Institutional Effectiveness Partnership Initiative
Partnership Resource Teams
List of Primary Successes and Menu of Options for Institutional Consideration
Date of Initial Visit: Oct 28, 2016

Name of Institution: College of the Siskiyous
Partnership Resource Team Members: Marilyn Brock (lead), Keith Wurtz, Paul Wickline, Christina Gold, Sarah Harmon, Alice Van Ommeren

Primary Institutional Successes

Description of Primary Institutional Successes	Notes and Comments
New administrative staff	● Most staff interviewed had only been there two years or less. ● The faculty were optimistic that some of the problems they experienced in the past would not continue with the new administrators.
College is working on the accreditation findings on warning.	● Staff and faculty seem focused on making things better. ● Some of the ACCJC recommendations were areas that COS had initiated work on (but not yet completed by the time of the ACCJC team visit), and have continued to work on.
All groups see the importance and benefit of training on computer systems and they show a willingness to switch systems and try something new when the existing system doesn't work. The College has committed major money ($2 million) to retraining, rebooting Banner.	● Employees seemed interested in discovering what Banner can do for the college. ● Faculty are willing to consider switching to a new system (Elumen) for program review and assessment.
Administration tried an F to W program to help student success.	● This seemed to work well and will be continued, although more administrative support and Academic Senate review would strengthen the messaging related to data.
There is campus wide agreement amongst administrators, faculty and staff about the need to use data for continuous improvement and decision-making. All groups say they want to use data in meaningful and impactful processes.	● There were repeated calls by all groups for more and better data and for an improved and meaningful program review process. ● There are examples of effective assessment and productive program review in the Math, Psychology and English departments.
Full time faculty are fully participating in assessment and they want the assessment process to be meaningful and used for improvement. They also want to revive a closer relationship with the adjunct faculty in their programs and to help their in their assessment and program review work.	● The Senate reports that all or nearly all of full time faculty complete assessments. ● They currently find the process meaningless and burdensome but they want a process that is helpful and manageable.

Menu of Options for Institutional Consideration for Its Innovation and Effectiveness Plan

Area of Focus	Options for Institutional Consideration: Ideas, Approaches, Solutions, Best Practices	Notes and Comments
A. Development of a plan for improving systems and procedures for the collection and use of data to support research and decision making	1. Continue with plan for technical help from Banner to retrain people and reboot system. 2. Consider training for all staff including part time and full time faculty on software and use of data. 3. Provide training to all research and IT staff on Banner and Argos focusing on how to access data. 4. Implement a program review process which has a continuous feedback loop. (Cerritos and Southwestern are possible resources.) 5. Involve the research office in all data requests, so that it will serve as a single point for data requests, though some might be delegated to IT. This will require a better delineation between IR and IT responsibilities. 6. Establish a systematic process for administrators, classified staff and faculty to make data requests, and create a way to use institutional goals to prioritize those requests. 7. Develop a standard set of reports that are provided by the research office on a regular basis to administrators. 8. Raise the priority level for the implementation of a data warehouse, and create a task force to facilitate the implementation of the data warehouse once the decision is made. 9. Consider creating and maintaining a five-year MIS database that can be used to inform decision-making throughout an academic year and updated annually. 10. Add non-resident FTES to the daily enrollment report. 11. Consider building an enrollment database from the daily enrollment report and providing the data to the college in a more consumable format (see presentation from RP Group conference in 2009 on enrollment management: Enrollment Management, Strategies, Tips, and Techniques). Manually add coding for areas where decision-makers need information even if not included (e.g.: ISAs). 12. As an alternative approach to implementing a full-featured data warehouse, consider creating an automated Data Warehouse using CCCCO MIS Referential Files (see presentation from the RP Conference in 2012 - http://rpgroup.org/resources/automated-data-warehousing-using-cccco-mis-referential-files-and-spss. 13. In general, data needs to be provided to decision-makers on a more consistent basis and in a more consumable format.	Banner has been blamed for many issues when in fact training and understanding the software are probably at least equally the issue. Research requests are not concentrated in the research office. The daily enrollment data is a rich data source that can be used to inform decision-making by transforming the information so that it is more easily consumed. Options 5, 6, and 7 might trigger the need for a data governance structure or process, which takes time to develop, and would likely help resolve issues between IT and IR. See also the 2016 IEPI/ACBO Enrollment Management Workshop Resources: http://www.acbo.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageID=3457
B. Integrating data systems (Banner, etc.) and improving confidence in using data to inform evidence-based decision making	1. Continue evaluating additional data systems to replace Curricunet and complement Banner, and adopt the solution that best fits the College's long-term needs. 2. Establish a campus-wide committee for the evaluation of additional software before it is purchased. 3. Implement a process making decisions such as resource allocation and hiring staff and faculty based primarily on research and program reviews. 4. Create agreed-upon definitions of terms so they are used consistently across reports in order to limit confusion (e.g., persistence). 5. Provide administrator support to the Institutional Researcher when presenting accurate data that might be poorly received despite its reliability. For example, the VPI could present data to campus groups with the Institutional Researcher there to answer questions. If knowledgeable administrators are present and publicly affirm the data, it will have more clout with the campus community. 6. Ensure that Academic Senate is part of the review process when data is released related to faculty.	Campus personnel report that some data presentations by Researcher have been poorly received.

