The purpose of this document is to provide step-by-step instructions for completing the online version of the AdmRP Template (available via Compliance Assist: Program Review) and the paper-based version using MS Word.

Administrative Support Programs
For the purpose of this program review, administrative support programs are defined as functional units of this institution that provide stewardship and support in delivery of fiscal, human, and physical resources to advance the university’s mission and strategic goals. This definition is flexible in order to allow divisions to identify programs. The vice president responsible for the division, in which the administrative support program exists, will have the final say in identifying programs to be included in this review.

General Guidelines for Completing the AdmRP Template
The Administrative Program Review and Planning (AdmRP) template is designed around criteria that will structure the program’s self-review in line with the university strategic goals, and how collected data and review information will be used in future strategic planning.

Responses must be based on credible, verifiable sources (e.g., institutional data, etc.), and must be appropriately cited. For example, if comparisons to the State of Michigan population demographics are being referenced, a website showing the data should be provided as the source, and the reader should be given relevant descriptive statistics as part of the response.
When providing evidence in the form of data (e.g., “participation increased 15% from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2017,” etc.), template completers must also comment on how data impact program planning. For all responses, care must be taken to provide evidence that can be identified in the source line, particularly when making comparisons or including program ranking information.

Although some questions may seem similar to others, each question is based on a specific criterion, so each requires an authentic response. Copying and pasting responses within a program template, or between program templates, will not provide accurate program-specific information.

It is possible that some programs may not be able to respond to some criteria. An honest response of “we don’t know” is valuable information for planning purposes. Responding with “N/A,” “not applicable,” “not available,” etc., however, is not sufficient on its own, and must include a brief rationale.

Please remember that completed review templates will be read by individuals who may not be familiar with the program’s taxonomy. Therefore, acronyms and initials should be kept to a minimum. When including acronyms and initials, the official title or proper name must be written out in its first instance.

The template is a fillable form. Click or tab in each box to enter information. Note: although fillable areas will expand to fit submission, please limit responses to 200 words.
Accessing and Using Compliance Assist

The Academic Program Review template will be completed online using Campus Labs’ Compliance Assist platform. Following is a step-by-step, pictorial guide to accessing and using Compliance Assist. Since this is a web-based application, you will not need any special software and may access it from any computer with an internet connection.

Locate and Open Compliance Assist

Open a browser and login to GoWMU with your Bronco NetID and password.

In your “My Work” channel, click the arrow next to “All Links,” to drop the menu down.

Scroll to the bottom of the list, and click the arrow next to “Student Affairs Planning & Assessment” to drop the menu down.

Click on “Compliance Assist” to launch – Note: This will redirect you to the Compliance Assist landing site.

Click “Program Review” to launch the template selector page.

The dark bar shows what template you are using, and which program you’ve selected – Note: Units with multiple programs under review must click on the arrow next to the program name to drop down the full list.
Each program template has a series of four tabs:

- **Introduction** – this tab summarizes the purpose and procedures of the Learner Support Program Review and Planning cycle – *this is the same information found on pages 2 and 3 of this guide*
- **AdmRP Template** – this tab is the template you will need to complete for each program – *it is identical to the MS Word version of the template found posted on* [http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review](http://www.wmich.edu/effectiveness/review)
- **Next- & Division-Level Review** – this tab is where the program’s next- and division-level supervisors will complete their reviews
- **Document Directory** – this is where you will upload and save your evidentiary documents

Completing the Template

After reviewing the introduction tab, click “AdmRP Template” to view the self-study template, as shown below. This template is identical to the Microsoft Word AdmRP template shared on the Institutional Effectiveness website.
This view shows the question number and title, the question to be answered, and instructions for responding.

To add your response, click the arrow next to “Options,” and select “Edit Item”

NOTE: When an item is opened in edit mode, it becomes “checked-out” of the system, and will need to be “checked-in” when completed.

Scroll down and place your response in the “Narrative” section

~ If working directly in Compliance Assist, just begin typing

~ If you used the MS Word version of the template, copy and paste your response here
Scroll to the bottom of the page to add your source information

- Choose “New Document Source” to include a PDF from your “Document Directory”
- Choose “New URL Source” to link directly to a webpage

Click “Save & Close” to return to view the completed response. This will generate a warning window.

