of Institutional Research will begin collecting the data for each measure. There are several individuals on campus who will work with the Director of Institutional Research to supply specific data. They will be trained on what data they must collect, how to collect it and when it is to be collected and submitted to the Office of Institutional Research. 3. Sample graphical representations of our dashboard will be drawn-up by May 15, 2009. 4. In May 2009 as data is being gathered, the project team will make a recommendation to the Strategic Planning Team on a) suggested graphical presentations of the dashboard and b) access and security surrounding the dashboard and measures. 5. By then end of May 2009 targets have been set for each measure and data gathering continues.

Review (10-02-08):

The next steps as described are logical and well defined. This reviewer regards as smart the decision to have the institutional research office begin collecting and compiling data (as prescribed by the agreed-upon measures) even while work on the process for setting targets proceeds. Having the data in hand and ready for use once the target-setting process is finalized will enable to team to sustain momentum and awareness of the project.

D. Describe any "effective practice(s)" that resulted from your work on this Action Project.

Not sure that we have any "best practices" to share at this point. While the collaborative and representative nature in which we have worked make many people feel included, it also makes others feel like it is a highly bureaucratic (ineffective) and inefficient process and therefore devalues it.

Review (10-02-08):

Apparently, the goal is to publish a user-friendly graphical representation of the data "dashboard" online. This, too, is a very excellent practice and will do much to quell the criticisms levied by those who can find fault in the laboriously careful process followed by the project team. Since the team included the data elements in the Voluntary System of Accountability in the full array of measures it studied when first defining the measures, the team may find it productive to return to the VSA College Portrait to see if there are ways of exploiting the similarities or complementarities of these "dashboards." Being able to cross reference IUN's dashboard with the nationally recognized VSA product would confirm that the time and effort invested in creating IUN's dashboard was worth the while.

E. What challenges, if any, are you still facing in regards to this Action Project?

The two biggest challenges will probably be 1) staying focused despite the number of people involved and 2) since we have never been a data driven institution, it will be hard to select quantitative targets for some of our indicators, since we will not likely have data on our current status on some of our indicators.

Review (10-02-08):

If quantitative targets for some dashboard indicators are hard to set because the thing being measured is either hard to express quantitatively or because data is preliminary or nonexistent, the team can still take steps to keep people involved in and focused on the project although doing so may take a good measure of creative thinking. Even hypothetical discussion of example targets with key stakeholders, such as faculty members, can draw out important differences in assumptions about the purpose of targets and the nature of assessment work. So, one way of keeping focus might be to do ahead of time some of the preliminary consensus-building work any campus must do once the 'real data' is in. With indicators that are imperfectly summarized quantitatively, the team might engage stakeholder groups in the development of descriptive targets. Rubrics or other tools used to criterion reference levels of achievement that are multi-faceted almost never fail to elicit much discussion and the exploration of presuppositions.

F. If you would like to discuss the possibility of AQIP providing you help to stimulate progress on this action project, explain your need(s) here and tell us who to contact and when?

Review (10-02-08):