**Institutional Effectiveness Committee Final Report, 10 May 2013**

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee works to improve functioning across the College. Below please find a summary report on our agenda for 2012-2013.

**Part I. Student Learning:**

1. **Thesis Goals, Structure, Preparation, and Assessment**: This working group is addressing the Middle States recommendation that Haverford examine the structure and preparation for the senior thesis, and develop “consistent but discipline-specific standards for the thesis within each academic department” and a “universal but not uniform, reliable and integrated system of assessment, reflection, and planning.” To that end we reviewed departmental student learning goals, thesis descriptions, and departmental websites, as well as the spreadsheet summary about the thesis that IEC created last year. We wrote a document that presents uniform, complete descriptions of departmental thesis goals, thesis preparation prior to and during the senior year, the structure of the thesis, tools for evaluating student work, and any assessment mechanisms that departments use to measure the success of their overall thesis program. EPC reviewed this document and generated some ideas for revisions, pending comments from department chairs. All department chairs received the document with a request for revisions, and twelve departments have confirmed their review (Anthropology, Astronomy, Chemistry, Classics, English, Fine Arts, Mathematics and Statistics, Music, Philosophy, Psychology, and Religion). We have asked EPC to use the final document as a foundation for community-wide conversations about the role of the senior thesis at the college. These conversations will inform our Periodic Review Report of June, 2015. This group also worked with College Communications, EPC, the Registrar, and the Library to create a unified thesis submission process that we piloted this year. *Working Group: Maris Gillette, Terry Snyder, Steve McGovern*

2. **Student Learning Goals**: This group worked to make departmental student learning goals more visible at the college. We assisted departments that had not yet written student learning goals to complete this task; two of the three outliers did so (at present Tri-Co Linguistics is the only major department that has yet to write student learning goals). We did comparative research on how peer institutions use student learning goals, distributing the results of this research to the faculty at large, and using them to inform a conversation with department chairs about departmental uses of student learning goals. With the approval and assistance of EPC and the Provost’s Office, we made student learning goals a central feature of the External Review process and the submission of requests for tenure-track positions. We conducted a survey of department chairs to identify departments that would like to revise their learning goals and post them on their websites; 13 have responded thus far and we will continue to solicit responses. Six departments decided to revise their student learning goals (Astronomy and Physics, Classics, Fine Arts, French, Mathematics and Statistics, and Philosophy); some have already completed this task while others have identified it as a project for the end of semester or next year. Nine departments have agreed to post their learning goals on departmental websites. Two have agreed to put their learning goals in the course catalogue. One will put the learning goals in their departmental handbook. The departments also identified their current assessment initiatives. All the administrative assistants in academic departments received training in the assessment of departmental student learning goals and are prepared to help faculty conduct program and course level assessments. The Library also identified staff to assist with the assessment of student research and is training all subject specialists in this work. All of this data will inform our Periodic Review Report of June, 2015. *Working Group: Maris Gillette, Cris Fuller*

3. **Learning Objectives and Review for Library and OAR**: The working group’s charge included the development of learning objectives and assessment strategies for the Library and OAR. We contextualized our mandate by reviewing the College’s mission statement, various departmental Teagle initiatives, the Middle States report, the AACU essential learning outcomes (particularly high impact practices for deep learning), comparative assessment-planning data from other institutions, and our own newly-developed strategic plans. We evaluated our respective training and outreach initiatives. General learning objectives and assessment strategies were developed, evaluated and improved upon; these efforts are all grounded in best practice standards for our respective professional agencies. Studies on research practices of students were completed with findings presented at the Association of College and Research Libraries meeting in April 2013, and a team of faculty, librarians and the Director of the OAR attended an invitational conference on effective student research practices. Next steps include: the development of discipline-specific rubrics; qualitative and quantitative analysis of assessment feedback gathered thus far; planning of and eventual participation in a longitudinal study on student research; assessment training and incorporation into our ongoing processes for continual improvement. Each program benefited tremendously from the collaborative approach, and we encourage other departments and offices to collaborate on establishing learning objectives assessment strategies. Please see Appendix 1 for further detail.  *Working Group:  Terry Snyder, Donna Mancini, Cathy Fennell, Lionel Anderson, Kelly Wilcox, Margaret Schaus, Jeremiah Mercurio*

4. **Study Abroad Student Learning Goals, Review, and Website**: This working group collaborated with the faculty group that oversees Study Abroad to create student learning goals and objectives for study abroad. These learning goals will be published on the study away website, provided to students who plan to study abroad, and inform program assessment. The study abroad faculty committee will work to design specific assessment tools to measure the success of particular programs at achieving the college’s goals. This group also worked to standardize travel policies for the College, specifically focusing on the creation of a comprehensive website that will provide centralized access to relevant study-abroad and travel information, a registration portal to document the travel plans of students, faculty and staff, and materials to streamline processes such as the procurement of travel insurance. The group created a model for a Global Haverford Travel Portal and Information website and College Communications began work on this site in April. While the data capture portion of the site will have to wait for FY14, College Communications will complete the bulk of the site by the end of July, 2013. See Appendix 2 for Study Abroad Learning Goals and Objectives. *Working Group: Spencer Golden, Donna Mancini, Cathy Fennell, Maris Gillette*

**Part II. Institutional Improvement:**

1. **Search Policies and Procedures***:* The working group created a standard dossier for departmental and program submission of proposals for tenure-line searches to EPC that includes how new positions serve departmental and college learning goals. We asked present and former EPC chairs to review and revise this document with us, and submitted it to EPC. EPC reviewed our format and suggested revisions. The new submission package was used during the spring 2013 for tenure-track position proposals. *Working Group: Chris Chandler, Steve McGovern, Maris Gillette*

2. **Restricted Funds Assessment**: This working group worked with representatives from the Business Office, Dean’s Office, Provost’s Office, Institutional Advancement, and IITS to propose to the College ways to create and publish a record of restricted funds, their uses, and fund managers, that provides easy access to both historic and current fund information to those who administer and steward the fund, and to develop assessment tools and accountability policies for use of these funds. They created a set of recommendations for proper management of restricted funds that is broadly applicable for all funds across the college. The recommendations include customizing a Kuali module to provide appropriate information on management, history, and planned expenditures for funds, and a set of assessment practices that include quarterly fund reports, training for fiscal managers, and complete documentation of fund uses. The group further recommends that the College put into writing and share its fund spend policies. Please see Appendix 3 for further detail. *Working Group: Diane Wilder, Donna Mancini, Maris Gillette,* *Spencer Golden, Marie Bistline, Mike Gavanus, Nhon Le, Donna Mancini, Janet Heron*

*3.* **Data and Records Management:****Data and Records Management:**This working group addressed Haverford’s Middle States Self Study recommendation to “share and communicate existing information more effectively, and facilitate data collection.” The working group drafted a set of Data Management Principles, which it will bring to Senior Staff, to frame ongoing conversations pertaining to data usage for institutional improvement. The group also identified gaps in institutional policy regarding records management and confidentiality, and reviewed best practices at other small liberal arts colleges in regard to data and records management. A key working group recommendation to improve the quality of, use of, access to and control over our data is to involve users in the transition to advanced data warehouse storage and business intelligence (reporting/analysis) systems. This recommendation includes the creation of a Data Management User Group composed of expert data analysts from across the College. The group’s initial charge would be to support IITS in selecting, purchasing and implementing a robust cross-system data sharing solution.  Data from various systems of record (and unintegrated applications and databases) will be stored in this institution-wide repository (a data warehouse) to enable robust reporting and analysis across data stores (via business intelligence tools).  The group can also function as a community of users who can share experience and support small offices with cross-training, and function as the College’s Data Standards Committee to articulate clear data standards for Haverford and work with Bryn Mawr’s Data Standard’s Committee on standards for our shared data. For further details, please see Appendix 4. *Working Group: Cathy Fennell, Spencer Golden, Jesse Lytle, Donna Mancini, Terry Snyder, Diane Wilder*

4. **Employee evaluations**: This group examined employee evaluation return rates and ways to improve them, and discussed the purposes of employee evaluations. The group recommends shifting the timetable for employee evaluations, with requests from Human Resources coming out in early December and completed evaluations due at the end of January. The group will initiate a conversation about the evaluation process and purpose with Senior Staff, including the possibility of identifying an individual in each area who would take responsibility for ensuring all evaluations for that area were completed in a timely fashion. Finally, the group will conclude its work for the year by reviewing the employee evaluation instrument to identify improvements. *Working Group: Chris Chandler, Jesse Lytle, Cathy Fennell*

5. **Alumni Relations Working Group**: The Working Group on Alumni Relations set out to evaluate and strengthen alumni relations functions, formal and informal, across the College.  The first stage of this work involved stock-taking in order to understand where, and in what form, interactions with alumni are occurring across campus.  A series of conversations with a range of departments led to the administration of a wider departmental survey this spring, and the group now has data with which it can move forward in the next phase of its work.  In this second stage, the working group will consider improvements to policy and practice to help individual departments and the College as a whole steward relationships with alumni.  This work will begin this summer and continue into the coming academic year as necessary. See Appendix 5 for more detail. *Working Group: Jesse Lytle, Spencer Golden, Diane Wilder, Maris Gillette, Jenn O’Donnell*

**Groundwork for future IEC efforts:**

*Civic Engagement basic documentation.* This working group has compiled longitudinal data on civic engagement, tracking student, faculty, and staff service hours and activities.  To provide a solid contextual grounding, we also collected comparative information on civic engagement, community-based learning, and community-based research programs at peer institutions. Currently, the group is assembling a list of academic courses at Haverford that integrate a direct element of community-based learning alongside classroom instruction, and collecting data on volunteer service activity data via a comprehensive student survey.

