LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT PLAN
Fiscal Year 2019

Updated June 28, 2018

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE VISION

Lewis-Clark State College (LCSC) will fulfill the Idaho State Board of Education's vision of a seamless public education system by integrating traditional baccalaureate programs, professional-technical training programs, and community college and community support programs within a single institution, serving diverse needs within a single student body, and providing outstanding teaching and support by a single faculty and administrative team.

The college's one-mission, one-team approach will prepare citizens from all walks of life to make the most of their individual potential and will contribute to the common good by fostering respect and close teamwork among all Idahoans. Sustaining a tradition that dates back to its founding as a teacher training college in 1893, LCSC will continue to place paramount emphasis on effective instruction—focusing on the quality of the teaching and learning environment for traditional and non-traditional academic classes, professional-technical education, and community instructional programs.

As professed in the college's motto, "Connecting Learning to Life," instruction will foster powerful links between classroom knowledge and theory and personal experience and application. Accordingly, LCSC will:

- Actively partner with the K-12 school system, community service agencies, and private enterprises and support regional economic and cultural development
- Strive to sustain its tradition as the most accessible four-year higher-education institution in Idaho by rigorously managing program costs, student fees, housing, textbook and lab costs, and financial assistance to ensure affordability
- Vigorously manage the academic accessibility of its programs through accurate placement, use of student- centered course curricula, and constant oversight of faculty teaching effectiveness
- Nurture the development of strong personal values and emphasize teamwork to equip its students to become productive and effective citizens who will work together to make a positive difference in the region, the state, the nation, and the world.

LEWIS-CLARK STATE COLLEGE MISSION

Lewis-Clark State College prepares students to become successful leaders, engaged citizens, and lifelong learners.

Core Theme One: Opportunity
Expand access to higher education and lifelong learning.

Core Theme Two: Success

Ensure attainment of educational goals through excellent instruction in a supportive environment.

Core Theme Three: Partnerships
Engage with educational institutions, the business sector, and the community for the benefit of students and the region.

ACCREDITING BODIES

Lewis-Clark State College is accredited by the **Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities**

The Teacher Education program is accredited by the **Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation** and approved by the **Idaho State Department of Education, Professional Standards Commission**.

The baccalaureate Nursing program is accredited by the **Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education** and approved by the **Idaho State Board of Nursing**.

The Radiographic Science program is accredited by the **Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology**.

The Social Work program is accredited by the **Council on Social Work Education**.

The Business Division's baccalaureate programs are accredited by the **International Assembly of Collegiate Business Education**.

The Professional-Technical Medical Assistant program is accredited by the **Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs**.

The Automotive Technology Program is certified by the **National Automotive Technical Education Foundation**.

INTRODUCTION TO ASSESSMENT AT LCSC

This assessment plan outlines a collaborative process, designed to ensure transparency and accountability to program performance, campus strategies, and requests for resource. LCSC's administration, faculty, students, staff, and governing oversight bodies (e.g., State Board of Education) are all key stakeholders in this process. The Institutional Research & Effectiveness office holds the primary responsibility for facilitating the processes laid out in this plan. This assessment plan is approved under the authority of the President for implementation by all college personnel and units.

Assessment is "the systematic collection of information…using the time, knowledge, expertise, and resources available, in order to inform decisions" (Walvoord, 2004, p. 2).[1] Assessment serves three essential purposes at LCSC. First, assessment allows us as educational practitioners to evaluate the extent to which we are fulfilling our mission and meeting the objectives we have set forth. Second, assessment informs the College's annual planning and budgeting processes. It plays an integral role in setting the direction for the campus and in justifying requests for resources. Third, assessment provides a means to communicate LCSC's effectiveness to external audiences and stakeholders, including but not limited to the Idaho State Board of Education, the Idaho State Legislature, the Northwest Commission for Colleges and Universities, prospective students, current students, and alumni.

Campus-wide assessment is often conducted at the program level, whereby measurements gathered from programs are aggregated to compose college-wide performance measures. Programs should have clear but aspirational goals and objectives to which assessment informs whether programs are making progress toward meeting their goals. Program level goals should be aligned with college level goals, whereby the same unit of measurement at the program level can be aggregated amongst programs to form a college level measurement.

Tools of assessment should change according to the conditions of the present, and tailored to measure and improve programs in ways that are meaningful in contemporary environments. Assessment should not serve as an impediment to progress, but provide meaningful information that informs strategies designed to enhance effectiveness in present-day settings. **Essentially, assessment ensures we are engaging in effective educational practice and effecting positive change for our students.** Educational practice without assessment to evaluate our effectiveness and uninformed by insights from these processes is not good educational practice.

---

[1] Walvoord, B. E. (2004). *Assessment clear and simple: A practical guide for institutions, departments, and general education.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

EXTERNALLY DIRECTED ASSESSMENT

STATE OF IDAHO GUIDELINES

The Idaho Legislature mandates (Idaho Code 67-1901 through 1905) that all state agencies conduct annual strategic planning and submit performance measurement reports, in order to "*assist lawmakers with policy and budget decisions, to improve agency management and service delivery, and assess program effectiveness*." In compliance with the statute, LCSC submits a strategic plan to the State Board of Education each spring for review and approval, followed by a performance measure report which describes progress on a selected set of performance measures. After approval, the State Board forwards strategic plans and performance measure reports to the Governor's budget office (Division of Financial Management) each summer for subsequent routing to the Legislature. Each January, LCSC's President presents updates on strategic plan progress and program performance/assessment results to the Legislature's Joint Finance and Appropriations Committee (JFAC) and House and Senate Education Committees, using the results of the previous year's planning cycle. Thus, LCSC's continuous program assessment, planning, and budgeting process is directly linked to the annual legislative budget cycle.