Click “Check-In” to register the response – you may always return, later, to make additions or corrections

A word of caution: Responses that are left “checked-out” do not register, and will not become part of the report.
Document Directory

When you have completed entering your information, it’s important to include resources to support your narrative. These resources serve as your evidence for reporting.

Make certain to convert your documents to PDF format, first. Then, upload the PDF version to this directory. This allows a single document to be used in multiple responses.

To upload your documents, click “Options,” and select “Manage Files.”

Then, select “Upload File”

To upload a single document, click “Select” to open a “File Explorer” window

Select your document and click “Open”
The filename appears confirming that it is an acceptable file type

Click “Upload Files” to complete the process

This will generate a confirmation window allowing you to continue or return to the
Completing the Template Questions

Example Narrative

Overview

Please provide the officially recognized program identification information. For the purpose of this program review, administrative programs are determined by the division’s vice president or director.

Please complete the following information. Note: if the division directly supervises the program, do not complete “College or Unit Name” or “College or Unit Head.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Office of Institutional Effectiveness</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>4/30/2018</th>
<th>Jody A. Brylinsky, Ph.D., Associate Provost for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College or Unit Name</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Program Head</td>
<td>Institution Effectiveness</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMU Division Name</td>
<td>Division of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>College or Unit Head</td>
<td>for Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP or Division Director</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please enter the address and physical location of the program offered.

3074 Seibert Administration Building, MS: 5204; 2002 W Michigan Ave, B112 and B113, MS: 5253

In what year was the program initiated? Programs initiated prior to 2000 may enter the phrase “prior to 2000”

2004

In what year was the last significant revision made to the program? Programs revised prior to 2000 may enter the phrase “prior to 2000”

2012

What revision was made, and what mitigated the revision (e.g., best practices, stakeholder recommendations, etc.)?

The office’s menu of projects was changed. Remaining institutional assessment projects (e.g., NSSE/FSSE and CLA administrations, ICES Online, etc.) were transferred to the association provost for assessment and undergraduate studies, along with supervision of the Office of Faculty Development. The associate provost for institutional effectiveness was named Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) to the Higher Learning Commission, which resulted in gaining responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the university’s strategic plan, Academic Affairs strategic plan, and institutional integrated program review and planning.

Strategic Planning

1. Please provide your program’s mission statement, vision and value statements.

The mission of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is to provide leadership to develop, integrate, and improve regional- and program-level accreditation, strategic planning, and integrated program review, while monitoring institutional compliance with federal regulations.

2. How does your program’s mission support the division’s mission (e.g., Academic Affairs, Budget and Finance, etc.) as well as the university’s goals and strategies?

IE’s mission supports the Academic Affairs strategic plan through alignment with Strategy 1.3b: “Implement the findings of the Academic Program Review and Planning (APR&P) process to grow, improve, remediate, or eliminate programs,” and Strategy 1.3c: “Provide resources necessary to support the needs of nationally and internationally recognized undergraduate and graduate programs, and model this trajectory to cultivate other programs.”
IE’s mission supports the university’s goals and strategies through alignment with:

- Strategy 2.1e: “Identify and support growth in the number of programs that achieve national or international distinction;”
- Strategy 4.3c: “Promote human resource practices and programming that meet the needs of WMU employees to enhance workplace engagement;”
- Strategy 5.1a: “Expand use of a resource-effective integrative review processes for all programs and services;”
- Strategy 5.1c: “Expand and improve integrated data-driven information systems for decision-making;”
- Strategy 5.1d: “Promote transparency and university accountability in all institutional systems;” and,
- Strategy 5.3a: “Maintain a leadership position in conservation efforts to reduce energy consumption and costs.”

3. What are your top three to four strategic objectives or their strategies for the 2017-18 fiscal year, and how do they align with your mission?

   i. “Objective 1.2: Implement a new electronic system (i.e., Compliance Assist: Planning from Campus Labs) to support and measure the University Strategic Plan progress” aligns with IE’s mission to “provide leadership to develop, integrate and improve strategic planning ...”

   ii. “Objective 4.1: Implement the Administrative Program Review cycle using the Compliance Assist: Program Review platform from Campus Labs” aligns with IE’s mission to “provide leadership to develop, integrate and improve ... integrated program review ...”

   iii. “Strategy 5.4a: Provide support to the Office of the General Counsel in developing a university-wide policy on policies” aligns with IE’s mission to “improve regional-level accreditation” and monitor “institutional compliance with federal regulations.”

   iv. “Strategy 5.4b: Provide support to the Office of Community Outreach in developing the application for Carnegie classification on engagement” aligns with IE’s mission to “improve regional-level accreditation” and monitor “institutional compliance with federal regulations.”