*Participants: Cris Fuller, Gilda Koutsiouroumbas*

*Course evaluation system background research.*The working group collected information and course evaluations from peer institutions, and explored possibilities for using Qualtrics to build and disseminate online course evaluations. The faculty administrative assistants working in the KINSC were trained on survey software, and approximately 50% of course evaluations in the KINSC are now web-based. Faculty administrative assistants shared ideas for standardization of course evaluations with the Associate Provost for Curriculum and Assessment Analyst. We anticipate that the college’s course evaluation system will move up onto the formal IEC agenda during 2013-14. *Participants: Cris Fuller, Cathy Fennell, Maris Gillette*

**Institutional Effectiveness Committee, 2012-13:**

Maris Gillette, Chair (Provost’s Office and Faculty)

Cathy Fennell, Vice Chair (Institutional Research)

Steve McGovern (EPC and Faculty)

Donna Mancini (Dean’s Office)

Diane Wilder (Institutional Advancement)

Terry Snyder (Libraries)

Jesse Lytle (President’s Office and Senior Staff)

Spencer Golden (IITS)

Chris Chandler (Human Resources)

Cris Fuller, ex officio (Provost’s Research and Assessment Analyst)

Affiliate: *Jenn O’Donnell*, to serve as IEC Web Reconnaissance Officer

Appendix 1: Library and OAR Working Group

During the Fall term, the committee met four times to discuss and plan methods for establishing learning outcomes and developing assessment strategies and processes for improvement based on those outcomes. Much of the work completed during the academic year focused on developing our evolving assessment plans for the Libraries and for the OAR. The committee started its work with two meetings that reviewed and developed a grounding in several important areas:

* the IEC Agenda for 2012-2013
* the mission of the College and the need to refine it
* establishment of learning objectives
* Middle States response
* AACU essential outcomes and high impact practices with deep learning
* the process of developing assessment plans and engaging in the assessment loop
* information from other institutions that might prove useful resources for
* an update on Teagle groups
* Information generated by Maris Gillette and supplied to EPC on Middle States Review and AACU's "Liberal Education and America's Promise" Initiative, which were also shared as handouts

Team members shared an overview of instruction and related work done in the OAR and the Libraries.

Subsequent meetings included a deeper, richer sense of the OAR programming, strategic plan, assessment, demographics and surveys.  Similarly a review of strategic plan for the Libraries, other plans related to learning outcomes such as the digital scholarship support, and a range of assessment initiatives within the Libraries were outlined.

Colleagues from OAR developed an intensive training schedule and organized efforts on campus around workshop planning that coordinated efforts, streamlined offerings, and evaluated efficacy of programs with resulting suggestions for improvement on either program content or time of the event. Collaborative workshops, whenever possible, allowed for greater outreach and more robust content. OAR developed a shared calendar system for scheduling and cross-promotion.

The Libraries developed a series of workshops, some of which included peer-to-peer strategies, which targeted student learning. Many of these workshops, 18 in total, were offered as part of the SaveAs series offered collaboratively through the Libraries, the Hurford Center for Arts and Humanities, Instructional Training and Technology, and the OAR.

The Libraries accelerated their timeframe for the development of learning outcomes, originally scheduled for Summer of 2013 through the 2014 Academic year, to the current year in order to capitalize on the collaborative work that the Co-Curricular Working Group offered. By the end of the Fall term drafts of learning objectives were in hand or in development. In addition some assessment instruments and data gathering were in place for both the Libraries and OAR.

During the Spring term the Working Group achieved several important objectives including our moving from draft into finalized form the learning outcomes for first through fourth year. The learning outcomes, which may be found later in this report, follow the Association of College and Research Libraries best practice standards. Librarians will take those generalized learning objectives and work with individual departments to identify discipline-specific outcomes.

Librarians administered brief post-instruction assessment surveys through the Spring semester and tested those instruments for ease and accessibility. During the summer months, a qualitative and quantitative review will take place with recommended improvements developed for implementation in the Fall 2013 semester.

The libraries developed language to aid study-abroad students under the guidance of Dean Donna Mancini.

Margaret Schaus and Terry Snyder completed their study of the senior theses process for Anthropology and History students for the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years. Preliminary findings were reported to participating faculty and results were shared at the Association of College and Research Libraries meeting in April 2013. After some additional, though modest modifications, the study will be made available for a broader audience.

Building on the senior theses assessment work, a team of librarians, faculty, and the Director of the OAR attended a conference funded by the Alliance to Advance Liberal Arts Colleges to study the question of what constitutes excellence in research. Participants included colleagues from Haverford College, Smith College, Mount Holyoke College, Amherst College, and Swarthmore College. For a fuller description of the conference objectives, see the reports that follow. Additional follow-up conversations will occur in May at Haverford for College-specific opportunities. Terry Snyder will join her counterparts at Swarthmore and Amherst to plan additional grant applications that will include a planning grant and a subsequent longitudinal study grant that will build off of this preliminary work.

Assessment and planning for improvement are underway in both the Libraries and the OAR We each see this work as enabling iterative opportunities to grow our respective programs, and by extension to enhance the learning and research skills of our students. The past year demonstrates the value of partnering and collaborating on assessment, not only in offering educational opportunities for our students, but also in presenting a fresh-eyed approach to review our processes. Already we have learned from each other and see ways to improve our own work through the lens of our colleagues. We would strongly encourage others engaged in articulating student learning goals and formulating sustainable assessment plans to partner with a related department or office.

In continuation of the current collaboration between the OAR and the Libraries, we have identified a series of processes for continued success in the areas of refining our learning objectives, assessing these programs, and identifying areas of improvement. They include:

* Involvement in Workshop Planning Group meetings (monthly)
* Plan and facilitate campus wide strategic workshop planning sessions (May and August 2013)
* Build upon AALAC conference and follow-up discussion (May 2013)
* Partner on OAR self-assessment in accordance with CAS standards for Learning Centers (July/August 2013)
* Attend staff training session on the development of sound learning objectives (August 2013)
* Coordinate and attend a follow-up session to compare program objectives and learning outcomes for AY 2013/14 with the intention of creating additional joint programs and/or supporting programming for each office (September 2013)
* Library staff provide external review of OAR strategic plan to illuminate any gaps and possibilities and to seek out synergies (September 2013)
* OAR staff to review Libraries assessment module and make recommendations (December 2013)
* Develop communication tools for centralizing information including:
  + Meeting data storage needs
  + identifying mechanisms to post relevant learning outcomes and assessment plans to appropriate web pages (December 2013)
* Hold open meetings on objectives and assessment (Fall 2013)

We look forward to continuing our work and are excited about both the work accomplished to date and future steps towards successful outcomes. We look forward to the meaningful impact that our developing cultures of assessment will yield for the growth of our students. Detailed materials for specific and rich reporting on learning outcomes and assessment development for the OAR and the Libraries, as well as some of the standards informing the respective work of those offices, will be posted on the IEC website. These materials are:

1. Office of Academic Resources Comprehensive Report on: Strategic Vision Statement, Assessment Strategies, Theory to Practice Statement, and Areas for Collaboration
2. Libraries Strategic Plan
3. Libraries Learning Outcomes, years one through four
4. Description of Assessment efforts – Mellon, AALAC, and future longitudinal study
5. ACRL Standards on Instruction Programs in Academic Libraries
6. ACRL Anthropology Standards as Discipline Specific Example
7. Leaning Assistance Program CAS Standards and Guidelines
8. Library post-instruction assessment tool
9. Study Abroad information
10. OAR Four year goals and Assessment tool

Appendix 2: Study Abroad Learning Goals and Objectives

We expect study abroad to encourage global and civic engagement. That is, we expect that **global engagement**, in their immersion in another culture, will lead students to reflect critically on the world and on themselves as global citizens, that they will become participants of different communities and institutional settings, integrating themselves into these different spaces, and that they will gain in self-awareness and understanding of their own culture as well as that of another; that the **academic enrichment** of a new curriculum will extend, complement and enrich their Haverford studies; and that in the **personal growth** they experience, study abroad will develop a confidence and self-reliance that will measurably influence and abet the success of their later pursuits, both at home and abroad. Our goals are thus both cognitive, affective and behavioral: cognitive in that we expect students to learn about another culture in depth; affective in that we want them to be morally invested in global issues and the larger world; behavioral in that we want to see them continue this experience in post-graduate study and careers.