Strategic Plan

LCSC submits their five-year Strategic Plan (appendix A) to the Board annually. Measures on this plan align with Idaho higher education system-wide priorities of Complete College Idaho as well as campus-specific priorities. Assessments displayed on the Strategic Plan and Performance Report serve to show that LCSC's five year strategies align with system-wide goals of higher education in Idaho, as well as alignment with LCSC's unique mission and vision.

Evaluating the progress of the strategic plan is an assessment process in and of itself. While the current iteration of the Strategic Plan was created in 2013, the College updates the measures on an annual basis to ensure that we are utilizing appropriate measures to track progress and to comply with State Board of Education policy. The next iteration of the Strategic Plan is currently being built with new campus-specific measures emphasizing new campus priorities surrounding non-traditional learners, expansion of course delivery options, diversifying college revenue streams, and equitable employee compensation (appendix B). The proposed campus-specific measures for LCSC's new Strategic Plans were approved by the Board during its meeting in June 2018. The first iteration of LCSC's five year Strategic Plan will be submitted to the Board for the first time during their meeting scheduled to take place April 2019, with their vote of approval schedule to take place June 2019.

It was questioned by members of the Board of Education during their April 2018 meeting whether campus strategic plans were aligned to support 'systemness', Idaho's 60% goal (that 60% of adults aged 24-35 have a degree or certificate by 2025), and whether benchmarks for performance were ambitious enough. In developing LCSC's new Strategic Plan, the Vice Presidents will work with the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness during this next academic year to ensure that these questions from the Board are addressed when the new

plan is presented during the April 2019 Board meeting.

Performance Measures Report

In conjunction with the Strategic Plan measures, LCSC submits an annual Performance Measure Report to the Idaho Division of Financial Management, which indicates progress toward a subset of our goals listed in our Strategic Plan. These 10 measures provide a snapshot of LCSC's work toward achieving strategic goals and initiatives. The current 10 measures we track for the DFM are:

- Total Certificates and Degrees Conferred per 100 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Students
- Graduation Rates (Percent of first-time, full-time students who complete their program within 1 ½ times the expected program length)
- Undergraduate Degrees/Certificates Awarded Annually
- Unduplicated headcount of graduates
- Unduplicated number of graduates over rolling 3-year average degree seeking FTE
- Graduates per $100,000 Cost of College
- Total full-time new students who are retained or graduate the following year and retention rate
- Total full-time transfer students who are retained or graduate the following year and retention rate
- Annual dual credit hours and dual credit headcount (unduplicated)
- First-time licensing/certification exam pass rates

The Governor has mandated that all state agencies use Zero Base Budgeting (ZBB) principles when making programmatic and budget decisions to ensure that limited resources are targeted toward vital mission areas and effective, efficient programs. One of the vehicles through which the State Board of Education has promulgated ZBB among the higher education institutions is the adoption of Program Prioritization principles, as described by Robert Dickeson[2], among others. LCSC's Program Prioritization (aka, Program Performance) approach has been approved by the SBOE and is fully integrated within the current Institutional Assessment Plan and in the overall assessment, planning, and budgeting decision-making process at the College.

REGIONAL ACCREDITATION STANDARDS

Assessment is a key focus area for specialized and regional accrediting organizations. LCSC's regional accrediting entity, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), addresses the importance of assessment and continuous program improvement in a number of its accreditation standards. Every seven years, LCSC must demonstrate that it fulfills the standards of educational quality and effectiveness in order to maintain accreditation status with Northwest Commission on Colleges & Universities (NWCCU). Those standards that pertain directly to assessment include:

---

[2] Dickeson, R. C. (2010). *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Standard Four – Effectiveness and Improvement

4.A – Assessment
- 4.A.1   The institution engages in ongoing systematic collection and analysis of meaningful, assessable, and verifiable data—quantitative and/or qualitative, as appropriate to its indicators of achievement—as the basis for evaluating the accomplishment of its core theme objectives.

- 4.A.2   The institution engages in an effective system of evaluation of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered, to evaluate achievement of clearly identified program goals or intended outcomes. Faculty have a primary role in the evaluation of educational programs and services.

- 4.A.3   The institution documents, through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student achievement, that students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Faculty with teaching responsibilities are responsible for evaluating student achievement of clearly identified learning outcomes.

- 4.A.4   The institution evaluates holistically the alignment, correlation, and integration of programs and services with respect to accomplishment of core theme objectives.

- 4.A.5   The institution evaluates holistically the alignment, correlation, and integration of planning, resources, capacity, practices, and assessment with respect to achievement of the goals or intended outcomes of its programs or services, wherever offered and however delivered.

- 4.A.6   The institution regularly reviews its assessment processes to ensure they appraise authentic achievements and yield meaningful results that lead to improvement.

