2015-16 Institutional Effectiveness Committee
End of Year Report
May 4, 2016

Richard Freedman, Associate Provost, IEC Chair
Cathy Fennell, Director of Institutional Research, IEC Co-Vice Chair
Jesse Lytle, Chief of Staff, IEC Co-Vice Chair

Working Group 1: Advising, Visible Curriculum and Enrollment Data

Accomplishments

- IEC Chair Freedman met with an academic and technical team members to define various tasks and challenges. We cataloged content types for academic regulations, departmental program descriptions, requirements, learning goals, and assessment criteria. These content types are noted among our Visible Curriculum archive (G Drive).
- Faculty strongly endorsed the need for an accurate published record of all academic regulations, departmental programs, and course information. We discussed flexible but powerful systems for 'tagging' courses with various forms of meta-data that would enhance the value of the electronic catalog for advisors and students. We also discussed the value of enrollment data as a source of information about how the curriculum is being used and explored by students.
- We identified where these items currently reside, and discussed the need for a 'single stream' for the editorial control and promulgation of the materials in print, pdf, and web. We discussed the technical means available for sustaining this work, and in particular the use of Bionic as a copy of record for course and academic information.
- With the help of department chairs, we curated all statements concerning senior capstone projects, including format, process, learning goals, and departmental assessment standards. These documents are now version controlled in Google Drive, where they can be shared as part of the next stage of work on the catalog.
- Bryn Mawr already has crafted version of People Soft (BIONIC is a sub-system of this) that includes Content Types such as Courses, Department Descriptions, Major and Minor Requirements, etc. With assistance of Haverford's IT department, we have identified the scope of work required to adapt this system for our needs; the work might take 3-4 months of work by a professional developer to complete.

Remaining Tasks

- We still need to identify sustainable workflows and division of responsibility for the academic content and technical means of promulgation of the various content identified above. Bionic (see above) will require considerable technical development in order to be

a useful resource for Chairs, Provostial Staff, and those responsible for publication of the information.

- The Bionic course repository has much potential for the enhanced course search engine noted above. Implementation in a free-standing web application seems a promising route, but we will need to work with Chairs to curate the basic course information in order to eliminate redundant, ambiguous, or outdated data.
- Still later we will need to consider technical development required to make Bionic a more useful dashboard for advisors and students, with various engines for showing progress towards academic goals and to preserve comments and suggestions across a student's career (these ideas are noted among our Google Drive archive).

Working Group 2: Assessment

Part A: Accomplishments in the creation and documentation of a systematic approach to Institutional Effectiveness (IE)

- MSCHE letter: To request a monitoring report, due April 1, 2017, documenting further development and implementation of
  - (I) a comprehensive, organized and sustained institutional assessment process to evaluate and improve the total range of programs and services and to inform planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal (Standard 7);
- Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at improving performance. With an educational mission, assessment of student learning within the academic program is central to our common purpose (and developments are detailed below in terms of general education and departmental capstone assessment), but our institutional effectiveness system also includes assessment of administrative and academic functional units, and the resource allocation process.
- To better articulate our systematic approach to institutional effectiveness, we began by diagramming the components and relationships, and identified areas in need of attention. We also diagrammed the three-part IE cycle of planning, implementing, and assessing with linkages to resource allocation.
- Multiple conversations with Senior Staff guided the development and pilot implementation of a comprehensive functional unit assessment plan. By September 2016 when the IE cycle begins, all nine administrative divisions (Academic Affairs, Admission & Financial Aid, Communications, Executive Affairs, Financial Affairs, IITS, Institutional Advancement, Institutional Investments and Student Affairs) and the administrative units comprising them will have articulated high-level goals and measurable objectives for their core and strategic functions. Departmental goals and objectives will be aggregated at the division level; the nine divisions will contribute to the institution-level assessment plan. The most tactical goals and objectives will be apparent at the administrative unit levels, with increasingly strategic goals and objectives appearing in the progression from the administrative divisions to the College as a whole.