* **Global Engagement**

We expect that study abroad will facilitate students’ intellectual growth by exposing them to knowledge, concepts, and/or experiences that reflect a different cultural frame of reference, and stimulate students’ interest in cross-cultural, international, and comparative learning. These goals demonstrate the investment of the study abroad experience in the expressed goal of the Haverford Educational Goals and Aspirations (2010) of “Translation and Interpretation”, asking that “[s]tudents engage in acts of translation, interpretation, and cultural inquiry in every area of their studies. Such practices develop models of reading and analysis that illuminate students’ scholarship and judgments across disciplines and contexts.” Students abroad necessarily engage in acts of translation and interpretation, from one culture to another, and develop an active and practical critical perspective both of their home and host countries. They gain “intercultural competence” or “cross-cultural competence”, the ability to understand and effectively interact with people across cultures.

* **Academic and Intellectual Enrichment**

We expect study abroad to expand, complement and enrich a Haverford education in the opportunity to take academic courses and pursue programs not available at Haverford; that is, we expect that study abroad will expand their study with other courses in their major or minor field of study, complements their accrued courses with others not available to them at Haverford, and thereby enriches their Haverford degree. We expect them to engage in research in a different academic environment, should that be a possibility, or in research that will be instrumental to the senior capstone project undertaken in the student’s senior year; and to acquire proficiency in another language, if language acquisition is primary to their study abroad. All of these contribute, again, to the expressed goal in the Educational Goals and Aspirations (2010) identified as “Mastery and Critique” in disciplinary knowledge or “active participation in the construction of scholarship.” That is, study abroad requires students to master not only course content, but cultural context, and to acquire a critical perspective not only upon the subject matter but upon the different pedagogical approaches, disciplinary perspectives and academic goals that they encounter abroad.

* **Personal Growth and Development**

Study abroad should encourage students’ personal growth and maturity by increasing self-awareness, understanding, confidence and self-reliance during the study abroad experience in such a way that it continues into their later experience, both as a student at Haverford and post-graduation. This demonstrates, in particular, the expectations of a Haverford education grounded in the Quaker tradition; that is, that it will have material consequences both to their further education at Haverford and to the world they enter upon graduation; that it will be, as Isaac Walton proposed, “not more learning, but better learning” or a sharpened and clarified intellectual competence.

**Learning Objectives for Study Abroad**

**Global Engagement**

1. We expect that through immersion in another culture students will reflect critically on the world and on themselves as global citizens, and that study abroad will:

* facilitate students’ intellectual growth by exposing them to knowledge, concepts, and/or experiences that reflect a different cultural frame of reference, and stimulate students’ interest in cross-cultural, international, and comparative learning;
* develop “cross-cultural skills”, that is, intercultural competence or cross-cultural competence in students’ ability to understand culturally different others in various situations, such as academic settings and social venues, so that they become aware of cultural differences, reflect upon them, and can live comfortably in diverse environments. This also includes students’ awareness of their own cultural work view, their attitude towards cultural differences, and growing knowledge of different cultural practices and world views.
* enable students to identify culturally appropriate behaviors of the host country, and participate in academic and other social settings in a manner that is respectful of those behaviors;
* enable students as well to learn about the sociopolitical and cultural perspectives of the host country, and engage with these thoughtfully and constructively.

2. Students will contribute to the internationalization and increasing global perspective of Haverford College by:

* informing the classroom and the broader campus with new cultural perspectives, contributing both in class and bringing their experience to bear on the collective college community;
* increasing the numbers of study abroad students who pursue internships that engage global perspectives, creating student-led seminars that are related to their field of study abroad, and who will attend lectures by visiting cultural figures and social activists, etc.
* actively participating in departmental events as these occur relative to campus visits from speakers from abroad (especially those in the language of that country);
* willingly acting as TAs in language courses where appropriate.
* actively managing student-led activities such as language tables in the dining rooms, round tables, and poster sessions;
* running the various language clubs which arrange cultural activities (such as visits to museums, local theatrical performance, local ethnic restaurants);
* sharing study abroad experience through digital storytelling; articles written for the Bi-Co news, and for Abroad View magazine; talking to other interested students about the study abroad experience;
* volunteering for Study Abroad activities related to the host country: sharing information (including lists of resources) about the host country and city where they stayed, and possibly acting as liaisons with people they met in their host country.

**Academic and Intellectual Enrichment**

1. We expect study abroad to expand, complement and enrich an undergraduate education, which can include:

* the opportunity to take academic courses and pursue programs not available at Haverford, thereby gaining a new perspective on their academic work at Haverford, and especially their college major;
* engaging in research for an academic project undertaken in a different academic environment or context, or
* engaging in research abroad specifically for the senior thesis to be undertaken upon returning to Haverford; or
* drawing upon their academic experience abroad in formulating and shaping the senior thesis or capstone project;
* increased confidence in exploring postgraduate academic scholarships and academic programs in international and global issues, and in pursuing post-graduation careers abroad.

2. Study abroad programs should complement departmental programs in language through a demonstrated improvement of language skills/language proficiency\*. Students will be able to interact effectively with speakers of the host country and can:

* express themselves ably (both orally and in writing) on topics pertaining to every-day life (i.e., *primary discourses*);
* express themselves with relative ease (both orally and in writing) on academic topics they have studied and researched;
* read fluently and accurately most styles and forms of the language pertinent to personal, social and certain academic discourses;
* understand accurately most styles and forms of the language pertinent to personal, social, and certain academic discourses;
* meet departmental goals and expectations

\*Relative to the proficiency with which the student undertakes study abroad.

**Personal Growth and Development**

Study abroad should encourage students’ personal growth and maturity by:

* enhancing students’ self-awareness and understanding of their own culture by providing opportunities to compare and contrast host country customs, values, and traditions with their own;
* facilitating the development of confidence and self-reliance, having gained experience in negotiating the common personal experience of immersion in a new culture—initial euphoria, occasional irritability and hostility, gradual adjustment and adaptation.
* developing practical “cross cultural” skills: learning about a new environment; finding reasons for why things are as they are; looking for patterns and relationships; increased patience and tolerance; learning that they have the ability to fail and recover from that failure; to learn not to judge, but to ask why.
* stimulating a desire for further exploration of new horizons, both local and global.

Prepared by the members of the International Academic Programs Faculty Advisory Board: Karin Akerfeldt, Linda Gerstein, Yoko Koike, Ana Lopez-Sanchez, Deborah Sherman, Donna Mancini (Chair)

Appendix 3: Restricted Funds Working Group Recommendations to Senior Staff

***Working Group Charge:*** *Work with representatives from the Business Office, Dean’s Office, Provost’s Office, Institutional Advancement, and IITS to propose to the College ways to create and publish a record of restricted funds, their uses, and fund managers that provides easy access to both historic and current fund information to those who administer and steward the fund, and to develop assessment tools and accountability policies for* *use of these funds.*

Over the course of 2012-2013, members of the Restricted Funds Group met to address its charge. The two parts of the charge and the group’s recommendations are below.

What do we mean by “restricted funds”? We use this term broadly. Our recommendations are such that the ability to store specific fund information on each fund record applies to **ALL** funds and not just to funds that are restricted either by the College or by the donor who established the fund.

*Part I: Create and Publish a Record of Restricted Funds…*

The group recommends, based on information provided by Sarah Chastain at Navigator Management

Partners (our Kuali Financial System consultant) that:

• The Kuali Financial System’s (Kuali) *Contracts & Grants* module be enhanced to provide the necessary fund information via Kuali as outlined in the customization section below.

The group also recommends that:

• The list of customization be reviewed by the Controller and the Director of Enterprise Systems to be implemented as part of the overall Kuali upgrade work.

**Fund Information to be Kept in Kuali and Customization Recommendations:**

• **Fund Name** – Account Name needs to be lengthened (do in FY13 if possible).

• **Fund Description** field needs to be lengthened.

