

Institutional Planning and Research Evaluation

In Spring 1998, the Office of Institutional Research sent a survey to 428 administrators and faculty asking them about their familiarity with the work of the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. One hundred seventy-four (174) surveys (districtwide A & P staff, 33; campus A & P staff, 18; program directors, 23; faculty, 96; not identified, 4) were returned for a return rate of 41%. In order to determine the group(s) most familiar with the work of the offices, only those surveys where the individuals identified their positions were included in the findings.

The majority of the respondents (118, 71%) indicated they were familiar or somewhat familiar with the work produced by the offices. This was true for all categories of respondents (districtwide A & P = 33, 100%; campus A & P = 13, 72%; program directors = 20, 87%; faculty = 52, 56%). Information provided from these offices were used by 72% of the districtwide A&P staff, 63% of the program directors and 50% of the campus A & P staff in their work. Only one-third (33%) of the faculty indicated this was true in their work.

Respondents who identified themselves as being familiar with the work from the offices were then asked about their familiarity with 10 reports produced by the offices and the usefulness of those reports to them. The table summarizes the responses by group and in total. The majority of all groups were familiar with five of the ten items. Familiarity with the SPIC FactBook varied from 89% (faculty and program directors) to 100% (districtwide and campus A & P). Of those familiar with it, 86% or more of each group indicated it was very or somewhat useful. Although the majority of all respondents were familiar with Research Briefs, more districtwide A & P (90%), program directors (88%) and faculty (85%) were familiar with them than campus A & P (69%). From 78% to 100% of those familiar with them felt they were useful. Familiarity with the Enrollment Reports varied from 62% (faculty) to 74% (districtwide A & P). Seventy-five percent (75%) or more of each group felt they were useful. The majority of all respondents were familiar with the Departmental/Unit Plan, however more program directors (100%), districtwide A & P (75%), and faculty (71%) were familiar with the plan than campus A & P (54%). Of those familiar, 81% or more felt the Departmental/Unit Plan was useful. More than two-thirds of each group (districtwide A & P, 67%; campus A & P, 73%; program directors, 67%; faculty, 70%) were familiar with the Student Survey Reports. From 78% (districtwide A & P) to 100% (campus A & P) of those who were familiar with the reports felt they were useful.

Familiarity with the Strategic Plan and Student Placement Reports varied by group. The majority of program directors (69%), districtwide A & P (56%), and Campus A & P (55%) were familiar with the Strategic Plan. On the other hand, only 34% of the faculty (34%) were familiar with it. However, the majority of those familiar with it (districtwide A & P, 87%; campus A & P, 100%; program directors, 91%; faculty, 57%) felt the plan was useful. Likewise, familiarity with Student Placement Reports varied greatly by group with program directors (75%) being the most familiar and districtwide A & P (39%) being the least familiar. The majority of those familiar with the report in all groups felt it was useful.

The reports with the least recognition were the 70/30 Analysis, the Core Indicators, and the Accountability Reports. The 70/30 Analysis is used by administrators and program directors to determine the percentage of classes taught by full-time and part-time faculty. Sixty-three percent (63%) of program directors, 38% of districtwide A & P, 36% of campus A & P and 12% of faculty reported familiarity with the report. However, the majority of those familiar with it felt it was useful (from 75% of the campus A & P to 90% of the program directors). From 10% (faculty) to 33% (campus A & P) of the respondent groups reported familiarity with the Accountability Reports. These are reports that measure the college progress towards five accountability measures developed at the state level and summarized annually for staff in a Research Brief. Conversely 63% of districtwide A & P and 100% of campus A & P, program directors, and faculty felt they were very or somewhat useful. More districtwide (41%) and campus (42%) A & P reported they were familiar with the Core Indicators than program directors (21%) or faculty (15%). The Core Indicators are institutionally developed measures of college effectiveness. However, 64% of districtwide A & P and 100% of campus A & P, program directors, and faculty who reported familiarity, also reported they were useful.

In recent years, the Division of Community Colleges has developed several databases. The Office of Institutional Research works with the College departments and Administrative Information Systems to ensure timely submissions of data and to verify accuracy of reports generated from the data bases. About two-thirds (62%) of A & P staff indicated they were familiar with the Student and Personnel Data Bases and more than one-half (58%) of the districtwide A & P staff were familiar with the Facilities Data Base. Less than one-third (24%) of the remaining groups were familiar with the databases. However, between 52% (faculty) and 77% (campus A & P) believed they could use the data to improve their office/program if it were made available. A major initiative has

been undertaken to verify data on the Student Data Base on a student by student basis and to provide more reports using the data to the districtwide A & P staff and to some program directors during 1999. Similar initiatives have also involved verifying personnel data on an individual basis and facilities data on a campus and building basis with campus staff.

Almost 12% of the respondents included survey comments, which suggested that it would be beneficial to provide in-service education about the reports and databases. Comparisons with other community colleges in the system were requested and this is provided for the accountability measures as systemwide numbers. A few of the comments questioned the accuracy of the information contained in the databases. Some indicated that they felt this questionnaire was useless.

Summary

The Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides information for planning and decision-making. College Administrators and Faculty were asked about their familiarity with and the usefulness of some of the work of these offices. The majority of the respondents indicated they were familiar with their work.

The majority of all respondents were familiar with the SPIC FactBook, Research Briefs, Department/Unit Plan, Student Survey Reports, and Enrollment Reports. There were variations by respondent group. The Student Placement Reports and the Strategic Plan were also familiar to the majority of some groups. The majority of those who were familiar with the reports also found them to be useful. The reports that had the least amount of recognition were the 70/30 Analysis, the Core Indicators, and the Accountability Reports. However, the majority of the respondents that were familiar with the reports also found them to be useful.

Report	Response	Familiar	Useful	Not Familiar	Not Useful	Don't Know
SPIC FactBook	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Research Briefs	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Department/Unit Plan	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Student Survey Reports	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Enrollment Reports	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Student Placement Reports	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Strategic Plan	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
70/30 Analysis	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Core Indicators	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Accountability Reports	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Other	100% 100% 100% 100%	97%	97%	3%	0%	0%