

## Steering Committee Meeting

April 21, 2015 8-10:00 am

Members attending: Alan Lyles, Cheryl Wilson, Lucas Wolleyhand, Michael Driscoll, Paul Walsh, Shelia Burkhalter, Jeffrey Sawyer, Murray Dalziel, Anita Harewood, Lucy Holman

### 1. Review and approval of minutes of April 7th meeting:

Minutes reviewed; approved with no changes

### 2. Discuss preliminary assessment of compliance (see attached):

The attached is a very high level summary from the four working groups. Next Monday I will send the results of the Steering Committee's perception of compliance. Realizing that working groups are still actively engaged in discussion of these assessments, co-chairs are asked to provide a status report of their groups' initial discussions and, to the extent appropriate, a high-level overview of initial findings.

- The consensus of the MSCHE Self-Study Planning Committee members (including the Steering Committee) is that the University is in partial compliance with each of the fourteen standards. Before the end of this academic year, each working group is going to compile a brief report identifying which fundamentals elements are "green lighted" and which are in need of more in-depth analysis. Another goal is to compile a list of actions currently underway to address some of concerns, develop recommendations of actions that the University could undertake this summer to address concerns, and identify key information needs. WG co-chairs will share their reports at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

### 3. Discuss attached rubric as a means to better understand institutional effectiveness (see attached):

The initial assessment of the group would indicate that this standard is a key area of concern regarding the University's level of compliance. The attached rubric was developed by SUNY based on Middle States standards and a comprehensive review of the reports and findings from decennial studies over a multi-year period.

- Members of the Steering Committee, WG1 and WG 2 are asked to complete the attached rubric on institutional effectiveness as a means of "triangulating" survey results. The value of the rubric is that it identifies the critical steps in implementing effective practices.
- As mentioned in the meeting, Catherine and I developed a report for President Schmoke regarding alternative IR models, reporting structures and effective IR/IE practices. It is attached for your review; please feel free to discuss and share within your respective working groups.

### 4. TeamSites:

Paul Walsh demonstrated the TeamSite tool which we will use to archive the activities of the Self-Study review. The good news is an OTS expert is represented on each of the WGs; co-chairs are encouraged to use their expertise in demonstrating the tools to their members.

**5. Other:**

Due to other professional obligations, Harry Schuckel informed us Tuesday morning that he was no longer able to serve as co-chair of WG1 or as a member of the Steering Committee. We are in conversations with President Schmoke to appoint a new co-chair.

Aspect	Element	Goal	Level 0: Not Evident	C
Design	Plan	The institution has a formal assessment plan that documents an organized, sustained assessment process covering all major administrative units, student support services, and academic programs.	There is no overall institutional plan for assessment. Assessment may be conducted at the institution, but when it occurs, it is completed on an ad hoc basis, perhaps in response to specific challenges.	
	Outcomes	Measurable outcomes have been articulated for the institution as a whole and within functional areas/units, including for courses and programs and nonacademic units.	Outcomes either have not been written, or where they do exist, they are not stated in ways that directly suggest how to measure them.	
	Alignment	More specific subordinate outcomes (e.g., course) are aligned with broader, higher-level outcomes (e.g., program) within units and these are aligned with the institutional mission, goals, and values.	Course/program or other functional area outcomes, when present, are not mapped to or aligned with higher level outcomes nor are they shown to be related to institutional mission, goals, and values.	
Implementation	Resources	Financial, human, technical, and/or physical resources are adequate to support assessment.	No resources are available to support assessment.	
	Culture	All members of the faculty and staff are involved in assessment activities.	Assessment, if occurring, is done by lone individuals charged with assessment responsibilities.	
	Data Focus	Data from multiple sources and measures are considered in assessment.	Assessment data are not collected.	
	Sustainability	Assessment is conducted regularly, consistently, and in a manner that is sustainable over the long term.	The institution cannot document that there is sustainable assessment activity occurring within any functional responsibility areas (academic, student services/support and administrative offices).	

April 20, 2015

**To:** President Kurt Schmoke

**From:** Drs. Catherine Andersen and Darlene Smith

**Re:** Analysis of Models for Institutional Research and Effectiveness

---

As requested, we are providing for you information on models for Institutional Research (IR) including the characteristics of effective IR offices and how these offices support institutional effectiveness. In addition, we have provided some of the structures at other USM institutions. We hope this is helpful and should you have additional questions please let us know.

This report includes information to address these key questions:

- To whom does the IR office report at various offices, and where is the office located administratively?
- What are the characteristics of IR offices that are particularly effective at supplying information for decision-making?
- How do the larger questions of institutional effectiveness and the need to use data for strategic management affect the role of IR at an institution?

### **Administrative Structure**

In a 2008 study of more than 1100 institutions, Volkwein, Liu, and Woodell (2012) found that 84% of all IR offices report to senior management, someone with the title of president, chancellor, provost, or vice president. The distribution of locations is shown in Figure 1:

**Figure 1**

<b>Administrative Leader</b>	<b>%</b>
President	26
Chief Academic Officer	38
Administrative/Business/Finance	8
Student Affairs	4
Development/Advancement/Marketing	5
Other (IT, Institutional Effectiveness, etc.)	19

Within in the University System of Maryland, the norm is to have the IR function within a larger office focused on institutional effectiveness and planning, and this office tends to report to the Provost or to the President. The Appendix shows the variety of office titles, reporting structures, and key functions.

A 2009 report by the University Leadership Council of the Education Advisory Board came to three relevant conclusions about the structure and function of institutional research:

1. The most important IR function is decision support for administrators.
2. An IR office must be able to understand and interpret data (not just present it), and IR office staff must have a deep understanding of the university and what is needed on