All goals and objectives will be viewable by community members within a folder on storage.haverford.edu, while the results of the assessments and discussions about improvement and resource needs will be limited to the appropriate supervisors.

- The mapping of the functional units responsible for preparing Departmental Assessment Plans (DAP) and annual DAP reports is nearing finalization. In addition to the system diagram and IE graphic, a timeline and "Quick Start guide" for administrative departments was developed.   The Institutional Research (IR) Office has consulted with divisions and units undertaking the articulation of goals and objectives.

Remaining Tasks
- Continue this year's focus on articulating goals and objectives, with consultative support from IR.
- Following the Senior Staff retreat in late August at which institutional priorities will be determined for 2016-17, units and divisions will revise appropriate strategic goals and objectives for 2016-17 and begin the implementation phase of the first full IE cycle, which will include an assessment plan report (May-July 2017).
- Divisional plans will be reviewed to note connections from the lowest to highest level.
- Over the fall of 2016, IE system development will focus on refining unit reporting expectations to include notation of links to next level up, and to the Strategic Plan. We also will build in the identification of resource impact and source (existing budget/new allocation).
- In consultation with the Budget Director, budget request forms for FY18 will be modified to ask about the relationship of the budget request to assessment results.
- Assessment language will be incorporated into the budget process website, and the IE website will be updated to include a description of this system.

Part B: Accomplishments in the creation of a system for the direct assessment of General Education

- MSCHE Letter: To request a monitoring report, due April 1, 2017, documenting further development and implementation of ….
    - (2) an organized and sustained assessment process that provides direct evidence of the achievement of expected student learning outcomes in all programs, including outcomes for general education and the senior thesis, with evidence that assessment results are used to improve teaching and learning at all levels of the curriculum (Standard 14).
- EPC has been in the process of leading Faculty discussion of the General Education requirements in recent years. We took advantage of these discussions to consider Learning Goals for each proposed requirement. The Faculty has not been able to reach consensus on any new system (or Learning Goals). But having the discussion has pointed out the difficulty of articulating clear goals for many aspects of the current system of divisional requirements.

- Phil Meneely (Chair of EPC) and Rich Freedman (Chair IEC) also had a productive conversation with Dr Kathy Harring, who coordinates Assessment at Muhlenberg College. Her perspectives helped us understand better how to implement something similar at Haverford.
- Meanwhile, progress on the development of clear goals and assessment criteria (both for individual departments and for shared assessment processes) advanced in discussions with EPC and with small groups of faculty veterans of our Teagle Foundation project of recent years, among others. Together, these discussions and reviews provided the basis of two sets of assessment rubrics (for General Education, following MSCHE Proficiencies). The most current versions of these rubrics are available to anyone at Haverford via our Assessment web hub.
- A system was designed to collect and analyze proficiencies achieved by our students in courses representative of every academic department. Each department selected two courses and 4-6 criteria to apply to a representative assignment in each course. The Registrar Jim Keane and Associate Provost Rich Freedman designed a series of Google forms and sheets to assemble, aggregate, analyze and subsequently visualize the data in Tableau. The dynamic Tableau visualizations can be posted to the Assessment web hub, or any other internet resource.
- We also articulated a privacy policy for these assessment data consistent with the handling of other student data. See memoranda assembled at the Assessment web hub noted above.

Remaining Tasks

- EPC will discuss the results of the General Education assessment project when it convenes again in September. They will review the process, the rubrics, the way we select classes for inclusion in the General Education report, and what sorts of questions we might want to ask of departments and divisions as a result of the patterns we notice.
- We will find ways to publish the General Education rubrics, and how we use them (so that students can understand our most general expectations for their education. (See notes on Catalog above.)
- EPC will also need to articulate (no matter the outcome of discussion about changes to the General Education requirements) clear connections between our Institutional Learning Goals (approved 2010), the MSCHE "proficiencies" (Written Expression, Oral Expression, etc), and any General Education requirements in force during the coming year. Faculty will need to endorse these correspondences, which translate local priorities and practices for external audiences.
- Academic leadership (EPC, FAPC, and the Provosts) will in turn need to discuss, assign, and document responsibility for the ongoing assessment of General Education as the system is finalized.
- EPC will put before the Faculty a specific proposal to formalize the Assessment system for General Education (revised as needed to meet their approval).

