EMORY UNIVERSITY 2012-2013 Assessment Report for Administrative and Educational Support Units Assessment Period Covered: September 1, 2012-August 31, 2013

Unit: The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness	**Date Submitted:** October 1, 2013
Contact Person: David Jordan	**Email address:** david.m.jordan@emory.edu

I.   MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (OIRPE) is to facilitate and integrate university-wide strategic planning, assessment, accreditation, and data-driven decision-making for Emory University.

The primary responsibilities of OIRPE include the following:

Institutional Research
- Provide accurate, timely, and consistent information in support of Emory University's planning, policy formation, institutional assessment, and decision making.
- Serve as the university's primary data source for federal agencies, accrediting bodies, data exchange groups, and publishers of college guidebooks as well as internal reports and special projects. Ensure the integrity of data collected and reported to internal and external sources.

Strategic Planning
- Develop and lead the annual planning cycle and strategic management for the university, including formation, communication, evaluation, and updates of the strategic plan.
- Provide expertise in planning principles and strategic management disciplines, facilitate and prepare business, program, and strategic plans for university-wide academic priority areas, and develop planning tools and processes that facilitate strategy development and collaboration.

Assessment
- Provide leadership and guidance for the university's outcomes assessment processes.
- Enhance the consistency, rigor, effectiveness, and documentation of assessment processes for academic degree programs and educational and administrative support units.

Accreditation
- Ensure university-wide compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation* of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.
- Facilitate the process of university-wide reaffirmation of accreditation.

II. 2012-2013 OUTCOMES

1. Improve the annual reporting process**.**
2. Improve the quality of administrative assessment reports.
3. Resolve the credit hours vs. contact hours issue.
4. Improve the tracking and collection of IE documentation for centers and institutes.
5. Establish policies and procedures for ensuring that institutional data are consistent, reliable, and integrated.

III. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

OUTCOME #1:
Improve the annual reporting process**.**

Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:
Same as university strategic goals.

Supports University Strategic Goals:
1. Emory has a world-class, diverse faculty that establishes and sustains preeminent learning, research, scholarship, and service programs.
2. Emory enrolls the best and the brightest undergraduate and graduate students and provides exemplary support for them to achieve success.
3. Emory's social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff.
4. Emory is recognized as a place where engaged scholars come together in a strong and vital community to confront the human condition and experience and explore twenty-first century frontiers in science and technology.
5. Emory stewards its financial and other resources to drive activities that are essential and those through which Emory can demonstrate excellence and provide leadership.

FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #1:

Method of Assessment: Administrative review of current process.

Achievement Target: Determination of new process for 2012-2013 reporting cycle.

Summary of Assessment Results: As reported in our 2011-2012 outcomes assessment report, the strategic planning staff reviewed and revised the strategic plan annual report template to align unit reports with the university-wide strategic plan. The first set of reports using the new format was submitted in October 2012. In Fall 2012, the OIRPE team reviewed all of the annual report materials that were submitted from the schools and developed summary reports to the Provost to be shared with Ways and Means and used in conversations with the Deans. We found that using the new template made it easier for the strategic planning staff to complete the Annual Strategic Plan Update for the Board of Trustees because it was more aligned with the university-wide goals, which is how the annual plan update is organized. The review included an assessment of the quality, consistency, and accuracy of the data and information reported. The team found that there were many issues with the reports, especially concerning consistency and accuracy of information reported on the multiple templates and in the narrative that comprise the annual report. At the request of the Provost, OIRPE initiated a review and redesign project aimed toward assessing our current annual reporting system and developing a process that would provide the Provost's Office with the best data on which to base operational, strategic, and budget decisions, and provide accurate information for internal and external reports. The project began in February, 2013 and was completed in May (project process document attached). A critical component of the assessment project was gathering stakeholder input to determine their needs. Some of our preliminary findings follow: - Metrics that schools provide data for need to have standardized definitions   - A feedback loop regarding the quality of the annual reports needs to be incorporated into the process   - Communications need to be clearer regarding firm deadlines and what data are used for   - The October 1 deadline is ideal for schools   - Schools need to be presented with more information and education regarding strategic planning and the university-wide strategic plan   OIRPE met with the stakeholder group to discuss ways to centralize and streamline the reporting process (for more details on these meetings, see supporting documents). As a result of these discussions, OIRPE made significant changes to the student and faculty templates,

eliminated the program template, removed the dean's personal statement as part of the annual report, and presented clearer instructions in a separate document (templates and instructions are attached).