4. Please provide your organizational chart.

   Right-click inside the box, below, to paste a JPG, PNG, or other “picture-type” copy of your organizational chart.
5. List and briefly describe the major functions performed/services provided by your unit. For each function, indicate the frequency in which the activity is performed (e.g., percentage of time, daily, weekly, etc.). Also for each activity, indicate the stakeholder(s)/customer(s) served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liaise with the Strategic Management Executive Council (SMEC) to manage and communicate reporting for the university’s strategic plan (typically monthly; 15%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to the Collaborative Risk/Opportunity Management (CRÔM) action teams (typically weekly; 15%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement an online system to support and measure the progress of the university’s strategic plan, including cross-functional collaboration on platform structure, relationships with peer institutions and the platform’s vendor (Campus Labs), and development and implementation of end-user training (daily; 25%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; Campus Labs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and report the progress of the Academic Affairs strategic plan, Invest in Gold, including alignment of Academic Affairs goals with university strategies (semi-annually; 5%) – stakeholders: administrators, faculty, staff, and students within the Division of Academic Affairs; future students and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with the Higher Learning Commission, WMU’s regional accreditor, to ensure university compliance with accreditation standards and federal regulations and mandates, including dissemination of information to the university community (daily to annually); preparing for assurance argument and HLC’s 2020 Decennial Visit, including streamlining the evidence collection and population process (daily); establishing and serving on the HLC Advisory Council (weekly to monthly), and coordinating and reporting annual updates (annually); approximately 10% – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; the City of Kalamazoo, the State of Michigan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to the implementation of the Signature quality initiative, including cross-functional collaboration with the Division of Student Affairs (daily; 5%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; employers of present and future students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to the specialized program accreditation activities of accredited academic and non-academic programs and facilities to ensure compliance with agency standards and requirements (weekly to monthly; 10%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; employers of present and future students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, implement, and provide support to the university’s integrated program review and planning endeavors, including cross-functional collaboration on self-study and reporting materials and procedures, relationships with the online reporting platform’s vendor (Campus Labs), development and implementation of end-user training, and end-of-cycle reporting (daily to weekly; 5%) – stakeholders: the university community; future students and their families; employers of present and future students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide support to the development and implementation of university-wide, cross-functional projects such as developing a policy on policies, developing a complaints tracking system, and establishing and being recognized for better community engagement practices, etc. (daily; 10%) – stakeholders: the university community; present and future community partners; future students and their families; employers of present and future students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Review the functions/services you listed in the previous question, and determine whether or not the activity falls within the purview of your unit and should continue to be performed.

---

| According to the Association for Higher Education Effectiveness, offices of institutional effectiveness intentionally integrate multiple functions (e.g., strategic planning, institutional research, assessment, accreditation, program review, |
Communication and Assessment

1. List and describe any external reviews/assessments conducted within the past five years of your unit. Provide information on who performed the review, when it was conducted, activities performed during the review, and the outcome.

The first, and only, external review conducted for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness was held February 26 through 28, 2012. This was a self-initiated review during the administrative transition period between the retirement of the inaugural vice provost and the current associate provost for institutional effectiveness. Rebecca G. Adams, Ph.D., then associate provost for planning and assessment at University of North Carolina at Greensboro, was selected as the peer reviewer. At the time, there were no best practices by which to establish metrics, and this office had no strategic plan. Dr. Adams facilitated group interviews with stakeholders of each of the office’s projects and activities to develop a SWOT analysis. A final report, including the SWOT analysis and planning recommendations, was made disseminated to WMU’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs on March 21, 2012 (see attached report).

Although a number of recommendations were made for restructuring the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, as well as other offices with cross-functional responsibilities, the office’s menu of projects and activities continued to evolve, through provost and presidential reassignment, causing many of the recommendations to become moot, while others remained outside of the office’s ability to implement. Recommendations for improving campus-based regional and specialized program accreditation activities, however, were adopted, such as expanding support to programs engaged in accreditation reviews.