Part C: Accomplishments in the creation of a system for the direct assessment of learning in all programs and departments via Capstone experiences.

- We took stock of, reviewed, and updated all departmental statements concerning Senior Capstones, including the format, process, learning goals, and individual assessment criteria. These are now curated in a version-controlled Google Drive archive, where they can be published on the websites of the IEC, Department, and other forms (see Catalog discussion above). They are already available to read via the Assessment web site
- These same departmental statements were in turn used to develop an array of some 18 different criteria shared among more than one department. Each criterion corresponds to some stage in the project itself (from preliminary steps through final product). Each criterion also describes activities shared by at least two disciplines (e.g.: data collection, collection of primary sources, collaboration in lab or seminar, written argumentation, oral presentation, oral examination). We developed standards describing four levels of accomplishment for each of these criteria. The complete set of rubrics is easily accessed via the Assessment web site.
- Finally, we asked each department to select 4-6 criteria they view as most important or relevant to the evaluation of the capstones produced by their students. We implemented a simple system for data entry, using shared and permission-controlled spreadsheets prepared especially for each department, which include their selected criteria and the names of all students in the given major. These spreadsheets are automatically assimilated to a larger data set, which is in turn available for analysis and review. For detailed instructions and sample sheets, see the Assessment web site.
- As noted above, we have articulated basic policies for access to the data, and who will review and report on it (EPC, Provosts, IR). Only highly aggregated information will be public.

Remaining Tasks

- EPC will discuss the results of the Capstone assessment project when it convenes again in September. They will review the process, the rubrics, and what sorts of questions we might want to ask of departments and divisions as a result of the patterns we notice.
- EPC will then put before the Faculty a specific proposal to formalize the Capstone Assessment system (revised as needed to meet their approval).
- We will find ways to publish the Senior Capstone rubrics, and how we use them (so that students can understand disciplinary expectations in somewhat generalized terms (See notes on Catalog above.)

Working Group 3:   Student Support Services

Accomplishments
- This group received the Middle States request to develop more robust assessment processes around the provision of student support. Significant creative work was undertaken at the department level within student affairs areas, including CCPA, OMA, and others.
- As Institutional Research and Jesse Lytle took in hand the Middle States charge, received in November, to strengthen assessment processes across the entire institution, Working Group 3's existence was obviated, and the work underway continued as part of that broader institutional effort.

Working Group 4 Communication/Transparency

Accomplishments
- Franklyn Cantor coordinated the production of new web sites within the Finance and Administration division and updated other web resources around institutional governance.
- Franklyn worked with IR, the Provost's Office, CCPA, and others to develop a proposal for a more efficient way to make available alumni outcome data on the web, via a centralized clearinghouse instead of on individual department websites.

Remaining Tasks
- If the proposal above is accepted by the relevant constituents, we can move into a production phase.

Working Group 5:   Data Development for Strategic Plan initiatives

Accomplishments
- IR/IITS collaboration advanced previous work in the aggregation and structuring of institutional data for potential use in a variety of assessment projects going forward.
- IR supported the assessment conversations surrounding the Ethical Leadership Summer Institute (ELSI), taking place on campus from May 15-27, 2016.
- A new website was created by Admissions for the Student Loan Debt Relief Fund and a baseline survey was conducted by IR to evaluate awareness and initial impact among the 45 eligible members of the Class of 2019.
https://www.haverford.edu/financial-aid/student-loan-debt-relief

Groundwork for future IEC agendas: Internationalization

Accomplishments
- This Group's task was to begin gathering information about the various international dimensions of Haverford's institutional footprint in order to inform future planning work. Some initial data was gathered, but the project was largely tabled in deference to more pressing business.

Remaining Tasks
- Completion of the above