The first set of annual reports using the revised templates is due October 1st. These strategic planning templates will be used to complete the university-wide Annual Strategic Plan Update. The student and faculty data will be used for Ways and Means and external reporting needs. We will again evaluate the reports to see if the changes we made resulted in significant improvement. Our goal is to ensure that the annual report template remains consistent and effective from year to year.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:
As mentioned above, after a thorough review of annual reports, OIRPE redesigned and streamlined the annual reporting process. The student and faculty data templates were modified to ensure accuracy, the program data template was eliminated, and a new process for collecting student data was implemented. The Provost removed the dean's personal statement as part of the annual report request. In addition, OIRPE produced a detailed instruction sheet with deadlines, uses of data, and step-by-step instructions to provide as much information to schools as possible to facilitate timely completion.

OUTCOME #2:
Improve quality of administrative assessment reports.

Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:
Same as university strategic goals.

Supports University Strategic Goals:
3. Emory's social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff.
5. Emory stewards its financial and other resources to drive activities that are essential and those through which Emory can demonstrate excellence and provide leadership.

FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #2:

Method of Assessment:
Administrative review of reports and reporting procedures.

OIRPE evaluated administrative assessment reports using a rubric (attached) based on best outcomes assessment practices identified by the Administrative and Educational Support Units Assessment Committee. The rubric corresponds to the assessment report template, which has six major reporting requirements. Each requirement was given one of three scores ("exemplary," "acceptable," or "developing"). OIRPE conducted two calibration sessions in

order to ensure consistent and objective ratings standards. Reports that received inconsistent scores were reevaluated by OIRPE.

Achievement Targets:
Overall rating scores
50% of administrative assessment reports will be rated as exemplary.
40% of administrative assessment reports will be rated as acceptable.
10% of administrative assessment reports will be rated as developing.
  0% of administrative assessment reports will be rated as incomplete.

Note: Based on last year's evaluations, the AES Units Assessment Committee and OIRPE decided to raise the standards for "exemplary" and "acceptable" in order to reflect the need for increased rigor in assessment reporting; achievement targets were also adjusted.

Summary of Assessment Results:
 Overall rating scores
38% of administrative assessment reports were rated as exemplary.
32% of administrative assessment reports were rated as acceptable.
20% of administrative assessment reports were rated as developing.
10% of administrative assessment reports were rated as incomplete.

These scores represent the average score of the following categories: A. Assessment Methods and Achievement Targets. B. Summary of Assessment Results. C. Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services. As noted above, reports did not meet the increased expectations for year three of the assessment cycle; however, as a whole, they represent an improvement over last year's reports, indicating an increased focus on institutional effectiveness by administrative support services units. One area of assessment that many units continue to struggle with concerns the establishment of clear, specific achievement targets for expected outcomes. OIRPE has taken steps this year (described below) to help units improve in this area. The most pressing issue, however, remains incomplete reports.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:
1. OIRPE met with division supervisors and communicated the importance of receiving completed reports every year by the October 1 due date. All units are expected to plan annual assessment activities around the academic year. After meeting with division supervisors, OIRPE collected most of the late or incomplete reports.

2. OIRPE sent unit directors assessment report evaluation rubrics along with summary evaluation comments. Suggestions for improvement were included in the comments section of the evaluation rubric. OIRPE met with units that needed more guidance to improve assessment procedures.