2. What actions did you take as a result of the findings of the external review/assessment?

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness revised its mission statement, developed vision and values statements, and created it’s first-ever strategic plan built on the sections of the SWOT analysis that remained pertinent to the office’s projects and activities (i.e., HLC accreditation, specialized accreditation, strategic planning). The current version of that plan, 2015-2020, guides all projects and activities facilitated and supported by the office.

3. List and describe formal communications made by your unit on a regular basis. Provide the frequency of the communication and identify the intended audience.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as the point of contact for accreditation, strategic planning, and program review.

For regional accreditation, IE works directly with Extended University Programs to periodically draft and submit “change request” documents to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). IE works with the offices of Business and Finance, Student Financial Aid, and Institutional Research to complete the Annual Institutional Data Update to HLC.

For specialized program and facilities accreditation, IE works with program and facilities coordinators to complete their periodic self-study and status reports, and participate in their accreditation site visits.

For strategic planning, IE participates on CRÔM Action Teams, and works with unit and divisional leadership to complete mid-year and annual reports to the university president and cabinet. IE also provides training to report designees in using the online reporting platform.
For program review, IE drafts and disseminates procedures guides and training materials to unit and division-level designees, and works with them to complete their cyclical self-study/self-review reports. IE also provides training in using the online reporting platform. IE provides secure access to authorized university personnel to review PDF copies of completed reports.

4. What metrics do you use to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of your operations? Identify three to five metrics you used to evaluate your operations.

Objective 1.2: Implement a new electronic system (i.e., Compliance Assist: Planning from Campus Labs) to support and measure the University Strategic Plan progress:
- Success Measure: IE enters the data for initial mid-year report by October 31, 2017 (completed)
- Success Measure: Trainings have been completed by May 31, 2018 (progress on track)
- Success Measure: The preferred system is fully implemented by June 30, 2018 (progress on track)
- Success Measure: All divisions report their fiscal year priorities in October/November using the common template and reporting format (progress on track)
- Success Measure: All divisions report progress toward their fiscal year priorities in December/January and May/June (progress on track)

Objective 4.1: Implement the Administrative Program Review cycle using the Compliance Assist: Program Review platform from Campus Labs:
- Success Measure: IE provides a minimum of one face-to-face training, during March and April 2018, to all self-study completers who will use Compliance Assist: Program Review (progress on track)
- Success Measure: IE ensures that templates for all programs that will use Compliance Assist: Program Review, are available for use no later than April 1, 2018 (progress on track)
- Success Measure: IE ensures that a technical guide is available for all self-study completers that will use Compliance Assist: Program Review, no later than April 1, 2018 (progress on track)
- Success Measure: IE provides a minimum of one face-to-face training, during September 2018, to all self-study completers who will use Compliance Assist: Program Review (progress on track)
- Success Measure: IE uploads PDF copies of completed reports to the Integrated Program Review SharePoint™ site within five business days of each completed stage (progress on track)

No success measures or metrics were developed for the following strategies:
- Strategy 5.4a: Provide support to the Office of the General Counsel in developing a university-wide policy on policies
- Strategy 5.4b: Provide support to the Office of Community Outreach in developing the application for Carnegie classification on engagement

5. Are you able to benchmark your performance against externally recognized metrics for either best practice or performance? If so, please provide performance metrics as benchmarked against external data. The external source must be a verifiable source and must be appropriately cited and attached, where appropriate.

Although there are numerous ways in which one institution of higher education can benchmark itself against another (e.g., VSA, IPEDS, Carnegie Classifications, etc.), there are no externally recognized metrics for either best practice or performance for offices of institutional effectiveness. It is hoped that the Association for Higher Education Effectiveness (https://www.ahee.org) may be able to develop a set of benchmarks in the near future.

Learning and Discovery

1. List and describe any programs/activities that your unit engages in that supports and provides:
   - Learning/discovery opportunities
Research and/or grants

Global engagement

Learning and Discovery Opportunities: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness provides support to the HLC Quality Initiative (Signature program).

Research and Grants: IE provides support to development of a grant that supports volunteer opportunities under the auspices of Shared Gold, the university’s civic action plan

Global Engagement: IE reviews all affiliation agreements with its international partners

2. Detail and comment on how your unit participates in, facilitates, or promotes community outreach.

IE financially supports one Faculty Fellow to lead and oversee the Shared Gold process, along with one undergraduate student assistant.

