

**2016-17 Institutional Effectiveness Committee
End of Year Report
May 4, 2017**

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

Working Group 1: The Visible Curriculum

Accomplishments: Project 1A: The College Catalog

- During the summer of 2016 we completed work on a thorough revision of the College Catalog. With the help of free-lance editor Susan Turkel, we worked with chairs of departments and coordinators to update and synchronize information about curricula, requirements, courses, and faculty as they are variously represented in the print/pdf version the Catalog and on the web under individual departmental and programmatic headings. All content has been archived in version-controlled electronic documents and organized in a central digital space, along with [editorial guidelines and other materials](#).
- In the fall of 2016 we surveyed the community about the new Catalog--what they liked and what they did not. We had only a modest number of responses, but we have taken into account their views as we readied ourselves for the 2017-2018 edition. The survey results are linked via the homepage noted above, and [visible to all community members](#).
- During the 2016-2017 academic year, we gathered with colleagues from IITS and Communications to evaluate options for a sustainable, modern system for curation and publication of the Catalog, including:
 - permission-based and effective-dated content that would be easily edited by authorized chairs and coordinators, and reviewed by the Provost's Office for accuracy
 - seamless integration with Bionic, which serves as the official record of the curriculum
 - simultaneous publication of Program Statements, Course Lists, and Faculty Lists in print/pdf, and web forms
- Discussions with various third-party vendors (including Smart Catalog [<http://www.academiccatalog.com/>]) were promising, suggesting that a cost-effective (perhaps \$15,000 as a start-up fee and ongoing fees of less than \$10,000 per year) system for curriculum management is within reach. Nevertheless, pressures of the migration to Workday for HR and other Business Office processes meant that IITS staff did not have time to consider the implementation of such a system in time for the start of the 2017-18 academic year.

Next Steps:

- We expect to return to the problem in the Fall of 2017. We will set a clear package of deliverables, evaluate each vendor's capacity to integrate with Bionic, and aim to conclude a contract to have a new system in place in time for timely preparation of the 2018-19 edition.
- Meanwhile Susan Turkel is again helping the Provost's Office and all chairs and coordinators with the task of updating curricula, departmental statements, and the course catalog itself. We expect timely publication in print/pdf and the web during early August 2017. The new 'hub' for the 2017-2018 Catalog project is [here](#).

Accomplishments: Project 1B: Curriculum Viewer

- During 2016-2107 we convened a small working group of faculty and administrators interested in advancing the idea of various tools that students, faculty, and professional staff might use to help them explore, discover, and map the curriculum. The notes and themes of our discussions are assembled in a single [web hub](#).
- We revisited the key themes from our discussions of 2015-16, including:
 - How are courses connected with each other? As part of credentialed 'streams' like majors, minors, etc? As networks of learning or knowing?
 - How do we want to organize the curriculum? In relation to disciplines? In relation to "problems?" In relation to the libraries? Something beyond the gates? At other schools?
 - What do faculty (as underclass advisors, as major advisors) need to do with a catalog?
 - How might the catalog relate to the 'trail' of advice given by various mentors?
 - What do chairs, program coordinators need?
 - Committee members and admin types?
 - What do students want to do? As Year 1-2? As Year 3-4?
 - What to prospective students needs to do with the catalog?
- Meanwhile progress towards these aims advanced in two parallel processes:
 - Work on the curation of course information as it is preserved in Bionic, which we discovered in the course of our work on the 2016-2017 is often inaccurate or incomplete. We also noted that since Bionic is in fact the *complete* record of the College curriculum, we would need Faculty to tell us which courses are likely to be an active part of offerings in the next 5-7 years, so that any curriculum viewer could serve as an effective planning tool for students and their advisors.
 - With the list of 'active' courses in hand, we subsequently launched a call for the systematic review, correction and updating of these courses. This work was managed with a series of version-controlled electronic documents, and is about 60% complete (see [current progress report](#)). The correction of courses offered in 2017-18 was a top priority in this process, and is largely complete. Susan Turkel is assisting the Registrar in updating the appropriate Bionic record for each course.
 - We simultaneously convened various workshops and conversations that aimed at the development of the most important functions for a dynamic Curriculum Viewer. With help from web developer and HC alumni Jeff Frankl, we held a workshop of faculty, registrars, and interested students from across the TriCo (see [here](#) for detail minutes).
 - It was judged too early to decide on a preferred platform, technical standard, or set of minimal deliverables for the imagined Curriculum Viewer, but we did identify key priorities, including the pressing need for students in their first year(s) to have ways of discovering new interests, and also of finding the various ways in which familiar interests are manifest in unexpected places across the curriculum.
 - We have experimented with discovery and search tools, both commercial and home-grown, including:

- [Not Bionic](#) is an open-source Django web application by Casey Falk (HC '16). It works with data pulled from Bionic, and allows anyone to search, sort, and save lists of classes. Configured as a search engine by time and department, it could easily be adapted to work with more complex metadata.
- [Semester.ly](#) is a fee-based service developed by graduates of Johns Hopkins University, and allows various search/save/sort functions. It could work with our Web Catalog or via an API to output from Bionic.
- [Havertivity](#) is a mobile app that we currently use at Haverford College to publicize student activities. It has other features that might integrate with course information.
- Adam Portier's [API for interaction with Course Data](#) exported from Bionic is available for use.
- 2017 [Visible Curriculum Search Engine](#) (an Omeka site hosted here at Haverford, currently populated with unrevised Haverford course data). We could easily add tags or other thematic markers to course data, see this [Demo](#) of how to edit items and tags. We will update this viewer in the new academic year with curated Bionic data.
- Stanford University's [CartaLab](#), a promising tool that combines course, enrollment, and preference data. We note that Stanford is also a PeopleSoft school, suggesting that our Bionic data could be easily assimilated to their system.

Next Steps:

- During 2017-18 we will continue conversations about the Visible Curriculum in various ways:
 - Working with colleagues at Swarthmore and Bryn Mawr Colleges to see how we might build something together
 - Adding revised Bionic data to our home-grown Visible Curriculum Search Engine, and convening a small working group of faculty and students to develop a vocabulary of tags and other descriptors of value to students and advisors
 - Explore CartaLab, Semester.ly, and other resources that might speed development of a system that could coordinate data of various kinds (about courses, and about enrollment)

Working Group 2: Academic Advising

Accomplishments:

- Over 2016-17, we engaged in extensive conversations pertaining to multiple aspects of advising at Haverford, and prepared a preliminary report
- We drafted a mission statement on academic advising
- We developed a description of academic advising and resources to convey our advising process to a new community member or others unfamiliar with our advising system

Next Steps:

- Create mechanisms to provide more systematic input from students and faculty members regarding their experiences with academic advising and suggestions regarding what they think would help improve the process
- Pursue discussions with the Provost regarding ways academic advising might be made more visible and recognized, perhaps through electronic means, among others
- Make materials for students and faculty members regarding academic advising more robust, helpful, and accessible
- Explore options to minimize and manage discontinuities in advisor assignment arising from the faculty leave policy.

Working Group 3: Retention**Accomplishments:**

- We researched and prepared a preliminary report on recent trends in retention at Haverford

Next Steps:

- Institutional Research will utilize the National Student Clearinghouse to improve our understanding of whether and where students who have left Haverford continue their educations

Working Group 4: Student Learning Assessment

Accomplishments: During 2016-17 we completed work on an Assessment Plan for student learning at Haverford College. Developed by our Educational Policy Committee (EPC), and working in collaboration with the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC), the plan was recently endorsed by the Faculty, and will be a permanent part of our ongoing efforts to review, revise, and improve curricular programs. Key features of the scheme include:

- Direct assessment of student progress towards learning goals in a wide array of courses that fulfill our core and distribution requirements for General Education, representing all departments and programs.
- Direct assessment of student progress towards learning goals in the context of Haverford's Senior Capstone Project, for all departments and programs offering a major, and involving all students in each major.
- Two sets of complementary rubrics (one for General Education, the other for the Senior Capstone Project) that allow individual faculty and departmental or programmatic groups to gather information about the pedagogical issues they find important.
- A simple, sustainable system for data entry using web forms and permission-controlled, templated spreadsheets that allow for easy aggregation of results.
- Live analysis and dynamic view of data, all available to individual departments, EPC, and the Provosts.

- Clear statements of responsibility for various phases of work in a cycle of assessment that ensures communication about challenges, at the department level, by EPC, and by the Provosts.
- Documentation of the entire system on a convenient website, with instructions, tools, an archive of memoranda and findings, and with a clear plan for data management.
- All assessment materials, memos, and tools are assembled in a single [web hub](#) for reference.

Next Steps:

- As described in the assessment plan presented to the MSCHE, during each Fall semester members of EPC will review all assessment data and suggest themes for discussion by the Faculty at large or small groups representing shared interests.
- As piloted in 2016-17, each academic department or program will submit an annual DAP (Department Assessment Plan) report, in which they will summarize considerations of assessment data in the context of discussions about their curricula, learning goals, and systems of advice and planning. Relevant sections of these DAP reports will be reviewed by the Provosts and EPC as part of an annual cycle of internal evaluation of the curriculum.