3. OIRPE met with the Division of Business and Administration units to evaluate reports and improve assessment reporting. Campus Services, Finance, and Information Technology have

decided to use the OIRPE reporting template instead of the Division's annual planning template. This should result in more comprehensive assessment reports as well as stronger links to strategic goals. In addition, Business and Administration units have reorganized the way they group offices for assessment reporting purposes, which should reduce duplication of reports.

4. OIRPE sent reminders to unit directors stressing the importance of providing clear, well-defined achievement targets and well-developed descriptions of improvements. In addition, OIRPE provided training workshops for those units that had difficulty in these areas. As a result, approximately 15% of administrative units revised their achievement targets and expanded descriptions of improvements.

5. OIRPE posted several reports on the OIRPE assessment website in order to provide units with specific examples of good assessment practices. Over 50% of unit directors said the reports helped them improve their assessment practices and reporting.

OUTCOME #3:
Resolve credit hours vs. contact hours issue.

Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:
Same as university strategic goals.

Supports University Strategic Goals:
1. Emory has a world-class, diverse faculty that establishes and sustains preeminent learning, research, scholarship, and service programs.
2. Emory enrolls the best and the brightest undergraduate and graduate students and provides exemplary support for them to achieve success.
5. Emory stewards its financial and other resources to drive activities that are essential and those through which Emory can demonstrate excellence and provide leadership.

FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #3:

Method of Assessment:
Administrative review by OIRPE and Office of the Provost of existing policy, recommendations of the university credit hour task force, and unit-based committee reports.

Achievement Target:
All schools and colleges will be in compliance with federal credit hour requirements.

Summary of Assessment Results:
The Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness led the review of existing policy

as well as task force and committee recommendations and coordinated the development and dissemination of a university-wide credit hour policy.

Analysis revealed the need for a flexible policy that encompasses:
- pedagogical strategies that vary across disciplines including traditional classroom learning, case-based education, and community engaged learning as well as residential and distance education modalities
- professional accreditation training requirements based on weeks on instruction
- structured learning/academic work outside of the classroom.

A university-wide credit hour policy was developed, reviewed by deans across all schools and colleges, approved by the Provost, and adopted by the Board of Trustees. The credit hour policy was disseminated via regularly scheduled Council of Deans meetings, and the deans worked closely with their respective administrative staff to implement the policy.

All schools and colleges are governed by the credit hour policy. The appropriate governance committees at each school and college reviewed courses to ensure that credit hours assigned to courses are consistent with the university credit hour policy. The review of credit hours is ongoing as part of curriculum oversight at each school and college.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:
The review of existing policy and development of a university-wide credit hour policy was the outcome of recommendations of task force and committees with representatives across all schools and colleges. The schools and colleges developed implementation strategies that involved reviewing existing courses and modifying credit hours when necessary. For example, the Curriculum Committee of the Emory College of Arts and Sciences conducted a complete review of all courses and aligned credit hours with the new credit hour policy. The School of Nursing conducted a syllabus review to ensure that credit hours assigned were consistent with both the university policy and professional accreditation standards.

OUTCOME #4:
Improve the tracking and collection of IE documentation for centers and institutes.

Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:
Same as university strategic goals.

Supports University Strategic Goals:
1. Emory has a world-class, diverse faculty that establishes and sustains preeminent learning, research, scholarship, and service programs.
2. Emory enrolls the best and the brightest undergraduate and graduate students and provides exemplary support for them to achieve success.
3. Emory's social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff.
4. Emory is recognized as a place where engaged scholars come together in a strong

and vital community to confront the human condition and experience and explore twenty-first century frontiers in science and technology.
5. Emory stewards its financial and other resources to drive activities that are essential and those through which Emory can demonstrate excellence and provide leadership.

FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #4:

Method of Assessment:
Administrative review of current policies and procedures.

OIRPE reviewed institutional effectiveness policies and procedures for centers and institutes. In addition, OIRPE reviewed a sample of annual reports, program reviews, external reviews, and self-studies provided by each school and college.