Law and Policy

1. List key laws and university regulations that you must comply with in performing your services.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness complies with The Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HEOA). The associate provost for institutional effectiveness serves as the university’s accreditation liaison officer (ALO) to the Higher Learning Commission, and assures that the university complies with HLC’s Core Components, Assumed Practices, and Federal Compliance for Title IV funding.

Something about Academic Affairs hiring practices and procedures, and those of the Graduate College (for GAs); SEVIS

2. How frequently do you review your unit’s procedures and guidelines? What causes the review?

Reimbursement policy for accreditation fees; we review when we recommend policy as a product of HLC changes (e.g., Faculty Credentials, etc.)

3. Detail and comment on the program’s preparedness for threats, emergencies, and crises.

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as a secure repository for regional, specialized program, and facilities accreditation, strategic planning, and program review. All IE documents are produced, reviewed, disseminated, and filed electronically. Staff members have access to a secure shared-drive maintained in the Office of Information Technology. OIT performs routine back-ups and security checks on all of its network servers.

For inclement weather or building-specific emergencies (e.g., fire, human threats, etc.), IE follows the workplace emergency plans set up for employees of Henry Hall Annex, and the Seibert Administration Building.

Resource Management

1. For your unit (e.g., what is used specifically by the dean’s office), please provide the following information:

- Operating budget for the 2017-18 year (can be a glow report or any other report format)

The FY 2018 Booked Budget for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness was distributed as follows:

- Operations:
  - Compensation: $398,622
  - General supplies and equipment: $7,752
  - Staff professional development: $5,335
- Integrated program review and planning activities: $20,966
- (Specialized Program) Accreditation fees and reimbursements: $102,135
• Institutional-level strategic planning: $160,958
• Regional accreditation annual activities: $6,400

Total FY 2018 Booked Budget = $702,168

• Operating expenses and revenues incurred year-to-date

Expenses to-date:
• Operations:
  o Compensation: $398,778
  o General supplies and equipment: $5,656
  o Staff professional development: $5,131
• Integrated program review and planning activities: $16,295
• (Specialized Program) Accreditation fees and reimbursements: $102,111
• Institutional-level strategic planning: $51,030
• Regional accreditation annual activities: $3,664

Total FY 2018 Expenses = $582,665
Revenues to-date (i.e., VPAA carryforward return): $48,929

• Number of FTEs

Administrator = 1.0 FTE (Brylinsky)
Staff = 2.0 FTE (Cardoso Reyes; Springsteen)
GAs = 1.0 FTE (0.50 FTE x 2 GAs)

Total FTE = 4.0

Note: The Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs has assigned one administrative assistant senior (Phillips) to work half-time in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and half-time in Office of Academic Labor Relations. Since this employee does not receive compensation through IE, she was not counted in the FTE.

• Key attributes, required degrees, professional certifications, or other professional credentials required or desired to perform the work of your unit

Associate provost for institutional effectiveness: earned terminal degree from an accredited institution; must have experience with accreditation...

Assistant director for institutional planning and accreditation (regional): master’s degree in a related field from an accredited institution; experience with federal reporting...

Assistant director for integrated program review and accreditation (specialized program): master’s degree in a related field from an accredited institution; experience with specialized program accreditation or other external program review.

• If you have employees who have voluntarily completed training and received certificates and/or other externally recognized degrees/program certifications/professional honors, please note these

Assistant director for institutional planning and accreditation (regional):
• Graduate certificate in Education Leadership: Higher Education Student Affairs
• Certificate of completion from the Academic Leadership Academy
• Certificate of completion from “Behind the W” Brand Ambassador Training

Assistant director for integrated program review and accreditation (specialized program):
• Certificate of completion from “Eliminating Racism and Claiming/Celebrating Equality” (ERAC/CE) training
• Awarded the WMU Make a Difference Award, 2004

• If you have employees who participate in regional, state, or national professional organizations as members please list these organizations

  Associate provost:
  • Executive board, Special Olympics, Michigan

  Assistant director for institutional planning and accreditation (regional):
  • Organization of Latino Social Works, Treasurer

• List presentations made at professional conferences or at professional group meetings


2. List any awards/honors received for specific projects/accomplishments within the past five years. Identify who provided the award/honor as well as for the reason earned.

