

SPRING 2016: OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

Conducted by WASC Steering Committee, Program Improvement Subcommittee (Team 6)

One hundred nine employees were identified as potentially using the Office of Institutional Research. They were invited to participate in a survey to help us in our self-study for WASC. One hundred five employees completed the survey (96.3% participation rate). Of the 105 respondents, 76 reported direct experiences with the Office of Institutional Research. The results of the survey are from these 76 respondents that include administrators, faculty, and staff. Assessment Coordinators ($n = 12$) were also identified in the survey and their results will be reported with the overall results. This was done because the Assessment Coordinators are the group that arguably works closest with the Office of Institutional Research. Please note that results for each item might not add up to 76 because respondents were given the opportunity to respond "Not applicable" to a question.

1. The Institutional Research Office provides information in a usable way.					
	Disagree		Neutral	Agree	
Overall	9%		12%	78%	
Assessment Coordinators	0%		8%	92%	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall (n)	4	3	9	25	32

2. I have used information from the Institutional Research Office to better inform my decision making.					
	Disagree		Neutral	Agree	
Overall	6%		14%	80%	
Assessment Coordinators	0%		0%	100%	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall (n)	2	2	9	36	16

3. I have used information from the Institutional Research Office to better inform planning of my work area's program.					
	Disagree		Neutral	Agree	
Overall	15%		9%	76%	
Assessment Coordinators	0%		0%	100%	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall (n)	1	9	6	33	17

4. I have used information from the Institutional Research Office to better inform improvement efforts in my work area.					
	Disagree		Neutral	Agree	
Overall	9%		15%	76%	
Assessment Coordinators	0%		0%	100%	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall (n)	2	4	10	35	17

5. The Institutional Research Office responds promptly when I have a need.					
	Disagree		Neutral	Agree	
Overall	7%		7%	86%	
Assessment Coordinators	8%		0%	92%	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall (n)	2	3	5	35	29

6. In general, I think the Institutional Research Office is effective.					
	Disagree		Neutral	Agree	
Overall	4%		7%	90%	
Assessment Coordinators	0%		0%	100%	
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall (n)	1	2	5	44	23

7. Do you have anything else that you would like to add?

I am dependent on IR. Much of federal and state funding is tied to data and if I did not have prompt and effective response and accurate data, PLNU would be in danger of losing federal funding. It is not unusual to have last minute requests from the Cabinet, departments, or outside agencies (AICCU, CCCU, etc.) asking for data to support initiatives. Having a central point of contact keeping a warehouse of data and data benchmarks has been a huge benefit and is critical to my role on campus.

The office needs more personnel. Analytics will be the wave of the future and I think the institutional research office can take the lead on using data effectively.

As we live into the Prioritization process and the need for evidence-based decisions I would ask if we are truly making data informed decisions at an effective rate? As a chair of a department that has undergone program review, I appreciated the help that institutional research offered while we were in that process. However, once PR is done, my sense is that no one (neither IR, nor Deans, etc.) is performing high level analysis on department metrics. By this I mean, which entity on campus is

providing the Provost with updated information on growth trends, enrollment increases or decreases, etc. in real time for individual departments so that prioritization can be implemented? If we truly are going to prioritize resources, then IR should devote ongoing attention to identifying which depts require further resources and which require cutbacks. Our current structure, in which chairs are required to continually provide rationale for why new resources are necessary, is not efficient or effective (at least not effective in cutting back resources, but it is effective in adding). My sense is that the administration should already be appraised by IR of which dept needs which resources (and which needs a decrease) and on a semester by semester basis, according to precise metrics. I would recommend that we devote more resources to IR so that at least one person can be freed up to implement this essential function!

Institutional Research and Effectiveness has moved forward by leaps and bounds over the past few years. While there is still lots of room for improvement, that is almost entirely because the University has done so little in this area over the past two decades. The trajectory of the office is 100% positive!

It is not lack of effort or lack of information that is the problem; it is perhaps too much data without adequate interpretation and assessment of the actual need for that data, or the best application of the data.

Brent Goodman and Amy Garcia have been extremely instrumental in our recent efforts to compile data for SOE.

Brent Goodman was an excellent hire for the university. I hope that he can become more and more central in shaping university initiatives (like prioritization, recruiting, etc.) in future.

Brent Goodman's work has been remarkably useful to us. He is accurate, efficient, clear in his explanations, and wonderfully helpful!

Brent is an effective leader for IR. He is very responsive with requests for information/data

Brent, Stephanie and Amy have been extremely helpful in assisting our program to understand the assessment and review process including data analysis and interpretation. Thanks!

During this time of transition, it has been very difficult to get timely responses. I think it is just a matter of transition. Previous experience with the department was very good.

For questions and needs I've always emailed Amy and received prompt replies regarding my requests and/or assistance as needed.

Having the Institutional Effectiveness Team input data we give them into the assessment wheel has been helpful. This support is much appreciated.

I appreciate the time, attention and support of the IE staff-each one of them is very helpful and will take the time to find answers!

I count on them annually when I have our accrediting and licensing body surveys to complete. They are always quick to respond and offer me the information in the fashion needed specific to each survey.

I haven't needed reports but I sure have to give information to their office.

I miss Maggie's overall understanding of accreditation and how it can differ in our collective schools/departments - She was always open to alternative possibilities. I do not sense this openness this year.

I mostly have worked with Brent G and have found him to be very collaborative and helpful.

I really support OIR so sorry but not much input.

I think that the institutional research office could be quite useful; however I have not seen results from any surveys completed so it has not directly impacted my work.

I work with Brent Goodman twice year when I have NCAA reports due. He's been great to work with. I get the data I need in a timely manner.

It appears that IR works with data often for external reporting purposes, and that is not always in line with our core business needs. However, I appreciate the goal of data standards and don't work with IR too closely.

My role is one where I do not really use the information provided. I assist in answering questions as they are pulling data. Clarifications/interpretations of data, perhaps confirming the table or fields being used, anomalies and reasons they might be present. Ways to filter those out or get at the information needed from the system.

Once we have a dashboard developed and the deans operate in a more direct way with their units on assessment and Program Review, things will improve greatly.

Primarily interface with Brent. He has changed the face of Institutional Research reporting. He asks important questions regarding the reporting and collection of data.

Staff is fabulous; they are responsive and attend to questions quickly. The biggest problem is getting correct data out of the system that is timely and helps us in our decision-making.

This year I have worked more with IR than in the past. Just awareness of IR's capabilities and expertise has kept them top of mind for me as I strategize in my office.

We use Brent, his staff and their data on a regular basis. Very helpful and responsive.