Action Project

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

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: 2007-09-12

This Action Project is on track. Our accomplishments to date: • Discussions were held with the Indiana University Office of Reporting and Research. The project to develop Indiana University system-wide measures of institutional effectiveness has been put on hold due to the transition of a new university president. Therefore the portion of this action project devoted to working with Indiana University's Office of Reporting and Research has been put on hold and we are proceeding with developing our campus-specific measures. • We assembled a core project team whose purpose is to draft a set of Key Performance Indicators for the campus. The project team has representatives from across campus and its members are the Human Resources Director, Accounting Services Manager, Director of Technical Services - Information Technology, Associate VC of Academic Affairs, Faculty Assistant to the Chancellor, a faculty representative from the College of Arts & Sciences, the assessment coordinator from Nursing & Education, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services and Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. The project leader is the Director of Institutional Research. • We have received permission to work with a consultant, Denise Sokol, who spent 28 years in Institutional Research and has experience developing key performance indicators. She will make a visit to campus to work with the project team on September 12, 2007. • The project team met on August 14, 2007 to review its charge. Sample indicators from other AQIP institutions were distributed. The team determined that we will reach out to the campus by involving our AQIP working groups. We also agreed that our key performance indicators must be linked to our campus Strategic Outcomes. • Our goal is to have our first set of draft performance indicators ready to present to the Strategic Planning Team on November 12, 2007. Final target date for approval of key performance indicators is 6/1/2008.

Review (10-03-07):

This Action Project is recently underway (April 2007) and appears to be making reasonable progress. The project team has already demonstrated its agility with the appointment of the new president and delay in creating system-wide measures of institutional effectiveness. The accomplishments over the past few months have focused on identifying and selecting project team members that will be responsible for the creation of a draft set of key performance indicators. The project team appears to include a representative sample of key areas on campus as well as a mix of administrators and faculty members. The institution is encouraged to consider how additional feedback can be collected from other areas of campus including the student body. In an effort to engage in best practices, the institution has elected to engage a consultant to assist in the process. The initial meeting between the consultant and project team was scheduled to occur near the submission of the annual update. The institution has allowed adequate time to create a comprehensive set of indicators that balance the campus's needs as well as the system-wide expectations. The institution is prepared to deliver a list of key performance indicators by June 2008.

The project team is comprised of faculty and staff from across campus. The team plans to involve our AQIP working groups which total approximately 50 people from faculty, professional staff and bi-weekly staff. These working groups will assist in the selection of

key performance indicators. A call for their involvement went out in early September.
Review (10-03-07):
It is evident through the timeline that the project team seeks to promote collaboration. Through the inclusion of nearly 50 people from the faculty, professional staff, and bi-weekly staff, the team has demonstrated the desire to foster collaboration as the key performance indicators are developed. The institution has taken the AQIP Principle of Learning seriously by dedicating itself through developing and utilizing everyone's talents as it centers it attention on the learning process. The natural diversity in a large team will enhance the end product by including a variety of people with specific knowledge or expertise to enhance the team's efforts. The project team is encouraged to consider ways to involve students within the process. The involvement may occur by inviting students to participate on project teams or through other mechanisms (presentations to student government/clubs, regular communications to students, surveys, focus groups, etc.).

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

We will meet with our consultant, Denise Sokol, the week of September 10, 2007 to begin our work. We will define the areas from which we would like our indicators to come, assign team members to specific areas and determine which AQIP working groups will be assigned to which team members. After the project team's meeting with the consultant, we will begin meetings with the AQIP working groups. Our draft set of key performance indicators will be presented to the Strategic Planning Team on November 12, 2007. We expect the Strategic Planning Team to provide direction on targets/goals for these indicators. The second draft will be due on May 1, 2007 and will be presented to the Strategic Planning Team the week of May 21, 2008.
Review (10-03-07):
The institution has defined several next steps of the committee's work including meeting with the consultant, development of AQIP working groups, assigning team members to working groups, initial and follow-up drafts of key performance indicators to the Strategic Planning Team, and the final submission in May 2008. The establishment of dates for each of these activities has been set and is commended. The thoughtful consideration of the necessary steps clearly indicates the institution's commitment to foresight – one of the principles which underlie all of the Academic Quality Improvement Program's Categories, activities, and processes. The institution is committed to anticipating how to implement changes to the institutional assessment process. In addition to your dates for drafts, the team should be encouraged to develop additional milestones for communicating progress to all stakeholders on campus (faculty, staff, students and administrators). The communication strategy will provide a solid basis for the campus community to understand the need for collecting and reporting the performance indicators.

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

Since this is a new project that we are just starting we don't have any best practices yet; however, we have continued the policy of maximum inclusion and consultation of experts that has served us well in other projects.
Review (10-03-07):

One of the cores of the AQIP process is articulating "effective practices" for the campus community and others to learn. While this project remains in the very early stages, the institution has clearly laid the foundation for effective practice. Of particular note is the inclusion of nearly 50 members of the staff and faculty into the working group. The institution is encouraged to document key steps in the process so they may become a guide for future projects.

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

The two biggest challenges will probably be 1) to stay focused and not select too many key performance indicators 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 for a given indicator.

Review (10-03-07):
The institution has identified two challenges for this action project. The first is the selection of the key performance indicators. As indicated in the action report, institutions frequently find it easy to adopt a large number of indicators. The hiring of a consultant to provide "best practices" will likely help the institution maintain focus. In addition, when considering key performance indicators, you may need to consider the tradeoff between the "ideal" performance indicator and one that is manageable to collect. Some things to consider when selecting indicators include: - Is the date available? - How frequently does the data need to be collected? - How much effort is required to extract the data? - Are there other indicators that approximate your "ideal" indicator, but can be collected much easier? The second challenge, the changing of the institutional culture to one that appreciates data-driven decisions will be a much longer progress. Continue your efforts of incorporating people onto teams. Consider how you can foster a larger degree of collaboration through communication. Finally, select key performance indicators that many stakeholders can connect with and indicators that can be accomplished within a reasonable effort.

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 (10-03-07):
The institution did not request of AQIP assistance. Should the institution find the need for additional assistance; they are encouraged to contact AQIP.