• **Fund Categories** (purposes of funds, current, vs. endowment, stewardship type, CAE type, Business Office codes, etc.): have a variety of places this could be stored including Purpose (on Proposal/Award), Grant Description (on Award), Account Type Code (on Account), or we could even repurpose a field that we do not use such as Letter of Credit Fund Group (Award)

• **Fund Restrictions** –Use the Guidelines/Purpose free form text fields (on Account).

• **Market Valu**e - the Committee reached agreement that this field does NOT need to be in the FY14 customization. Instead in the procedures list (see Part II: Assessment) we will note that those who need market values may contact Nhon Le in the Business Office.

• **Amount to spend in current year** – Once the budget module system is in place, we can upload this using the budget amendment document within KFS.

• **Recommended spend amount for current year** – there are several fields that could be repurposed for this including the guidelines/purpose field.

• **Historical information on how the funds were spent in previous fiscal years** – this is available within KFS from FY13 onward.

• **Ability to access previous fund stewardship reports and other important communications about the fund** – scanned documents can be attached as pdfs to the Proposal/Award/Account.

• **Current information on how funds have been spent** including amounts, purpose of spending, and person who spent the money-reports to be developed to show this information in such a way as to be helpful to those in charge of the fund(s).

• **Information on how the fund will be spent in the future** – A fund manager might wish to not spend from a fund for several years, allowing it to increase in size for a particular use. This provides information about the fund’s future spending/purposes. This can be stored in another repurposed field.

• ***Reports must be developed to provide information on “multi-fund” projects like OAR/Chesick that involve careful budgeting and expenditure review and reporting on several funds that***

***make up one project.***

*Part II: Develop Assessment Tools…*

We recommend that IITS and the Business Office:

• Develop detailed fund reports that are available to fiscal officers as well as others who are responsible for a specific fund’s stewardship and reporting requirements. These reports must include information outlined in Part I.

• The Controller works with the new Budget Director (to be hired for FY14) to standardize procedures involving funds:

o Provide quarterly fund reports that show fund information and spending to date

Alert fiscal officers as to unusual aspects about the fund and spending.

o Train fiscal officers and others how to store and access fund information

Ensure that fund restrictions, whether set by the College or the donor(s), are easily reviewed as needed.

* Implement technology solutions that allow budget information to be matched to specific funds to track fund spending.

o At the June 30 Year End Fund meeting set up by the Business Office, more information should be provided prior to the meeting about the meeting purpose, the type of preparation and review that needs to be done by fiscal officers, and the desired goals and outcome for the meeting.

An overview of what needs to be accomplished at the calendar year end meeting should be included in the instructions so that new fiscal officers understand their responsibilities at the meeting and come prepared.

The report that is shared with fiscal officers should accompany this written outline and should include the additional fund information outlined in Part I.

Fund Description and Restrictions are important, and fiscal officers will be asked to review these carefully.

Review funds with outstanding funds not yet spent

Flag funds that are overspent.

o Document these processes and provide opportunities for training.

o Documentation should include a list of resources available to fiscal officers including but not limited to:

 a description of Stewardship’s role and contact information for Director of

Stewardship Janet Heron

That the endowment fund market value can be obtained from Nhon Le and provide his contact information.

That there is documentation that describes various reports, what they contain, and the ways in which they can be used.

In conclusion - All funds in Kuali (whether restricted or not) should include *additional* important fund information as outlined in Part I. The work needed to customize Kuali to include this information is to be done in FY14. After this work is completed, the Controller and the Budget Director need to provide the Campus Community with training and reporting tools that allow fiscal officers to track fund purposes and expenditures as well as review related fund budgets. Though the group’s charges did not include a review of the College’s fund spend policies, it was clear from group discussions that the College would benefit by having written guidelines on its spend policies.

**IEC Restricted Funds Group Participants:**

Marie F. Bistline, Assoc. Controller

Janet A. Heron, Director of Stewardship

Michael J. Gavanus, Controller and Ass’t. Treasurer

Maris Gillette, Assoc. Provost and Professor of Anthropology

Spencer Golden, Dir. of Enterprise Systems

Nhon Le, Endowment Accountant

Donna Mancini, Assoc. Dean of the College, Dean of Global Affairs

Diane L. Wilder, Ass’t. Vice President, Inst. Advancement

Drafted on behalf of the Restricted Funds Group by Diane Wilder

Appendix 4: Data Management Working Group

The cross-divisional, collaborative, data-friendly composition of this working group proved to be an effective model for catalyzing discussions of substance about many of the data issues facing the College. We used the iterative process of drafting and refining the **Data Management Principles** as a framework for achieving our goals (charge and meeting schedule attached). After Commencement, we will be delivering to Senior Staff the attached proposal, with a request for approval. It includes a prologue that captures much of the discovery process in our work. The principles themselves are quite simple:

**1) The College owns the data; individual offices are stewards.**

**2) The College embraces collaborative and coordinated data collection, and appropriate data sharing to maximize institutional effectiveness.**

**3) The College abides by all relevant laws and regulations.**

The Data Management Policies section identifies responsibilities for IITS, data stewards, and a proposed Application User Group structure.

We make **three strategic recommendations** to improve the quality of, use of, access to and control over College data as systems evolve. More detail is contained within the attached Principles document, but here is a status update on each:

**1) Develop a College Statement on Confidentiality**

a) The current draft is attached b) Next steps:

i) consultation with IITS on updating the safe computing documentation

ii) consultation with HR on the mechanics of recommended placement for the statement

(handbooks, web, etc.)

iii) updating and sharing the final version with Senior Staff for approval this summer

**2) Involve Users in the transition to advanced data warehouse (storage) and business intelligence (reporting/analysis) systems**

a) Next steps (with Senior Staff approval):

i) CIO establishes a Data Management User Group (DMug)—see page 10

ii) Collaboration between IITS and others in the articulation of a strategy for post- implementation employee technology training—see page 11

**3) Enhance our College-wide Records Management System**

a) Inspired by review of best practices at other liberal arts colleges, three documents were developed and are attached to provide greater detail:

i) Records Management Summary Recommendations

ii) Records Management and Retention Policy

iii) Draft Procedures

b) These documents were shared with the VP for Finance and Administration and the Provost in order to gauge institutional interest and support for an integrated Archives and Records Management approach to support our existing Records Retention Policy, and to discuss next steps. The conversation was encouraging, and the Librarian of the College was given approval to begin work with a census of current records storage, and a charge to develop a strategy and proposal for a centralized, or perhaps hybrid approach, to records management for the

College. This will be a multi-year project, and will require an appropriate allocation

of resources in order to remedy current deficiencies and establish effective protocols.

**Other accomplishments this year include:**

• Study Abroad was used as a **case study** for how we could help data users/collectors in reporting and analysis. This discussion identified the need for a designated data management and reporting support person or structure (DMug?) to assist users in accessing, manipulating and better utilizing what’s already within various college systems and data stores --Getting the data “out” in usable ways to meet “business intelligence” needs.

• An initial **Business Intelligence brown bag lunch took place on April 23.** This was an informal gathering of individuals (pre-DMug) interested in learning about how other areas of the College are using business intelligence tools such as predictive modeling. Corbett Shinn from Advancement Services shared how she initiated predictive model scoring to triage prospect pools. The next topic will be Tableau for data visualization. [http://www.tableausoftware.com](http://www.tableausoftware.com/) (for examples of what Tableau can "do" for Haverford, visit [Texas A & M](https://accountability.tamu.edu/content/university-metrics)). A future topic could be Qualtrics, and how we’re using it. All welcome (let Diane Wilder know of interest).

• To demonstrate to academic departments the **valuable information contained within and available from Raiser’s Edge**, and encourage the sharing of any additional information that the department might have on its recent graduates, at the end of May, IA will be reporting back to academic departments the Class of 2013 post-graduate plans and contact information for departmental majors.

Summary of Additional Materials:

1. Data Management Working Group Charge/meeting schedule

2. Draft memo to Senior Staff

3. Draft Data Management Principles

4. Draft Confidentiality Statement

5. Records Management

a. Summary of Recommendations

b. Draft Records Management and Retention Policy c. Draft procedures

Institutional Effectiveness Committee 2012-13

Data Management Working Group

Charge:

Information Management Initiatives: dual focus

Data Management focus:

a) Host a discussion that will lead to the articulation of high-level College Data Management

Principles and develop a proposal for action by Senior Staff (connect our College vision for tomorrow with today's data collection and management protocols, address data ownership and access issues);

b) Provide feedback to IITS on the implementation of SEADS, the transition to PeopleSoft, and

related plans to centralize data storage, and improve data access and retention;

c) Explore options for helping data collectors/users in managing/improving both data

needed for mandatory reporting, and data needed for business intelligence purposes ( e.g. international elements, civic engagement, educational outcomes).