  No work-related awards or honors have been received by IE staff or administrators for the past five years.

3. How does your unit support diversity and inclusion?

  The Office of Institutional Effectiveness supports diversity and inclusion through hiring and recruitment processes; all IE employees belong to one or more underrepresented groups.

  To prepare to serve effectively on search committees, WMU senior leaders participated in the Implicit Bias Workshop for Search Committees, offered through the Office of Institutional Equity.

  IE also supports diversity and inclusion through its support of professional development opportunities. Examples include employee participation in the Everyone Counts Diversity Learning Communities and Real Talk Diversity Series event offered through the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and participation in the MI-ACE Network and its Women of Color Collaborative. Until she left in June 2017, the former assistant director for institutional planning and accreditation served as WMU’s institutional representative.

  IE provided financial support for 50 Upward Bound students in 2014 and 2017.

**Impact and Opportunity**

1. As you look forward to the next five years, describe challenges and opportunities that your unit will face.

   The greatest challenge the Office of Institutional Effectiveness faces is consideration of the role of IE in the Montgomery administration, and changes in Academic Affairs leadership. In addition, there will be a leadership change in IE as the current associate provost plans to retire in 2019. At an associate provost level, the office is physically placed in a position of diminished authority to carry out a number of its current functions (e.g., university strategic planning, HLC compliance, etc.), and there is a risk that the university community sees IE as an Academic Affairs only entity.
With personnel and organizational change, IE also has renewed support. With more and more research on the need for offices of institutional effectiveness, AHEE could pursue Integrated Institutional Effectiveness (IEE) as “…the purposeful coordination and integration of functions that support institutional performance, quality, and efficiency; those functions include strategic planning, outcomes assessment, institutional research, regional/specialized accreditation, and program/unit review.” This includes “cross-functional institutional initiatives, assuring implementation, monitoring progress, and facilitating change as needed” (2017).

Source:

2. As a result of this review, what opportunities have you identified to change the level and delivery of services to reduce costs, increase revenues, enhance the level of service, or to be more effective in the delivery of service?

Proposal for restructuring to be submitted to the provost and president May 1, 2018.

ATTACHMENTS

External Review of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Submitted by Rebecca G. Adams

March 21, 2012

The original purpose of the review conducted as the basis for this report was to provide a SWOT analysis of Western Michigan University’s (WMU’s) Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) and to make recommendations for goals to be included in its strategic plan to be developed and implemented under the new Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness. In the process of reviewing the documentation provided by OIE staff and available via the Internet (see Appendix A for a list of these documents) and in discussing the institutional effectiveness challenges facing WMU with the Provost and others during the site visit (see Appendix B for a list of participants), the scope of the report was expanded to include overall recommendations regarding the structure and function of the IE enterprise across all of the relevant WMU offices.

Before discussing the implications of the SWOT analysis (see Appendix C) for the overall institutional effectiveness challenges facing WMU and for the OIE strategic plan, I would like to thank the numerous faculty and staff who took time out of their busy schedules to meet with me, especially Cathe Springsteen and the other very able staff currently assigned to OIE. As an associate provost at one of WMU’s peer institutions, my visit to WMU was particularly informative and, to this Toledo-born-Carolina-dwelling relative of Michigander farmers, autoworkers, and railroad workers, it was also nostalgic.

**Overall Institutional Effectiveness Challenges**

The mission statement of the OIE is a list of loosely-connected tasks rather than an overall mandate to ensure institutional effectiveness and continuous improvement: “The mission of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is to provide leadership to develop, integrate, and improve university- and program-level accreditation, university-level assessment, and faculty recognition, while monitoring institutional compliance with regulations stemming from the Higher Education Reauthorization Act.” Although OIE
certainly supports the institutional effectiveness function, much of the work of assessing and demonstrating continuous improvement is actually assigned to the Office of Assessment and Undergraduate Studies (OAUS). It is, for example, the OAUS that provides funding for all University Assessment Steering Committee endeavors including technical training, workshops, and awards.