4.B – Improvement

- 4.B.1   Results of core theme assessments and results of assessments of programs and services are: a) based on meaningful institutionally identified indicators of achievement; b) used for improvement by informing planning, decision making, and allocation of resources and capacity; and c) made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.

- 4.B.1   The institution uses the results of its assessment of student learning to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices that lead to enhancement of student learning achievements. Results of student learning assessments are made

available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.

NWCCU's standards also require that institutions show how their assessment processes build to demonstrate that the institution has fulfilled its mission:

Based on its definition of mission fulfillment and informed by the results of its analysis of accomplishment of its core theme objectives, the institution develops and publishes evidence-based evaluations regarding the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The institution regularly monitors its internal and external environments to determine how and to what degree changing circumstances may impact its mission and its ability to fulfill that mission. It demonstrates that it is capable of adapting, when necessary, its mission, core themes, programs, and services to accommodate changing and emerging needs, trends, and influences to ensure enduring institutional relevancy, productivity, viability, and sustainability (NWCCU Standard Five – Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability).

Standard Five – Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability

5.A – Mission Fulfillment

- 5.A.1 The institution engages in regular, systematic, participatory, self-reflective and evidence-based assessment of its accomplishments.

- 5.A.2 Based on its definition of mission fulfillment, the institution uses assessment results to make determinations on quality, effectiveness, and mission fulfillment and communicates its conclusions to appropriate constituencies and the public.

The extent to which institutions assess whether or not they are fulfilling their mission, every seven years, is a central part of NWCCU accreditation. LCSC's next seven year self-evaluation of mission fulfillment is occurring this year (accreditation visit scheduled to take place Oct. 29-31, 2018). To that end, the College has developed a specific assessment instrument designed to assess LCSC's goal of mission fulfillment, which is organized around the College's Core Themes. The College Assessment Rubric (CAR) lists a series of measures designed to, in the aggregate, assess mission fulfillment. We track progress toward mission fulfillment using the Mission Fulfillment Rubric (MFR – see Appendix C). These assessment tools, which draw on data gathered through the assessment and planning process, are uniquely designed to document LCSC's important work toward meeting its mission.

The measures on the CAR somewhat overlap with those on the Strategic Plan. However, the CAR differs from the Strategic Plan in that the assessment practices outlined CAR is considered to be a more enduring form of assessment. Measures on Strategic Plan change according to contemporary contexts of system-wide and campus goals every five years. The measures included in the CAR, the other hand, are considered to be more fundamental to the root of a

quality education overtime, as defined by NWCCU.

CAMPUS-WIDE ASSESSMENT PROCESSES

The campus assessment and planning cycle primarily occurs on an annual basis. Although LCSC maintains a five-year strategic plan and a 7 year regional accreditation cycle, these process are composed of annual assessments that incrementally show progress on these longer term plans. Communications regarding the steps of each year's assessment process are the responsibility of IRE through email and postings in the IRE intranet page.

ANNUAL PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING CYCLE

A primary focus of annual assessment at LCSC is program performance. Virtually all significant operations at the institution are organized as programs, whether they be instructional programs or non-instructional student service programs or administrative programs.

Instructional Programs
Instructional programs at LCSC are divided into three categories, academic, career-technical programs[3], and professional programs and are defined by State Board Policy:

- "**Academic and Professional Program(s)** shall mean a systematic, usually sequential, grouping of courses forming a considerable part, or all, of the requirements (i.e., curricula) that provides the student with the knowledge and competencies required in a specialized field (i.e., major) for an academic certificate, an associate's, baccalaureate, master's, specialist, or doctoral degree…" (SBOE Governing Policies and Procedures III.G.2.c).

- "**Career-Technical Program(s)** shall mean a sequence or aggregation of competencies that are derived from industry-endorsed outcome standards and directly related to preparation for employment in occupations requiring professional-technical certificates or an associate of applied science degree…These programs must include competency-based applied learning that contributes to an individual's technical skills, academic knowledge, higher-order reasoning, and problem-solving skills," (SBOE Governing Policies and Procedures III.G.2.f).

Non-Instructional Programs
Non-instructional activities at LCSC have also been organized as programs to facilitate assessment and informed decision making by program managers and administrators. LCSC's

---

[3] Referred to as professional-technical programs prior to FY17.

approach of organizing major activities into programs dovetails with the "Program Prioritiza-tion" principles promulgated by Robert Dickeson[4] and adopted for use at all Idaho public four-year institutions by the SBOE. Activities which involve financial resources (budgets), personnel, and/or space/facilities, are organized as programs, whether instructional or non-instructional. The individual programs within the College are defined by the responsible vice presidents, or by the directors of those units which report directly to the office of the President. Four of the six functional areas of the College fall under the category of non-instructional programs – community programs, student affairs, administrative services, and the President's direct reporting units.

Notwithstanding recurring external evaluations on a multi-year cycle (e.g., those directed by specialized accreditation agencies) or internal major program reviews which may take place on a multi-year basis, all programs on the LCSC program inventory list are assessed on an annual basis. The timeline and mechanics of LCSC's annual program assessment and resource request process are outlined below. These materials, as well as the results of annual program assessments, are maintained on an assessment and planning intranet web site, maintained by the office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness.