Records Management focus:

Revisit conversations about College policy and practice on records retention, storage/archiving, and appropriate disposal (for both paper and electronic material). Integrate records retention protocol and mechanics into related data management discussions.

Working Group:

Cathy Fennell (lead), Spencer Golden, Jesse Lytle, Donna Mancini, Terry Snyder, Diane Wilder

Data Management WG schedule/agenda

Nov 2: Review Charge, Overview on systems/SEADS/PeopleSoft conversion (Spencer), Principles intro

Dec 4: Principles (with Joe Spadaro) Dec 11: Records management

Dec 18: Principles

Jan 29: Principles--Spencer (plus Donna to recap study abroad data collection/analysis issues) Feb 12: Principles (brief update); Records Management (Terry)

Feb 19: Reporting at IEC meeting

Mar 5: Principles/Records Management (new developments); Business Intelligence (Diane to share how others are handling BI and analytics.)

Mar 19: Confidentiality statement (Jesse)

Apr 9: Recap of year and review of near-final draft of Data Management Principles with Joe Spadaro

**D\*R\*A\*F\*T** 5/6/2013

TO: Senior Staff

FROM: Cathy Fennell, for the Data Management Working Group of the IEC

Below is background, summary, and detail on the work of the Data Management Working Group regarding the articulation of Data Management Principles for the College. We would like to request your review and formal approval of what follows, and would welcome the opportunity to discuss any questions or refinements you might have.

The articulation of these principles and the conversations associated with them, can be part of our PRR response on the progress we have made on our self-study recommendation #12: “Share and communicate existing information more effectively, and facilitate data collection.” They touch on both the human and technological components of the call to “strengthening support” for institutional assessment that Middle States specifically has asked us to address in the PRR.

<http://www.haverford.edu/provost/reports/middlestates/MSCHEdecisionletterweb.pdf>

The Visiting Team report also noted:

…”The need for a comprehensive, integrated information system and more collaborative information sharing was identified in the self-study and consistently in our interviews on campus… The visiting team endorses the college’s recommendation #12 to put college wide procedures in place to improve the sharing of information and facilitate data collection. (p. 8)

<https://www.haverford.edu/provost/reports/middlestates/docs/TeamReport_Response.pdf>

The drafting and hopeful approval of these Data Management Principles is intended support our efforts in these regards.

Thank you very much for your time.

Cathy Fennell, Spencer Golden, Jesse Lytle, Donna Mancini, Terry Snyder, Diane Wilder

Prologue

Over the course of 2011-12, multiple data-related conversations led to the idea that the College would benefit from having a clearly articulated set of “Data Principles” to accompany our evolving data systems. A working group of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) was charged with drafting a proposal for consideration by Senior Staff**. If endorsed as College policy, these principles would be available to frame additional campus conversations about the points contained therein. The intent in articulating “principles” was to give form to the foundational concepts that are inherent to the ways in which we operate (or intend to operate) regarding data.**

A cross-functional group of data users developed these principles. Input from IITS leadership was incorporated. Key points address data ownership, the College’s collaborative model for data collection and sharing, and legal aspects of data management (privacy/security/reporting/etc.). The discussion identified gaps in our institutional policies regarding records management and confidentiality, for which separate proposals are being prepared for your consideration. Our process also clarified the need for an ongoing structure to continue intra-institutional data-related discussions, and serve as a bridge to Bryn Mawr on data issues. We have included a “Strategic Recommendations” section that provides more detail.

Institutional Needs and Effectiveness

As our data systems evolve and the ability to assess student outcomes becomes more critical, **clarifying our “systems of record,”** and facilitating related protocols is an urgent institutional need. This is addressed within the “Data Management Policies” section, under the purview of IITS, in consultation with user groups.

In order to effectively undertake assessment of alumni outcomes, we need to work toward culture change regarding ‘ownership’ of **alumni contact information**. Maintaining multiple, unintegrated repositories of alumni contact information is problematic in many ways. Institutionally confirming Raiser’s Edge (RE) as the system of record for alumni contact information is an essential step we recommend. However, focused education about the importance of and strategy behind this is critical for buy-in, particularly from academic departments. **Protocols need to be formalized and understood by those who receive updated alumni contact information so that this information consistently reaches RE.** The advantages to departments are that they will have access to the most up-to-date alumni contact information for assessment work, and will not need to use departmental resources to maintain duplicate systems.

Related to tracking outcomes, and in advance of having a data warehouse, it is appropriate to **acknowledge the vital role currently played by Raiser’s Edge (RE) in centrally hosting key data/outcomes** about students and alumni for both reporting and analysis. RE currently includes information about student activities, internships through the Centers, study abroad program/location, senior thesis topic, post-bacc fellowships, and graduate/professional degrees across the alumni body. This information is readily shared with Departments who know to ask for it in their assessment work. At the end of May, IA will be reporting back to academic departments the Class of 2013 post-graduate

plans and contact information for departmental majors. The intention is to demonstrate the valuable information contained within and available from RE, and encourage the sharing of any additional information that the department might have on its recent graduates.

Since **the initial PeopleSoft implementation for student records has not yet been configured to capture comprehensive undergraduate activity data**, RE will continue to serve this role for some time. Future implementation of such a module would be a valuable, integrated source of campus assessment

data. Therefore, we recommend that such a module be seriously considered when prioritizing among the various institutional needs for future IITS attention.

Another key theme throughout our discussions was training. **As technology systems and approaches evolve, the community would benefit from a clear articulation of technology training expectations and institutional supports.** The topic of training could warrant particular feedback from Senior Staff.

**The articulation of the data management principles, if approved, frames and supports progress on each of these institutional needs, thereby contributing to Haverford’s effectiveness and the accomplishment of our educational mission.**

**D\*R\*A\*F\*T Haverford College**

**Data Management Principles**

**1) Introduction**

Data collection and management is critical to the successful achievement of the College’s educational mission. Capturing reliable, high quality data; ensuring broad but appropriately secure access to those data; and providing sophisticated tools and techniques to enable the analysis of those data will allow the College to serve its students, alumni, and institutional stakeholders most effectively.

The College’s data management principles are informed by the following information-related goals:

• Accurate and reliable data, available to those who need that data

• Centralization of data resources whenever possible

• Widespread adherence to institutional confidentiality and governmental privacy and security laws, rules and regulations

• Well-defined and executed data security practices, including record retention and disposal

• Clear communication of collaboratively-determined data standards and practices

• Effective and efficient coordination of capture and dissemination processes

• Integrated, user-friendly business intelligence tools to access, store, organize, analyze, and report data

• Robust documentation and training

**2) Data Management Principles**

**a. The College owns the data; individual offices are stewards.**

For the College’s purposes, data includes any information, current or historical, about College stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, alumni and friends, members of the Corporation and Board of Managers, benefactors and supporters); academic, co-curricular and other programs;

institutional finances, operations, and assets; College policies and practices; and all information related to evaluations, assessments, planning exercises, and strategic plans.

b. **The College embraces collaborative and coordinated data collection, and appropriate data sharing to maximize institutional effectiveness**.

a. Data stewards have specific responsibilities for collecting, maintaining, securing,

and appropriately sharing data within their purview and systems. (See

Appendix I for additional detail on data stewards and sources.)

b. IITS is responsible for managing policies and protocols related to centralized and network data storage, security, and access.

c. The College collaboratively supports on-going employee technology training.

**c. The College abides by all relevant laws and regulations.**

a. Areas covered include information privacy, security, reporting, and research protocol, among others. (Appendix II summarizes and/or provides links for additional detail.)

**3) Data Management Policies**

a. IITS is responsible for leading the collaborative process of managing, securing, and improving our data systems. Leadership areas include:

a. Researching, acquiring and launching institutional data systems, including initial

application training and subsequent upgrades

b. Managing the risk associated with maintaining data

1. Developing and periodically reviewing reliable access and security controls (both technological and human) for centrally stored information, and advising data stewards on appropriate protocol for data stored in auxiliary systems.

2. Informing and periodically reminding all those accessing institutional data of the College’s Statement on Confidentiality (to be published).