Working Group 5: Institutional Effectiveness

Accomplishments: Creation and documentation of a systematic approach to Institutional Effectiveness

- An expanded, four-part IE system was created to complement and integrate existing planning and evaluation processes:
 - Academic Program Development and Student Learning Assessment (General Education and Capstone)
 - Administrative and Academic Unit Assessment (DAP process)
 - Institutional Effectiveness Committee (strategic and cross-functional initiatives)
 - Resource Allocation (budget process aligned with strategic goals and linked to assessment)
- Following pilots in 2015-16, all administrative and academic functional units engaged in the implementation phase of the departmental assessment plan (DAP) process in 2016-17. Departments and divisions:
 - revised appropriate strategic goals and objectives (DAPs) for 2016-17 based on the institutional priorities identified by Senior Staff in August 2016;
 - collected data and monitored processes throughout the year;
 - and will soon be preparing department/division assessment plan reports and engaging in discussion with leadership about assessment results, plans for improvement, and related resource needs (May-July 2017).
- Linkages were articulated and mapped between the strategic plan, the institutional level and the divisional levels. Similar mapping between division objectives and supporting departmental goals

and objectives is complete for a few divisions, and will continue over the summer for the remaining divisions.

- Connections between assessment and resource allocation were strengthened:
 - Budget request forms for FY18 were modified to invite department heads to support new budget requests with insights derived from the various forms of evaluation and assessment.
 - Within the DAP Report meetings, division leaders are being asked to:
 - review current FY performance against a department's goals/objectives
 - remind departments to use assessments to support fall budget requests
 - review the integration grid of division objectives with department goals/objectives to guide the revision of assessment plans this summer
- The external IE website was updated to reflect the improved IE system, and an internal IE website was created to support the DAP processes (Working Group 6, below).

Next Steps:

- Complete the mapping of divisional objectives to department goals/objectives.
- Move the inventory of 2016-17 DAPs from storage.haverford.edu to Box, and expand access to all Haverford community members.
- Update the internal budget process website to more fully describe the integration of assessment, planning, and budgeting, i.e. how the budget process is designed to direct resources toward areas of demonstrated institutional need and opportunity.
- Prompt the annual DAP process on an ongoing basis.

Working Group 6: Communication, Data, and Transparency

Accomplishments:

- The expansion and reorganization of [Institutional Effectiveness website](#) was executed, along with the creation of a new [internal-facing page](#) to guide faculty and staff through newly implemented assessment processes.
- Researched and accumulated existing areas of student complaint, working with relevant departments to articulate and/or strengthen complaint protocols and their availability. Developed a framework (still in draft form) to be published on the College's webpage documenting all avenues for formal student complaint, in compliance with accreditation standards.
- Worked with CCPA, IR, and IA colleagues to design a mechanism and timeline for a robust annual collection of alumni outcomes data, covering alumni who graduated 1, 5, 10, and 25 years ago. In partnership with the web team in Communications, conceptualized the appropriate interface for digesting and navigating the collected outcomes information.
- Fostered conversations between Admission, Registrar, IITS, and IA concerning the collection, storage, and systems integration affecting student demographic data. Prioritizing the availability of rich, correct data, as well as compliance with federal regulations.

- Participated in Workday implementation discussions in order to, where possible, customize the system, ensuring inclusive and compliant employee demographic data collection.

Next Steps:

- Finalize and publish student complaint framework, possibly as a part of a reinvented Student's Guide.
- Analyze responses to Alumni Outcomes survey, take the interactive webtool live in late summer/early fall, and repeat the same process annually.
- Continue conversations regarding student demographic data to ensure unity and compliance, modifying data flow or architecture of relevant systems where necessary.

Working Group 7: Monitoring Report Preparation and Submission

Accomplishments:

- Monitoring Report was submitted on time, documenting our improved comprehensive systems of institutional effectiveness and direct assessment of student learning.
- The report is available on the accreditation website:
<https://www.haverford.edu/president/institutional-effectiveness/accreditation>

Next Steps:

- Await the MSCHE decision on the small team visit that “may” follow submission of the report.
- Await the late June Middle States Commission decision on our report and subsequent steps, if any.
- 2017-18 is the planning and preparation year for our self study under the revised Standards and new reaccreditation process. The self study will be conducted over 2018-19, concluding in 2019-20 with a team visit.