Achievement Targets:
1. Develop an up-to-date University list of centers and institutes.
2. Collect C&I review policies and procedures from each college and school.
3. Collect C&I annual reports, program reviews, external reviews, and self-studies from each college and school.
4. Evaluate IE documents and determine consistency of C&I reviews.

Summary of Assessment Results:
1. OIRPE created a spreadsheet listing each of the University's centers and institutes. The spreadsheet includes a brief description of each center and institute, its location, contact information, and current review policies and procedures. The spreadsheet was reviewed and approved by each college and school. OIRPE recommends that this information be updated regularly and that changes be posted by each college, school, center, and institute to their websites.

2. OIRPE reviewed the C&I review policies and procedures from each college and school. The Emory College of Arts and Sciences has developed the most effective policies and procedures, and OIRPE recommended that each of the other schools and colleges adopt a similar model. To date, three of the colleges and schools have made significant revisions to their C&I review policies and procedures.

3. Emory's decentralized review policies and procedures for centers and institutes has resulted in an inconsistent schedule of periodic reviews and a wide variety of evaluation methods, assessment data, and documentation. OIRPE recommends that each college and school implement a systematic process for scheduling reviews, evaluating centers and institutes, documenting quality improvement, and ensuring that that information is forwarded to OIRPE.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:
OIRPE identified several opportunities for each college and school to improve its current C&I review policies, procedures, and documentation. OIRPE also communicated to the deans and associate deans the importance of implementing periodic reviews and documenting institutional effectiveness information – not only for university-wide decision making purposes, but also in order to comply with SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation.

OUTCOME #5:
Establish policies and procedures for ensuring that institutional data are consistent, reliable, and integrated.

Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:
Same as university strategic goals.

Supports University Strategic Goals:
1. Emory has a world-class, diverse faculty that establishes and sustains preeminent learning, research, scholarship, and service programs.
2. Emory enrolls the best and the brightest undergraduate and graduate students and provides exemplary support for them to achieve success.
3. Emory's social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff.
4. Emory is recognized as a place where engaged scholars come together in a strong and vital community to confront the human condition and experience and explore twenty-first century frontiers in science and technology.
5. Emory stewards its financial and other resources to drive activities that are essential and those through which Emory can demonstrate excellence and provide leadership.

FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #5:

Method of Assessment:
Staff members in the Office of Institutional Research conducted a systematic review of data analyses conducted for internal and external data reports throughout the reporting cycle. Using Association of Institutional Research standards for IR practices and NPEC "Best Practices for Data Collectors and Providers," we identified 7 central practices for ensuring data integrity (documentation of information source, use of date of record, identification of subpopulations, transparent data definitions and algorithms, verification of results, comparison of findings with previous year, and final copy storage) and developed office practices for each. Implementation was monitored throughout the reporting cycle through record review.

Achievement Targets:
100% compliance with new practices by the end of the reporting year.

Summary of Assessment Results:
At the beginning of each report, a staff review of previous reports was conducted using the 7 practices and any areas of concern identified. Staff developed a plan for completing the report that included documentation of each area. Early in the reporting year, use of date of record information, identification of subpopulations, and consistent verification practices were areas that required regular monitoring and repeated efforts toward implementation.

A review of the end-of-year reports indicated 100% compliance with new practices.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:
Early in the reporting year, review suggested that modifications of practices in three areas needed revision. Concerns surrounding the establishment and use of date of record were brought to the Data Advisory Committee and dates of record were established for some reports. The Office of Institutional Research revised data analytic procedures to automate some reports and make the identification and use of subpopulations more transparent. Definitions of subpopulations are now stored in program instructions/syntax so that they are readily available for verification and later use. Verification practices were built into office procedures prior to the release of reports.

SECOND METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #5:

Method of Assessment:
Administrative review of data collection, analysis, and reporting across schools and colleges and academic and administrative support units. Two reviews were conducted: 1) inventory of key external reports and 2) data verification procedures.