Program Assessment and Planning Documents
Two primary documents serve as the backbone of the program assessment and planning process – Unit Assessment Reports (UAR) and Resource Request Forms (RRF).[5]

- **Unit Assessment Reports** are designed to allow each unit on campus to report on their objectives and progress toward meeting those objectives. UAR is a generic term to describe the form used in reporting on these assessment and performance results. The three instructional areas on campus (academic programs, career-technical programs, and professional programs) will complete the template for instructional programs; non-instructional programs (student affairs, administrative services, the President's direct reporting units, and select areas of academic affairs) utilize the non-instructional program template. Commonalities across all UARs include a program description, list of objectives (key performance indicators), assessment methods, several years-worth of data tracking progress toward meeting those objectives, and an analysis/work plan. All programs complete program performance

- **Resource Request Forms** are designed to allow each program to request resources to advance the work of their unit and the College. Central to any planning process is strategic planning for the needs of a program that will allow them to meet their objectives. Therefore, the planning/budgeting process must be integrally linked to the assessment process; one should flow from the other. A primary emphasis on the RRF is the use of assessment data from the UAR to justify requests for resources. As stated on the RRF: "In order to integrate the assessment and planning processes at the College,

---

[4] Dickeson, R. C. (2010). *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
[5] Resource Request Forms were formerly referred to as Unit Action Plans (UAP).

resource request items should be justified by a) explaining the ways in which the request advances the work of the program and College, and b) presenting, in most cases, supporting evidence from a program's assessment efforts. While some resource requests are made to continue the work of a program (e.g., a new piece of equipment for a lab or class or worn out physical infrastructure) and are less able to be connected to assessment efforts, most resource requests should be supported by assessment evidence showing why the item is being requested and extrapolating how the request will improve or advance the work of the program."

Program Assessment and Planning Timeline

The general timeline for reporting on program assessment findings and participating in the resource request and planning cycle are given below. The completion of Unit Assessment Reports as part of this timeline should not be the only time in the year during which assessment occurs. Rather, assessment should be an ongoing process of improvement throughout the year. For the purposes of this plan, the timeline below is general and indicates typical times in a given year. Specific dates and instructions are provided in the detailed guidance documents and templates which are provided to all units each year, through the supervisory chain, with current formats and latest versions of submitted reports posted on the assessment and planning intranet (maintained by the office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness).

Functional Area Committee

After programs have submitted their UARs and RRFs, they are initially peer-reviewed within Functional Area Committees (FACs). Six FACs are composed of similar programs who meet annually to review the assessment of their programs within the context of their broader functional areas. The six FACs are:
1. President's Direct Reporting Units FAC
2. Academic Programs FAC
3. Career-Technical Programs FAC
4. Community Programs FAC
5. Student Affairs FAC
6. Administrative Services FAC

FAC membership consists of division chairs and department supervisors. FACs are chaired by the three deans for Academic, Career-Technical, and Community programs, and by the President and Vice Presidents or their designees. Observers appointed by the Faculty Association, Professional Staff Organization, and Classified Staff Organization attend FAC meetings to observe the process but are not members of the FACs. Additionally, the Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the Budget Director attend every FAC meeting to observe and provide guidance related to assessment, planning, and budget. Other interested individuals are welcome to observe, subject to space availability and permission of the FAC Chair.

FAC discussions should serve two purposes. First, directors and/or division chairs should share key findings from their assessment practices and reports. This serves to not only allow

colleagues to better understand the work and accomplishments of their peers but also encourages sharing assessment tools and techniques among units. Second, members of the FACs should discuss the resource requests and provide the chairs with an understanding of the needs of their respective FACs. Outcomes of the FAC meetings entail a priority ranking of resource requests and a formal presentation of those FAC resource request rankings to President's Cabinet by the FAC Chair.

Observer Groups

Three constituent groups, Classified Staff Organization, Professional Staff Organization, and the Faculty Association, observe FAC meetings and represent the concerns and issues of its members. Each FAC meeting is attended by one observer from each of these groups. These observers are also expected to report back to their constituent groups about the overall discussions that occur in the FAC meetings. Doing so allows faculty and staff to have a better understanding of the needs of units across campus and assists to hone their priorities for the resource allocation process that they communicate to the cabinet.

Annual Program Assessment and Planning Cycle Timeline

Time Frame	Tasks
Summer Months	Unit Assessment Report templates and Resource Request Forms are finalized and posted to the IRE Assessment and Planning Information intranet site.
Fall Semester	*Programs* Programs review and analyze assessment findings gathered over the prior year to report on the Unit Assessment Documents. Programs, divisions, and departments determine resource needs based on assessment data and document these needs on the Resource Request Forms. At the end of the semester, members of the President's Cabinet review and approve assessment and resource request documents. *IRE Office* IRE holds meetings or fields questions from various campus stakeholders, which may include representatives from the three assessment observer groups (classified staff organization, professional staff organization, and faculty representatives) and chairs, deans, or other designees from the six functional areas to review expectations for and clarify any changes to the assessment and planning process for the current academic year.
Spring Semester	All completed Unit Assessment Reports and Resource Request Forms are posted to the IRE Assessment and Planning Information intranet

| | site within two weeks of the beginning of spring semester.

Functional Area Committees (FAC) convene to review assessment documents and discuss resources requests for each unit in the functional area. Resource requests are rank ordered within the FAC.