3. Securely maintaining centralized College records as well as those stored

on network servers, and consulting with relevant data stewards and the College Archivist/Records Manager in adhering to College record retention policies.

c. Establishing, in consultation with user groups, the systems of record and related protocols to ensure that all data-users are accessing the most accurate, up-to- date data from those systems of record; IITS responsibility includes

coordination of the critical data update protocols that involve multiple departments.

d. Facilitating employee technology training, by establishing and supporting the

activities of Application User Groups (either within departments or across divisions)

b. Data stewards are responsible for ensuring the accuracy and reliability of the data within their purview.

a. Individual offices are responsible for adhering to and periodically reviewing

College policies on confidentiality

b. Individual offices are responsible for updating the system of record (or alerting the data steward for that system of record) of any updated information they receive

c. Individual offices are responsible for providing appropriate/necessary intra- institutional access to systems of record, with the assistance of IITS

d. Individual offices are responsible for engaging all departmental data

professionals to improve data quality and processes

e. Individual offices are responsible for function-specific training, cross-training of staff, and documentation of local data management applications.

f. Individual offices are responsible for securely maintaining records and consulting with the College Archivist/Records Manager in adhering to College record retention policies

c. Application User Groups (either within departments or across divisions) support post- implementation application education and cross-training.

a. On-going user support/troubleshooting

b. Demonstration and sharing of techniques for accessing data within legacy, auxiliary, and new data systems

**4) Strategic Recommendations to improve the quality of, use of, access to, and control over**

**College data as systems evolve.**

**a. Develop a College Statement on Confidentiality (draft under development)**

a. Develop and inform all employees of the College’s confidentiality expectations

(draft under development for Senior Staff approval).

b. Charge department managers with responsibility of discussing the Confidentiality Statement with all departmental employees and student workers, as appropriate, at time of hire and periodically thereafter. A departmental manager may request signature to the Confidentiality Statement.

**b. Involve Users in the transition to advanced data warehouse (storage) and business intelligence (reporting/analysis) systems**

**a.** Request that the CIO establish and support a Data Management User Group

(DMug)

1. Composed of expert level data analysts from across the College

2. Initial charge: to support IITS in selecting, purchasing, and implementing a robust cross-system data sharing solution. Data from the various systems of record (and unintegrated applications and databases) will be stored in this institution-wide repository (a data warehouse) to enable robust reporting and analysis across data stores (via business intelligence (BI) tools). See Appendix III for background material on Business Intelligence and Higher Education.

3. Subsequent charge: to function as a community of data users from

across the college who can share experience and techniques, particularly BI tools/approaches and support small offices with cross- training.

4. A subcommittee of the DMug will function as the College’s Data

Standards Committee (DSC) in order to:

a. Articulate clear data standards for Haverford, involving Data

Stewards in the process

b. Work with Bryn Mawr’s Data Standards Committee to develop standards for the data shared between our institutions

b. Articulate the College’s strategy for post-implementation employee technology training

1. IITS collaborates with the DMug (IEC? HR?) in drafting a plan for Senior

Staff discussion. Topics could include:

a. What are our expectations for technology skill development among employees?

b. What is the distinction between good customer support and

formal training?

c. What is the IITS role in the creation/facilitation/support of User

Groups, such as DMug?

d. How do we support on-going training in applications and techniques for accessing and analyzing data within legacy, auxiliary, and new data systems (includes utilizing existing tools more fully)?...role of DMug?

e. How do we support cross-training within small offices?...role of

DMug?

f. For new hires: How do we verify that position descriptions include the requisite technology skills? Or is it more important that employees be “adaptable” in a technological sense?

g. Should we identify core technology competencies to require of all employees, and somehow do pre-employment testing and post-employment skill development?

h. Professional Development for current employees: How might technology skills training specifically be offered/encouraged/discussed within the context of the annual evaluation?

i. Other?

c. **Enhance our College-wide Records Management System (proposal under development)**

a. Include a proposed management structure, records retention policy statements/definitions/schedules, operational procedures, and a timeline for all College Departments to comply

Notes on Technology Committees:

TAC—Technology Advisory Committee: to advise IITS on prioritizing projects

-Broad institutional view, perhaps some senior staff? faculty?

DMug—Data Management User Group: analytical and cross-training support

-Expert data analysts, IT professionals embedded within departments, some data stewards

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

EMPLOYEE CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT Draft 3-21-2013

Employees and other individuals doing work for Haverford College (e.g. volunteers or interns) may in the course of their work have access to confidential or personally identifiable information about students, parents, staff, faculty, alumni, donors, volunteers and customers. This information is protected by College policy and by law.

Confidential information includes any information that identifies or describes the individual (other than “directory information” for current students who have not limited the release of such information). Personally identifiable information is defined as first and last name (or first initial and last name) in combination with any one of the following: Social Security number; driver’s license or state identification card number; or a financial account, credit or debit card number, with or without any required security code, password or PIN number that would permit account access.

Accessing, using and/or disclosing such information for any reason other than the legitimate pursuit of the individual’s employment or volunteer responsibilities or in ways that jeopardize the security of such information constitutes misuse.

The College expects that all employees and volunteers will comply with the safe computing practices identified in the document entitled “Working with Confidential Information”.

All employees and volunteers are expected to safeguard and refrain from disclosing passwords and other codes that allow access into College computer systems. Any access to electronic systems containing College data and made using an individual’s login and password is that individual’s responsibility. If there is a possibility that someone other than the individual has used his or her login information, the individual is responsible for immediately reporting the circumstances to Instructional & Information Technology Services and requesting a new password.

An employee’s or volunteer’s access to confidential or personally identifiable information of the College is conditioned upon the employee’s acceptance of the obligations described in this Confidentiality Statement. Obligations to protect confidential information continue after termination of an individual’s employment or a volunteer’s period service. Any misuse or unauthorized release of such information, either during or subsequent to the conclusion of performing work for Haverford College, may for employees be grounds for legal and/or disciplinary action up to and including discharge from employment with the College and civil or criminal liability; volunteers similarly may incur civil or criminal liability and may be asked to cease their services to the institution.

WORKING WITH CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FOR EMPLOYEES, INCLUDING STUDENT EMPLOYEES

The policy on “Acceptable Use of Information Technology Resources” (<http://iits.haverford.edu/policies/acceptable-use-of-information-technology-resources/>) generally defines appropriate computer use practices at Haverford College. However, when working with personal or confidential information, a higher standard of practice is required to ensure compliance with federal and state privacy and security regulations. The strictest standards apply to personally identifiable information, which is specifically regulated by both Federal and state law. Personally identifiable information includes first and last name (or first initial and last name) plus any of the following: Social Security number; driver’s license or state identification card number; or a financial account, credit or debit card number, with or without any required security code, password or PIN number that would permit account access.

In order to ensure that confidential and personally identifiable information is properly safeguarded, it is important to comply with the following guidelines, both at work and at home. It is particularly important to be vigilant when working at home with confidential information, since the system protections available at the College are typically not present. Do not work on home computers with personally identifiable information.

Computers must be regularly updated with the most current version of anti-virus and anti- malware software, all announced patches and bug fixes installed promptly and anti-virus and anti-malware software run regularly to detect and remove invasive software.

• For College machines, IITS provides automatic updates for anti-virus software. The College uses McAfee’s VirusScan anti-virus software, which employees may install on their home computers at no cost and will run automatically. Otherwise, anti-virus software should be run at least weekly.

• Keep current with all critical security patches (e.g., Windows and MacIntosh updates), which are announced periodically by the vendor. Never install patches sent by email; these are viruses.

• Run anti-malware programs (the College uses Malwarebytes, Anti-malware software)

weekly.

• If a College-owned machine shows signs of compromise (unexpected pop-up windows, suddenly sluggish response, or other anomalous behavior), run the anti-malware program and notify IITS. If your computer has access to personally identifiable information, unplug the machine from the network, don’t touch the machine further and notify IITS immediately.

Computers must be password protected, with a password that is unguessable and changed regularly. Passwords for accessing College information should not be used for other purposes. (For example, your campus email password should not be the same as the one you use for access to your PDA or non-Haverford email account.). Do not keep passwords in places where others can find them.

Computers should be turned off when not used for any extensive period of time and secured from unauthorized access when the employee is away from his/her office or home workspace.

Security measures include securing the space (e.g., locking the office or room door) and/or securing the information on the machine (e.g., by closing the application or locking the computer) so that others can’t access the information. Computers and printers should be turned off at the end of the work day unless overnight reports are being run.

Staff who plan to work at home with files that contain confidential information for employees, students, or alumni should discuss this with the department manager and receive his/her approval to do so. Personally identifiable information should not be accessed or worked with on

a home computer. If you need to work from home using personally identifiable information, there are options, including Remote Admin and Microsoft Remote Desktop, that will allow you to

access your office computer remotely. Contact your supervisor or LITS for details.

All files containing personal or confidential information need to be used, stored and disposed of properly.

Paper files taken home must be stored in a secure place (e.g., a locked file cabinet) when not in use. The files must be returned to the office in an appropriate time frame, with no copies retained at home. Discarded paper files should be returned to the office for disposal through appropriate office channels. Do not throw in home garbage or home recycling.