Achievement Targets:
Development of an Institutional Data Management Policy

Summary of Assessment Results:
The Data Advisory Committee (DAC) was formed with representatives from schools and colleges and academic and administrative support units involved in data collection and external reporting. Review of current practices revealed that over 50 external reports are made across the institution with data verification procedures varying widely across units. Using the findings of the review process, the DAC identified core principles and procedures for an institutional data management policy. The policy was written and is currently under review by our general counsel and senior administration.

Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:
The Institutional Data Management Policy defines data integrity for the institution as accuracy, completeness, consistency, reliability, and timeliness and establishes general principles governing the collection and uses of institutional data. These include the definition of roles and responsibilities and well as data administration procedures.

IV.   What outcomes will your unit assess in 2013-2014?

Outcome 1: Systematize the process for periodic reviews for academic and administrative units, including making the process more data-driven and coordinated with assessment and annual reports.	
Method: Develop instructions and a calendar for future periodic reviews of academic and administrative units.	**Achievement Target:** Review, approve, and post the instructions and calendar for periodic reviews.

Outcome 2: Establish systems and procedures for ensuring that institutional data are consistent, reliable, and integrated.	
Method: Administrative review of data collection, analysis, and reporting.	**Achievement Target**: Create a university-wide student retention database, to be shared with select data staff at the University.
Method: Administrative review of data collection, analysis, and reporting.	**Achievement Target:** Create a system for monitoring compliance with SACSCOC standards related to faculty credentials and course instruction. The system will allow OIRPE, prior to the start of each term, to identify instructors not credentialed to teach courses.

Outcome 3: Increase awareness of and compliance with new and revised university policies governing new program development and faculty qualifications.	
Method: Administrative review of program planning documents submitted to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Board of Trustees for approval.	**Achievement Target:** 90% of new program proposals submitted by the academic units for approval contain completed documents specified in accordance with university policies governing substantive changes, credit hours, faculty credentials and, where appropriate,

	signed collaborative agreements when submitted for initial review and 100% for final review; 100% of documents are submitted by published deadlines.
Method: Administrative review of automated tracking system for faculty credentials.	**Achievement Target:** 90% of initial course-faculty records generated by new OIR automated tracking system (see plans for Outcome 2) indicate appropriate faculty credentials with 100% credentials/approved justifications at established deadline.

Outcome 4: Improve the quality of administrative assessment reports.	
Method: Administrative review OIRPE staff members will evaluate administrative units assessment reports using a rubric based on best assessment practices indentified by the AES Units Assessment Committee. The rubric corresponds to the assessment report template, which has six major reporting requirements. Each requirement will be given one of three scores ("exemplary," "acceptable," or "developing").	**Achievement Target:** Overall rating scores 50% of administrative assessment reports will be rated as exemplary. 40% of administrative assessment reports will be rated as acceptable. 10% of administrative assessment reports will be rated as developing. 0% of administrative assessment reports will be rated as incomplete.

Outcome 5: Full implementation of university Data Integrity Policy	
Method: Administrative review of data roles.	**Achievement Target**: 100% of academic units and academic support units appointed administrative staff to Data Trustee, Data Steward, and Data Manager roles within their units.
Method: Administrative review of data management training logs.	**Achievement Target:** 100% of appointed data stewards, data managers, and data users completed the required data management training.

## V.	SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Please remember to attach supporting documentation such as surveys, questionnaires, charts, tables, spreadsheets, and detailed descriptions of assessment findings. If you have questions about what should or should not be included with the report, please contact the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness.

## VI.	REVIEW PROCESS

Please forward your 2012-2013 assessment report to the Dean of your college/school or the Vice President/Vice Provost of your administrative division for review and signature. This review will ensure that the information included in this report is accurate and that your unit is engaged in a systematic process of continuous improvement.

Nancy Gourash Bliwise   October 1, 2013
Associate Vice Provost for Academic Planning   Date

## VII.	SUBMISSION OF REPORTS

Please email reports to David Jordan, Director of Institutional Effectiveness (David.M.Jordan@emory.edu) by October 1, 2013.