FAC chairs meet with the President's Cabinet to share requests from their functional areas and make recommendations based on the FAC meetings.

Chairs from each constituent group meet with President's Cabinet to share themes and observations and make resource recommendations reflecting the priorities of their respective group.

Prior to the close of the legislative session, the President and Vice Presidents prioritize funding requests based on the presentations made to Cabinet.

At the close of the legislative session, available resources are allocated by the President's Cabinet for the next fiscal year. These decisions are made based on priorities and recommendations communicated by FACs and observer groups; mandates and decisions from both the Idaho State Board of Education and the Idaho State Legislature; and priorities set by the President's Cabinet to advance both the College's Strategic and Enrollment plans.

In May of each year, all areas will be asked to review and update their program inventory lists in preparation of the next assessment cycle. |
|---|---|

OTHER CAMPUS ASSESSMENT PROCESSES

In addition to the processes described above, other forms of assessment and evaluation occur across the College. These include course/instructor evaluation and college-wide surveys.

Course/Instructor Evaluation

SBOE policy specifies that *"Each institution must develop policies, procedures, and measurement instruments to be used in the evaluation by students of faculty teaching effectiveness."* [SBOE Policies & Procedures, Section II.G.4(d)]. Collecting and acting upon student feedback is an essential aspect of LCSC operations. Information gathered by way of

course evaluations include the effectiveness of instructors, syllabi, and training materials in meeting course goals. Student Course Evaluation (SCE) completion is encouraged and expected of all students participating in a course. Deans and members of the office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness monitor student participation rates on the SCEs to insure that results are reliable. Feedback from SCEs is one of the tools used by academic and career-technical supervisors in assessing and improving the performance of faculty members and when making their promotion decisions. In these cases, the results of SCEs are considered alongside of other instructional assessment tools such as direct observation of classroom performance by division chairs, peer/mentor evaluations, instructor self-evaluations, and/or other unit-developed tools designed to assess and improve the quality of curricula and instructional. SCE processing is maintained and administered by the office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. The office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness oversees the timely dissemination of course evaluation materials to instructors for administration, processing completed SCEs while preserving student anonymity, and disseminating SCE results to instructors and their Division Chairs in a way that maximizes the time instructors have to use the feedback in their next semester of instruction. IRE has a departmental goal of returning the SCE results to faculty within six weeks after the end of the previous semester. In the case of first year instructors, their course evaluation are processed first so that initial evaluations of junior faculty can take place with the most time for implementation of the feedback. However, there is still a desire among faculty to have those results more swiftly:

> *Some faculty members wait a very long time to see their results and would like to see a timelier turnaround on SCE data. The Division Chairs were in support of devoting more resources to IPRA in order to ensure a timelier turnaround of the data.*
>
> -Presidential Guidance document 15:57

One way to reduce the turnaround time for SCE results would be to place SCE administration online. And at one point, SCE for face-to-face courses were administered online. However, online administration of SCEs was abandoned due to an unreasonable drop in student response rate. In late 2014, and into 2015, a committee was charged by the President to consider whether SCEs could be administered online. Conclusions of the committee were as follows:

> *There is very strong desire among faculty to retain the current SCE system status quo, both in terms of frequency and technology. Research indicates that faculty buy-in is critical to the success of any new SCE process/platform. At the moment, faculty buy-in to make major changes to the current structure does not exist at LCSC.*
>
> -Presidential Guidance document 15:57

Other notable conclusions of the committee pertained to having results electronically presented:

> *Numerous faculty members would like to see the written comments, if not translated into type-written text, scanned into a .pdf document. This would mean comments need*

only be scanned one time and then electronic files, rather than hard-copy files, of student comments could be more easily stored. This would cut down on labor costs and paper use, as only one .pdf would need to be created and no further paper copies would be needed in perpetuity.

-Presidential Guidance document 15:57

In response this feedback, IRE started computer scanning all hand written comments from spring 2018 SCEs so that electronic copies can be stored. However, this has resulted delayed the dissemination of SCE results to faculty. This delay in can be mitigated by collecting the student feedback from the SCEs online, thereby eliminating the need to scan hand written comments. The drop in response rates among SCE when previously administered online was perhaps was due to other factors aside for the online administration (not reserving class time for online SCE completion, lower rates of smart phones ownership among students, etc.). It is the plan of IRE to attempt online administration of SCEs again, while controlling other factors that bolster response rates.

IRE will also add a validity check item to the SCEs. A validity check item on a questionnaire asks the respondent to respond in prescribed way (i.e., *"please choose answer choice B"*). By adding these validity check items to SCEs, we are attempting to eliminate responses from students that are not meaningful (e.g., students who choose the same answer choice of "a" for all multiple choice items). In this way, we hope to increase the validity of student responses on SCEs.

In these ways, IRE will continue to balance the varied requests of LCSC faculty in order to support their goals of quality instruction.

College-Wide Surveys

According to campus survey policy, IRE coordinates all campus surveys, both one-time and recurring. IRE also consults with campus constituents on survey design, as well as analyzes and disseminates survey results for internal and external clients. By having IRE serve as the central clearinghouse for all campus surveys and survey requests, survey results can be cross-referenced to enhance comparative conclusions. IRE also monitors the frequency at which LCSC surveys various audiences by maintaining at survey calendar (available on the IRE intranet webpage). This is done in effort to bolster survey response rates so that target audiences are not over-solicited to take surveys and therefore feel less 'survey fatigue'. In conjunction with the campus' Institutional Review Board, the office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness confirms that basic ethical principles of survey research are upheld. And finally, members of IRE serve as a consultants and administrators of our campus Qualtrics, our electronic survey software.