When working with electronic files on shared home computers, a firewall (either software, hardware or both) must be installed and enabled and the files must be password protected. In addition, when naming files, remember that file names are inherently insecure and should never contain personally identifiable, confidential or otherwise sensitive information.

When the work is completed (using a home machine), all work-related files must be removed from the local hard drive. While putting the files in the computer trash bin and then emptying the trash removes the data from the visible files, remember that specialized software may still be able to retrieve the files. When removing files containing confidential data, utility software (e.g., Norton Utilities) should be used to remove the files completely.

Prior to being replaced, an office machine containing confidential or personally identifiable information should have that information removed using software like the Spybot shredder capability. This provides added assurance that the data cannot be accessed between the time the machine is removed from the individual’s office and when IITS completely erases its hard drive before disposal.

If at all possible, avoid storing personally identifiable information on laptops, PDA’s, flash drives or any other portable device. If it is unavoidable, the storage area on the device must be encrypted. Any portable device on which confidential or personal information resides must also be physically stored in secure place (e.g., locked drawer or cabinet).

The College does not provide technical support for encrypting email. Files containing personally identifiable information should not be sent as email attachments.

Files should not be opened or saved on computers running peer-to-peer file sharing programs, because of the inherent risk of such software. Browsers should not be set to remember passwords or data in forms. If you suspect that your computer has been compromised by a worm, virus or other invasive software, report the problem immediately to IITS. By law, the College has reporting and other responsibilities if personally identifiable or confidential data are accessed by unauthorized users.

**Records Management Summary Recommendations:**

A. Management:

1) Integrated archives and records management process into one program

2) Change of authority for records management to Archives and Records Management program with dotted line reporting on records to Vice President for Administration or his/her designate.

B. Policy Documents:

1) Policy and definitions: Existing statement modified with suggestions for adaption; more work to be done if concept approved.

2) Retention schedule: Existing schedule covers needs; establish some mechanism for periodic review

C. Procedures:

1) Records Liaisons – more formally establish group and meet quarterly or as needed with Archivist/Records Manager on individual or group basis.

2) Records Storage

a. Physical records: Currently records are stored in a range of attic and other spaces which have no true security and place records at risk. Records should be stored in stable and secure environment with controlled access. Space needs must be identified and secured. Start with a review of existing spaces and what is stored and develop recommendations.

b. Electronic records: storage of electronic records is not fully developed and is an area of need. The libraries’ area of responsibility and expertise does include the development and maintenance of an institutional repository for historically significant documents and databases. Further exploration and identification of a e-records system in conjunction with other campus partners; such needs can be integrated into related e- repository explorations currently underway. Some integration of archival needs for historical e-records is important in the consideration and development.

3) Records Transfer - Develop a set of procedures for transfer of records

4) Records Destruction - Develop a set of procedures, preferably centralized, for secure destructions. Procedures should include a review of records before destruction to ensure the appraisal, identification, and preservation of historically significant records.

**Overview**

**Haverford College**

**Records Management and Retention Policy**

**Draft 2/11/2013**

The College Archives and Records Management program is responsible to the College for orderly retention and disposition of all academic records. Effective records management is a critical to the success of an institution’s effectiveness. Records are among an institution’s important assets and as a result unmanaged records are a liability that put the College at risk.

**Responsibility**

The purpose of the Haverford College Records Management program is to provide records retention and retrieval services that assist faculty and administrative staff in the ongoing operation of the College. Storage is provided for College business, academic, and other records that must be retained but are generally no longer needed on a daily basis. Careful management of semi-active and inactive records ensures that institutional needs are met in a responsible and legal manner and permits the transfer of records of historical and enduring value to the Archives at the conclusion of the retention period.

**Policy**

It is the policy of Haverford College to comply with applicable laws and best practices with regard to the records it maintains, and to apply those laws and practices consistently across College offices.

**Purpose**

It is the purpose of this Records Management and Retention Policy:

• to define certain terms relevant to records management and retention;

• to establish accountability for records management and retention;

• to strengthen safeguards against the inadvertent disclosure of confidential records;

• to operate in conjunction with other College policies and programs relating to the generation or maintenance of records, including, but not limited to, the College’s Information Security and Identity Theft Prevention Program;

• to establish the length of time certain categories of records are required to be maintained and stored;

• to establish the time at which certain categories of records should be destroyed, absent exceptional circumstances;

• to preserve and protect physical and digital records

• to provide appropriate physical and digital storage space;

• to establish appropriate records destruction practices;

• to transfer records of historical significance to the College Archives.

**Definitions**

Records are information in any format or media created in the course of College business. Familiar formats include, but are not limited to paper and electronic documents, microforms, audio and video recordings, databases, and electronic mail messages. College records include but are not limited to minutes; correspondence; memoranda; financial records, such as invoices, journals, ledgers, purchase orders, grant documentation, and other information pertaining to fiscal matters; published materials, including reports and newsletters; moving images and photographs; sound recordings; drawings and maps; and computer data or other machine readable electronic records, including electronic mail. Typically, but not necessarily, college records fall into some of the following categories: personnel (staff and faculty), student, alumni, financial, research administration, health and safety, physical plant, and general administration and management records.

Not included in this definition are records created by staff members in activities outside of the College; personal private documents; and faculty research and writing. Faculty’s work in advising students, committee work or administrative roles do constitute College records.

Confidential Record:

The following types of Records are considered confidential:

• “Education records” as defined by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of

1974, as amended;

• Individual employment records, including records which concern hiring, appointment, promotion, tenure, compensation, performance, termination or other circumstances of employment;

• Records that include "protected health information" as defined by the Health Insurance

Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA);

• Records the use of which has been restricted by contract;

• All administrative and financial records of the College, unless specifically excluded by

the Vice President for Finance and Administration [in existing statement but I’m not clear why or when this would be appropriate. Transparency?];

• Records which might expose the College to legal liability if treated as non-confidential.

Duplicate Record: A copy of a Record maintained by a College office other than the

Responsible Office.

Electronic Record: Any Record that is created, received, maintained and/or stored on College local workstations or central servers, regardless of the application used to create that Record. Examples of Electronic Records include, but are not limited to, electronic mail, word processing documents, spreadsheets and

databases.

Paper Record: Any Record maintained in a hard copy paper format, regardless of whether the Record was originally created on paper or as an Electronic Record.

Record: Electronic and Paper Records, collectively.

Retention Period: The retention period set forth in the College’s Records Retention

Schedule.

Responsible Office: The College office responsible for ensuring that a particular Record is maintained for the Required Retention Period.

**Authority and Responsibilities**

**Archives and Records Department (recommended change from College Archives)**

The Haverford College Archives and Records Department is the steward of records for the College. The department works with departments and offices throughout the College to ensure that records are managed, retained, and safe-guarded in accordance with the College’s policies and procedures.

The Archives and Records Department protects and preserves records of enduring value. The Archives collects, preserves and makes available historically significant documents and other materials that reflect the College’s origins and development and the activities and achievements of its officers, staff, faculty, students, alumni, and benefactors. As the archival repository for all college records, it has the authority to collect, appraise, describe, preserve, and make available college records of enduring value in compliance with appropriate laws and regulations. The College Archives advises faculty, staff, and administrators on the proper management and disposition of their departments’ college records.

The College Archives and Records Department shall consult with appropriate staff or faculty regarding any special conditions of access that it may need to place on any records. In the absence of specific restrictions, the College shall open all college records under its stewardship

to researchers on a non-discriminatory basis, according to its general policy on access to archival collections. The College Archives is responsible for determining the appropriate disposition for college records in consultation with the necessary faculty, staff, and administrators.

**Departments and Offices**

All departments and offices are responsible for properly managing their college records. Each department shall establish a records liaison to work closely with the Archives and Records

Department. The staff or faculty member in charge of department records, or the staff or faculty member in charge of the records of official committees, is responsible for consulting with the College Archives to determine the proper disposition and storage of their college records in compliance with appropriate laws and regulations and records schedules.

**Employees**

Employees of Haverford College are responsible for being aware of this College Records Policy and properly managing the college records in their care. Staff may seek guidance from their supervisors or from the College Archives.

**Summary of Best Practices for Managing Records**

Departments and offices must manage their college records in a trustworthy manner that ensures their authenticity. In order to do this, departments and offices must:

• Create records that accurately document their core activities.

• Work with the ARD to manage and store their records in a manner that facilitates timely and accurate retrieval.

• Transfer their records to ARD for storage in secure locations and safe, stable environments.

• Allow only those with the proper authority to have access to their records.

• Know and carry out the proper disposition of their records, that is, know what to do with their records when they no longer actively use them.