Area of Focus	Options for Institutional Consideration: Ideas, Approaches, Solutions, Best Practices	Notes and Comments
	7. Consider having one source for data, and when data is presented, provide the methodology, fields chosen, location of fields, and the date the data was accessed. 8. Consider developing a process for selecting, implementing, and updating software. 9. Resource for tracking transfer, including out-of-state - http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/TechResearchInfoSys/Research/Transfer.aspx.	
C. SLO assessment and reporting: data collection, tools, training, disaggregation, increasing participation by part-time faculty and integration into program review	1. Training is needed on SLOs for part time faculty. Currently many classes are taught only by part-time faculty who have no understanding of SLO's and no incentive to assess them. Explore the possibility of providing incentives to part-time faculty for completing assessments (stipends, designated amount of paid time). Examine models from other small campuses that have incorporated adjuncts into assessment processes, and adopt practices that fit the College's needs. 2. On mandatory flex days, provide ongoing training for full- and part-time faculty in writing and assessing SLOs, emphasizing the difference between objectives and outcomes and how to write measurable outcomes. Also on flex day, hold a panel presentation of faculty who can tell assessment success stories in which assessment has led to instructional improvement (e.g., math and psychology). The campus needs some enthusiastic voices who find the processes meaningful and helpful. 3. Consider a systematic review of the number of SLOs in each course, and modify that number as needed to help ensure that SLO assessment is both meaningful and effective. For example, in a given course, three or four overarching SLOs that effectively measure overall student learning might replace six to ten SLOs that are both less meaningful and more laborious to assess. 4. Encourage the Program Review Committee Chair and Senate leaders to attend off-campus training and conferences in order to see how their progress and processes compare to those of other colleges across the state (e.g., the RP Group Student Success Conference). Such experiences will improve campus understanding of what the College needs to do to in the area of assessment. 5. Reconsider the expectation that all SLOs be assessed each semester. This cycle is so short that it does not allow time for the effective development and implementation of changes. Have the Senate lead a conversation about revising the assessment cycle. 6. Consider other resources/positions, in addition to the IR Director, to monitor (track and collect) the SLO process. 7. Ensure that Institutional Service Agreements require faculty teaching in those programs to complete assessment and program review. Develop a seamless process, include creating a mechanism for accountability and enforcement. 8. Explore the Chancellor's Office Part-Time Faculty Support program for additional funding related to part-time faculty - http://extranet.cccco.edu/Divisions/FinanceFacilities/FiscalStandardsandAccountibilityUnit/FiscalStandards/PartTimeFaculty.aspx.	Best practices include consensus from applicable faculty on course and program SLOs, and measuring, evaluating and reviewing the outcomes to see if further modifications are needed. This is not a compliance issue but one of improving learning and student success in the classroom. Discussion was held about number of SLOs needed per class.
D. Program Review Processes	1. Create a consistent and easily consumable set of data that is provided to every program for use in the comprehensive program review process, to reduce the amount of time faculty spend entering and extracting data. One data set that has proven useful at other institutions (though there are undoubtedly many more) is as follows: five-year trend data showing course completion and success rates, FTES, WSCH/FTEF ratio, fill rates, and degrees and certificates earned (see data example). Train the program review committee and faculty who are completing program review in how to interpret and use the data set.	Many colleges do a comprehensive program review once every 3-6 years with robust annual updates on each program. The quality and rigor of the annual updates are crucial to the effectiveness and integrity of such systems.

Area of Focus	Options for Institutional Consideration: Ideas, Approaches, Solutions, Best Practices	Notes and Comments
	2. Evaluate program review timelines. Consider moving away from a one-year comprehensive program review cycle (for one example among many, see four-year timeline example). Contact other campuses to see how they use annual plans that feed into budgeting and link to program review so that comprehensive program review can occur less frequently and yet urgent or new requests can still be made each year (see Example 1). Implementing such an approach should improve the connection between hiring cycles and resource allocations based on program reviews, and increase faculty confidence that program reviews are in fact read and used in planning and decision-making. 3. Use a consultative approach to diversify and expand the number of people who will help shape and revise the assessment and program review processes. In order to build the best processes, the campus should engage in a collegial cross-campus dialog about the kinds of processes that would make assessment and program review both manageable and meaningful. This will create a better process and create more buy-in. As a subcommittee of the Senate, the Program Review Committee should bring recommendations for change and other important decisions to the Academic Senate for discussion and a vote. Contact other campuses to obtain models of this approach. 4. Define the term "program." Faculty should not be asked to complete comprehensive program review for a standalone class. Instead, figure out ways to fold standalone classes into other programs for purposes of program review. 5. Encourage administration to provide a set amount of reassigned time to the Program Review Committee Chair; consider establishing a term limit for that position. 6. If the comprehensive program review cycle is lengthened, develop and implement a schedule to provide applicable faculty with training 4-6 months before their reviews are due. 7. Establish a peer review system in which the program review committee meets with the faculty member and the supervising Dean to give friendly feedback and ideas about a draft of the review. It is empowering for faculty to have a group of people hear about their program and their good work on behalf of students. Also, they receive more ideas for continued improvement. 8. Provide a presentation on mandatory flex day by a panel of faculty who can demonstrate that their program review led to program improvements and/or resource allocation. (Math program review led to a shorter sequence for basic skills/developmental course work and English program review led to the consideration of accelerated classes.) 9. Engage the Deans more actively in supporting the faculty in their assessment and program review work. Provide the Deans training as needed on assessment and program review. In the absence of department chairs, Deans may need to provide more support in these areas. Enforcement of timelines needs to come from the Deans, who have authority, rather than faculty members. 10. Create a clearer campus planning and budgeting process that shows how requests from program review are included and prioritized, and how funding decisions are made. Ensure administrative transparency in budgeting decisions; publicly explain those decisions in order to give more meaning to the program review process. Systematically inform the campus community of which requests were funded and which were not funded, and the general reasons for the latter.	Turn-over in committee membership is a good habit on any committee because it provides fresh ideas, new motivation, and more buy-in.