Examples surveys include student satisfaction surveys, graduate employment surveys, and faculty/staff surveys. Campus-wide surveys provide a mechanism for assessing campus climate and morale and the effectiveness of specific campus services. These aggregate surveys are intended to complement, rather than replace, point-of-service suggestion boxes, client interviews, etc. Results from IRE surveys are posted on the IRE intranet page.

IRE Assessment Communication Plan

Many times results of analyses and surveys are not widely known among campus constituents. Current forms of communication from the IRE office include posting assessment results and materials on the IRE intranet webpage. We also frequently communicate with those (via email, phone, and in-person) who have requested our services. However, both of those forms of communication require the individual to be proactive by checking the IRE site or reaching out to IRE with a defined request. In the future, IRE will communicate assessment results that reach our less proactive campus partners. The Director of IRE plans to attend Faculty Senate and perhaps briefly describe current projects or survey results as agenda items. The Assistant Director of IRE plans to teach a Professional Development Course on survey design in Qualtrics, our campus survey software. In so doing, we hope to promote data literacy and empower members of campus to engage in reliable and valid assessment that can be aggregated into a college-wide body of findings and conclusions.

APPENDIX A – STRATEGIC PLAN MEASURES

Goal 1: Sustain and enhance excellence in teaching and learning					
Objective A:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Assessmennt Submission	98%	100%	100%	100%	100% (ongoing)
First-time licensing/certification exam pass rates	NCLEX RN 95% NCLEX PN - 75% ARRT - 100%	NCLEX RN - 89% NCLEX PN - 100% ARRT - 100%	NCLEX RN - 94% NCLEX PN - 95% ARRT - 90%	NCLEX RN - 93% NCLEX PN - 100% ARRT - 88%	Meet or Exceed National Average (ongoing)
Percentage of responding LCSC graduates with positive placement	95%	92%	95%	95%	100% (FY19)
Number of Idaho teachers who are certified each year by specialty and meet the Federal Highly Qualified Teacher definition	83%	68%	60%	62%	90% (FY19)
Median number of credits earned at completion of certificate or degree program	Associate 94 Bachelor 148	Associate 109 Bachelor 146	Associate 114 Bachelor 146	Associate 111 Bachelor 145	Associate 69 (FY20) Bachelor 138 (FY20)
Percentage of degree seeking students taking a remedial course who complete a subsequent credit-bearing with a C or higher within one year of remedial enrollment.*	25%	24%	24%	24%	2% increase per year (ongoing)
Percentage of first time degree-seeking students completing a gateway math course within two years of enrollment.*	21%	19%	17%	15%	2% increase per year (ongoing)
Objective B:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
ETS Proficiency Profile critical thinking construct	88th			85th	90th (FY18)
Objective C:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Annual end-of-term duplicated headcount for students enrolled in web, hybrid, and lecture/web-enhanced courses	8,726	8,780	9,586	9,652	10,000 (FY20)
Objective D:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Student-to-faculty ratio	16:1	16:1	14:1	13:1	16:1 (ongoing)

Number of programs offering structured schedules.*	17	17	17	17	20
Number of students participating in undergraduate research	284	352	338	493	400 (FY20)
Objective E:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Classified Staff (State of Idaho Classified Staff Pay Schedule)[2]	81.20%	84.40%	86%	86%	100% of Policy (ongoing)
Instructional Personnel (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Human Resources Report)[3]	89%	87%	87%	88%	100% of Average of Peer Institutions all Academic Rank (ongoing)
Objective F:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
ADA Compliance		0	0	0	0 ADA related discrepancies (ongoing)
Wellness Programs	12	12	14	12	Provide info and updates to employees 10 times each (ongoing)
Goal 2: Optimize student enrollment and promote student success					
Objective A:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
High school students participating in concurrent enrollment programs (headcount and total credit hours)	1,959/7,963	1,750/8,071	837/4,779	994/5,991	1,500/8,000
Scholarship dollars awarded per student FTE	2,142	2,260	3,061	2,969	3,000 (FY19)
Objective B:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Total degree production (undergraduate)*	Certificate 31 Associate 211 Bachelor 497	Certificate 25 Associate 202 Bachelor 544	Certificate 22 Associate 351 Bachelor 541	Certificate 18 Associate 414 Bachelor 528	Certificate 20 Associate 430 Bachelor 540
Total unduplicated undergraduate graduates by degree level*	Certificate 17 Associate 161 Bachelor 497	Certificate 17 Associate 152 Bachelor 544	Certificate 18 Associate 248 Bachelor 541	Certificate 14 Associate 300 Bachelor 528	Certificate 15 Associate 330 Bachelor 535