• Know and comply with Haverford policies and the external laws, regulations, standards, and professional ethics that affect the management of their records.

**Safeguards Against Unauthorized or Accidental Disclosure**

Until records are properly disposed in accordance with the Records Retention Schedule, each office of the College is accountable for working with the ARD in securing and maintaining its Records, regardless of format or location. Each office is accountable for ensuring that employees, and others, are only granted access to Confidential Records essential to the

performance of their duties. Further, each office must ensure that those granted access are trained and employ reasonable safeguards to protect the Confidential Records.

**Records Retention Schedule**

The Records Retention Schedule sets forth the length of time Records should be retained.

The Responsible Office must ensure that Records are retained in accordance with the Records Retention Schedule. The Records may be maintained in the Responsible Office or in another location as designated by the Responsible Office.

Duplicate Records should be destroyed once no longer necessary to the operation of the office

maintaining the Duplicate Record.

**Extended Retention Period**

The Responsible Office may retain a Record beyond the Required Retention Period if good cause exists for doing so. In that situation, the Responsible Office will ensure that the Record is destroyed in accordance with this policy once the need for its extended retention ends.

**Destruction**

Disposition of records will follow the retention schedule and no records will be destroyed

without authorization of the originating office. Approximately one month prior to the disposition date shown on the original Transfer Request form, the Archives and Records Program will notify departments of boxes eligible for disposition. Originating offices may: 1) change the disposition dates in order to retain the material for a longer period; 2) authorize destruction; and 3) indicate the method (confidential shredding or recycle). The ARD will evaluate any records authorized

for destruction for historic or enduring value and will either: arranges for the final disposition of approved destructions or move historically significant records to the Archives.

**Suspension of Records Retention Schedule and Litigation Hold Directives**

When litigation involving the College or its employees is filed or threatened, the law imposes a duty upon the College to preserve all Records that pertain to the issues involved. Once aware that litigation exists or is likely to be commenced, the College’s attorneys or the Vice President for Finance and Administration will issue a litigation hold directive to appropriate personnel. The litigation hold directive overrides the Records Retention Schedule to the extent it may have otherwise called for the destruction of Records covered by the hold directive until the hold has been lifted by the College’s attorneys or the Vice President for Finance and Administration. The suspension applies equally to Paper and Electronic Records, including Duplicate Records. No College employee who has been notified of a litigation hold may alter or destroy a Record that falls within the scope of that directive.

Any College employee who becomes aware of litigation or threatened litigation prior to receiving a litigation hold directive shall inform the Vice President for Finance and Administration immediately and shall suspend the Records Retention Schedule until either (a) a litigation hold directive, defining the scope of the suspension, is issued by the College’s attorneys, or (b) the employee receives confirmation from the Vice President for Finance and Administration that no litigation hold directive will be issued.

**Training and Oversight**

The Haverford College Archives and Records Program in conjunction with the Vice President for Finance and Administration, or his/her designee, shall be responsible for the overall administration of this Policy.

Each member of the College’s Senior Administrative Staff shall identify an individual to serve as

the Records Management Liaison responsible for training and oversight relating to this Policy within that Staff member’s area of the College. At a minimum, the Records Management Liaison will:

• train new College employees regarding this Policy and its implementation within the

Liaison’s area of the College;

• provide a reminder to all employees regarding the terms of this Policy and the Records

Retention Schedule on or about April 1st of each year; and

• take steps to generally assess compliance with this Policy on an annual basis. The Records Management Liaison will report systemic failures to comply with this Policy to the Records Manager/Archivist or the Vice President for Finance and Administration, or his/her designee, who will take steps to address those failures.

**Transferring Paper Records (draft)**

1. Records must be packed in standard, sturdy records boxes. Check with the Records Manager for information on recommended boxes. Generally these boxes are sturdily constructed to withstand stacking

on pallets. Fifteen inches of letter size or twelve inches of legal size material fit in each box.

2. Do not pack Pendaflex or "hanging" folders in the boxes.

3. Do not over pack the box so that the lid does not go on firmly; or so that the sides bulge. Over-packed boxes do not fit on the shelving.

4. Never lay additional files on top of files already packed; doing this prevents access to those underneath.

5. Leave 1.5 inches of space in each box to allow for the easy retrieval of files; additional space should be left if it is known that more files will be interfiled at a future time.

6. Records should be packed in the same order as they were maintained in your filing cabinets; letter size starting at the 12" end of the box with the logo, and legal size on the 15" side, and all files must face the same direction for efficient retrieval.

7. Prepare an inventory by box number of the contents in that box; keep the original for future retrieval information and send a copy to the Archives and Records Department (ARD) with the boxes when they are picked up.

8. Keep writing on the box to an absolute minimum. Two items of information only are necessary to be written on the box: your Department and the departmental box number smaller end of the box.

9. A records transfer form must be completed for each group of boxes being sent to the ARD. Be sure to enter a destruction (or disposition) date on the form to indicate when the boxes may be disposed of after your approval. Staple all detailed box inventories to the Transfer Request form and give to the courier when the boxes are picked up. Be sure to keep a copy in your files.

Note: The above represents the basic model, but these procedures should/could be worked out electronically, i.e. create an automated and paperless way of sending inventories and notifications of record transfers.

**Procedures for Transferring / Storing Electronic Records:**

To be developed after storage solution identified

**Procedures for Destroying Records:**

1. No material is disposed of or destroyed without written authorization from the originating department.

2. Approximately one month prior to the disposition date shown on the original Transfer Request form the

Archives and Records Program will notify departments of boxes eligible for disposition.

3. Departments should review the list of boxes eligible for disposition and indicate:

- Changes in the original disposition dates in order to - retain the material for a longer period.

- Authorization to dispose/destroy the box(es) by signing.

- Type of disposition/destruction wanted:

1) Certified destruction, generally used for confidential material

2) Permanently remove the boxes from the ARD.

4. Return the signed authorization to the Archives and Records Department

5. The ARD will evaluate any records authorized for destruction for historic or enduring value and will either: arranges for the final disposition of approved destructions or move historically significant records to the Archives.

Appendix 5: Alumni Working Group

There are many functions on campus to which Haverford alumni serve, or could serve, as a valuable resource. Relationships with alumni tend to be multifaceted, extending well beyond philanthropy to include participation in vast array of academic or co-curricular programs, including for example the arboretum, athletics, mentoring and career development, giving talks and performances, attending reunions, appearing in College communications.

Efforts to connect with alumni tend to vary from College department to department, with some areas deriving great value, others less so or not at all. Coordination among these offices and individuals varies, too, so not everyone has the same information about alumni or knows what other concurrent interactions might be happening. On the other side, the alumni experience of College outreach has also varied significantly, with some relationships strengthened fruitfully and others neglected; the lack of coordination on the College side sometimes causes those on the receiving end confusion or frustration. In addition, the frequency and type of outreach to each individual alumnus/a by the College varies significantly and is not centrally tracked.

Project & Scope

In response to these and related issues, this year the Institutional Effectiveness Committee convened a working group on Alumni Relations. The working group seeks to address the following questions:

1. *How do we best leverage our relationships with alumni to advance institutional priorities, bearing in mind the limits of institutional time and energy?*
2. *How do we ensure that the work of individuals, departments, and programs strengthens relationships with alumni so they can continue to play a positive role in the life of the College in multiple ways?*
3. *How do we ensure that people on campus interacting with alumni have access to the most useful, current information on alumni, and, conversely, feed relevant new information back to be shared with others?*

Revised work plan for 2012-2013

1. Reach out to key groups / departments to discuss project and solicit advice (mostly done)
2. Administer survey of campus departments in order to develop inventory of current alumni outreach efforts and needs; opportunities and challenges. (Spring 2013)
3. Propose approaches for strategic coordination, information sharing, and/or institution-wide communications plan. Preliminary, tentative recommendations might include:
   * Articulation of strategic institutional priorities around alumni relations. How and for what should we be tapping alumni? (A plan? A set of guidelines? Aspirations? Policies?)
   * Mechanism to provide relevant alumni data to communicators doing outreach; feedback mechanism for communicators to add new info to database
   * Process to manage volume and timing of communications
   * Process to maintain/improve quality control over content and form of communications
   * Improved (centralized?) process for gathering alumni employment/accomplishments and feeding relevant departments (academic departments, CDO, Comms, e.g.)
   * Mechanism to allow alumni to opt in and out of communications
   * Group/forum for campus communicators to stay in touch, swap ideas, receive training and updates, etc.

*Working Group:  Maris Gillette, Spencer Golden, Jesse Lytle (Chair), Diane Wilder, Jenn O’Donnell*