	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	Benchmark
Unduplicated headcount of graduates and percentage of graduates to total unduplicated headcount (split by undergraduate/graduate).	675/12%	713/15%	795/16%	817/17%	700/12% (New benchmark to be identified for FY19)
Unduplicated headcount of graduates over rolling 3-year average degree-seeking FTE (split by undergraduate/graduate).	675/2,756 25%	713/2,913 24%	795/2,901 27%	817/2,862 28%	30% (FY19)
Total full-time new and transfer degree seeking students that are retained or graduate the following year (exclude death, military service, and mission) (split by new and transfer students).*	Freshmen 203/338 60% Transfer 166/234 71%	Freshmen 304/474 60% Transfer 141/202 70%	Freshmen 283/491 56% Transfer 161/238 68%	Freshmen 248/419 59% Transfer 275/410 67%	70% (FY20)
First-year/full-time cohort retention rate	61%	61%	58%	57%	60%
The number of degrees and certificates awarded per 100 FTE undergraduate students enrolled.	25	26	33	34	35 (FY19)
First-year/full-time cohort 150% graduation rate.*	27%	27%	30%	27%	35% (FY22)
First-year/full-time cohort 100% graduation rate.*	17%	20%	27%	31%	35% (FY20)
Objective C:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)[4]	89%			90%	90% LCSC Students Satisfied (FY20)
Goal 3: Strengthen and expand collaborative relationships and partnerships.					
Objective A:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Number of students participating in internships	655	743	779	721	800 (FY19)
Objective B:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Number of adults (duplicated) enrolled in workforce training programs	3,533	3,471	2,887	3,345	4,000 (FY20)
Objective C:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Number of Alumni Association Members	13,904	16,009	17,115	18,025	20,000 (FY20)
Objective D:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Number of students participating in internships	655	743	779	721	800 (FY19)
Goal 4: Leverage resources to maximize institutional strength and efficiency					
Objective A:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**

	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	Benchmark
Cost per credit hour – Financials divided by total weighted academic credit hours from the EWA report and unweighted professional-technical hours from the PSR1 (new calculation)	294	296	310	376	400*
Objective B:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Efficiency – Graduates (of at least 1-year or more) and degree completions per $100,000 of financials	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	2
Objective C:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Annual campus master plan updated	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (ongoing)
Address campus needs using institutional resources and funding from the Permanent Building Fund through the creation of DPW projects.	$2.368M	$821,000	$6,068,000	$340,000	$500,000 (ongoing)
Objective D:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Continuous acquisition and replacement of equipment, instruments, machinery, and technology funded by institution	$ 8,731,618	$ 9,008,889	$ 7,798,956	$ 8,638,491	Increase by $500,000 per year (ongoing)
Objective E:	**FY14**	**FY15**	**FY16**	**FY17**	**Benchmark**
Institutional funding from competitive grants	$3.0M	$2.5M	$2.5M	$2.9M	$2M (New benchmark to be identified for FY19)
LCSC Consolidated Financial Index (CFI)	6.6	5.57	5.37	5.61	3.0 (ongoing)

* Indicates SBOE System-wide performance measures
Notes:

1. ETS Proficiency Profile is administered every 3 years. LCSC Mean Critical Thinking score for 2014 was 114.55 which places us in the 88 percentile and means that 88% of institutions who used this exam had a mean score lower than LC per the ETS Proficiency Profile Comparative Data. Results from spring 2017 not yet available.
2. These values represent the percentage of individuals in this class who are making 90% of policy.

3. The percentages for faculty represent LCSC's weighted average 9-month equivalent salary divided by the weighted average 9-month equivalent salary of LCSC's peer institutions.

4. Reflects the overall percentage of students satisfied with LCSC. This survey is administered every 3 years. Spring 2017 results not yet available

5. Reflects data elements available after June 30 or after audited financials are available.

APPENDIX B – NEW PROPOSED STRATEGIC PLAN MEASURES

2019-2023 Strategic Plan Draft

Context: In light of the college's updated mission and core themes, a complete review of the goals and objectives has been underway. A representative committee is developing new strategies, objectives, and corresponding performance measures to guide the work of the college. These proposed performance measures are outlined below, and if adopted, will be used alongside of the state-wide performance measures in the 2019-2023 Strategic Plan.

Goal 1: Strengthen and expand instructional and co-curricular programming

Objective 1.A: Expand course, program and delivery options

Performance Measure (PM) 1.A.1 Number of fully online, hybrid delivery, and evening/weekend programs

Objective 1.B: Ensure high quality program outcomes

PM 1.B.1 Licensing/ Certification pass rates
PM 1.B.2 Research Symposium participation

Objective 1.C: Expand co-curricular programming

PM 1.C.1 Student participation in internships and apprenticeships
PM 1.C.2 Student participation in activities that build a co-curricular transcript

---

Goal 2: **Increase student enrollment, retention and completion**

Objective 2.A: Increase the college's student FTE.

PM 2.A.1 Direct from high school enrollment

Objective 2.B: Increase the number of non-traditional, adult learners enrolled in degree programs.

PM 2.B.1 Adult learners (age 24 years or older)

PM 2.B.2 Online Headcount (one or more online classes)
PM 2.B.3 Direct transfer students
PM 2.B.4 Degree-seeking nonresident students

Goal 2: **Increase student enrollment, retention and completion (cont.)**

Objective 2.C: Increase credential output

PM 2.C.1 Certificates and Degrees

PM 2.C.2 Workforce Training Enrollment

PM 2.C.3 Workforce Training Completion

PM 2.C.4 Overall Retention Rate

Goal 3: Foster inclusion throughout campus culture and processes

Objective 3.A: Expand inclusive practices programming for faculty, staff and students.

PM3.A.1 Number of faculty and staff participating in inclusive practices programming each year.

Objective 3.B: Develop community and other partnerships to enhance student learning and enrich the region.

PM 3.B.1 Number of Work Scholar/internship sites (exclude required internships for programs)
PM 3.B.2 Number of participants in community enrichment activities

Goal 4: Increase and leverage institutional resources to achieve enrollment, employee retention and campus planning objectives.

Objective 4.A: Diversify revenue streams to allow for investment in campus programs and infrastructure.

PM 4.A.1 Develop new ongoing revenue streams

Objective 4.B: Bring the average employee's compensation to 80% of policy

PM 4.B.1 Bring 8% of employees to 80% of policy each year.

Objective 4.C: Increase grant funding

PM 4.C.1 Federal, state, local and private grant funding

Core Theme	Objective	Indicators	✓ Met X Not Met	% Above or Below Annual Benchmark
Core Theme 1 Opportunity	1-A. Access to higher education	1. Headcount	X	-5%
		2. FTE	✓[1]	-2%
		3. First Generation	✓	+5%
		4. Tuition	✓	-14%[2]
		5. Scholarships	✓[1]	-1%
	1-B. Extend opportunities for Regions I and II	6. CdA Center headcount	X	-19%
		7. Online headcount	✓	0%
	1-C. Access to life-long learning/ career development opportunities	8. WFT enrollments	✓	+15%
		9. Cont. Edu., Small Bus. Dev. Cntr., Adult Learning Cntr. enrollments	✓[1]	-1%
	1-D. Prepare students for post-secondary success	10. Dual credit	✓	+18%
		11. Dual credit who matriculate	✓	+31%
		Benchmark 8 of 11 met, 73%	**Results** 9 of 11 met, 82% achieved	
		Core Theme 1. Opportunity	(MET) Not-MET	

---

[1] Although this indicator technically missed the annual benchmark of '1% increase or maintain', the size of its annual decline was less than one standard deviation of the mean of the measurement, and thereby considered to have maintained.

[2] Performing below the annual benchmark contributes to mission fulfillment in the case of the tuition, whereby lower tuition at LCSC compared to its Idaho peers is a positive outcome. Percentage measures the relative distance between LCSC tuition and the average tuition of the three other Idaho public 4-year institutions.

Core Theme	Objective	Indicators	✓ Met X Not Met	% Above or Below Annual Benchmark[3]
Core Theme 2 Success	2-A. Well informed graduates	1. Degrees/ Certificates	✓	+4%
		2. General Education Student Learning Outcomes	✓	+3%
	2-B. Graduates well prepared for profession or continued learning	3. Pass Rates: Licensing, Certification, Major Field Exams, & Tech. Skills Assessment	X	-12%
		4. Employment rates	✓[4]	-6%
		5. Professional/ Grad school placement	✓	+7%
		6. Students who continue to next degree level	✓	+4%
	2-C. Persistence	7. Retention rate -freshmen[5]	✓	+2%
		8. Retention rate – all students	✓[4]	-2%
		9. Timely Completion of Degrees	✓	+1%
	2-D. Satisfied graduates/ supportive environment	10. Students are satisfied	✓	+4%
		11. Supportive campus environment	X	-2%[6]
		12. Satisfaction with advising	X	-7%[6]
			Benchmark 9 of 12 met 75%	**Results** 9 of 12 met, 75% achieved
		Core Theme 2. Success	MET Not-MET	

---

[3] In cases where more than one measurement is used to satisfy the indicator, percentage measures the *average* relative distance between multiple measures and their respective annual benchmarks.

[4] Although this indicator technically missed the annual benchmark of '1% increase or maintain', its annual decline was less than one standard deviation of the mean of the measurement, and thereby considered to have maintained.

[5] First-time, full-time retention reported to State Board of Education on the LCSC's Strategic Plan that considers whether students graduate as well as re-enroll.

[6] Percentage represents the distance between the outcome(s) to the long-term benchmark(s) (there was not an annual benchmark).

Core Theme	Objective	Indicators	✓ Met X Not Met	% Above or Below Annual Benchmark
Core Theme 3 Partnerships	3-A. Enhance student learning through community & industry partnerships	1. Internships	X	-7%
		2. Work Scholars	✓	+94%
	3-B. Enhance student success through academic partnerships	3. Articulation agreements - out	✓	0%
		4. Articulation agreements - in	✓	+38%
		5. Undergraduate research participation	✓	+23%
	3-C. Service to the college and community	6. Student participation in service	X	-46%
		7. Center for Teaching & Learning K-12 activities	✓	Non-Numeric Achievement
		Benchmark 5 of 7 met 71%	**Results** 5 of 7 met 71% achieved	
		Core Theme 3. Partnerships	MET Not-MET	

MFR SUMMARY TABLE (Benchmark 3 of 3; 100%)	MET	UNMET
Core Theme One: Opportunity	✓	
Core Theme Two: Success	✓	
Core Theme Three: Partnerships	✓	
	Benchmark 3 of 3 met 100%	**Results** 3 of 3 met 100% achieved
Mission Fulfillment	**MET**	**Not-MET**