Like the IE mission statement, the Framework for Institutional Effectiveness at Western Michigan University (see Appendix D) is a list of tasks rather than a comprehensive IE policy. It merely lists and describes the elements of institutional effectiveness (strategic planning and academic priorities, academic program planning and enrollment management, institutional and program accreditations, institutional program assessments, and academic resource effectiveness). It does not specify the purpose of the “policy,” who is responsible for ensuring it is enforced, the procedures through which institutional effectiveness will be achieved and documented, the responsibilities of the various offices that serve institutional effectiveness functions, a description of the workflow among offices necessary to ensure continuous improvement, methods of enforcement of expectations, or how the process will be reviewed.

Possibly due to the mismatch of the names of both the OIE and OAUS with their assigned functions or because of the frequent change in their assignments and rapid staff turnover, the campus community seems to be confused about what these offices do and what support they offer. During the last six years, the structure of the OIE has changed as many times, seemingly to accommodate shifts in personnel rather than as a result of a systematic consideration of goals and assessment data. Of the 19 staff employed during the last 6 years, only 5 are currently affiliated with OIE and one of them is about to resign from the University. An overdependence on temporary staff and students contributes to confusion because the staff constantly changes and connections have to be reestablished. It is clear that the new Associate Provost has the wide-spread support of stakeholders, but some anxiety surrounds the transition because of the perception that whatever success OIE has enjoyed in the past was largely attributable to the work of the recently-retired Vice Provost.

Exacerbating this resulting problem of lack of transparency regarding the function of the various IE offices is poor communication. Although senior leadership and the staff of the offices comprising the IE system apparently send appropriate communications to the Deans and Associate Deans, they do not seem to reach or at least do not seem to be read by most unit- and program-level faculty and staff. The existence of this repeatedly-mentioned communication problem was confirmed by comparing the knowledge of OIE services by program leadership for recently-reaccredited specialized programs and by the Associate Deans.

So, recommendations regarding how to address these overall institutional effectiveness challenges include:

- As part of an examination of the structure and workflow of IE efforts across all relevant offices, rethink the missions of the OIE and of other offices with IE responsibilities, describing their overall mandates in addition to listing their areas of responsibilities and possibly changing their names to reflect assigned tasks;
- Develop a comprehensive institutional effectiveness policy that clearly specifies the function of each office involved and the workflow and division of labor among them;
- After reorganization, commit to a stable structure and stable or growing support for staff in the relevant offices through the next reaffirmation of accreditation; and
- Reconsider the OIE communication plan, including alternative communication paths, visits to units, and media in addition to email.

Restructuring the IE Initiative

As is confirmed by background research conducted by WMU’s OIE staff on the structure of institutional effectiveness initiatives at peer institutions (see Appendix E) and similar research conducted by UNCG’s Office of Planning and Assessment staff on University of North Carolina System schools (see Appendix E), every university divides the IE functions among various offices in different ways.
and following different organizational principles. At WMU, it seems that the principle underlying the changes made recently is to divide tasks according to whether the time horizon for them is long-term (in the case of OIE) or short-term (in the case of OAUS). OIE is currently assigned responsibility for HLC Accreditation, Specialized Accreditations, Strategic Planning and Environmental Scanning, Faculty Development, the Voluntary System of Accountability, External Faculty Recognition, and Institutional-Level Assessment of Student Learning. OAUS is charged with Academic Success, Curriculum Review, General Education, Academic Program Planning, Academic Program Assessment (for both undergraduate and graduate programs), and Academic Advising. The Associate Provosts for OIE and OAUS serve as ex-officio members of the University Assessment Steering Committee which approves assessment plans of degree-granting and non-degree granting units. In addition to OIE and OAUS, the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) supports the institutional effectiveness responsibilities of both offices. Although this division of labor based on length of planning horizon may make sense from an administrative perspective, it does not contribute to transparency and creates communication challenges.

Although a campus-wide conversation about the division of labor among the IE offices is essential before any decisions about reorganization are reached, my preliminary recommendations would be as follows:

- Now that accreditation has been reaffirmed, move academic program planning (including academic program prioritization) and academic program assessment back to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness;
  - Change the name of OAUS to the Office of Undergraduate Studies (OUS);
  - Possibly create a position for a Director of Academic Assessment to report to the Associate Provost of IE, charging him or her with the assessment of all academic programs, the Voluntary System of Accountability, and closing the loop on the institutional-level assessment of student learning and student engagement (including General Education, CLA, and NSSE);
  - Consider having the Director of Institutional Research report to the Associate Provost for IE;
  - Move the data collection and reporting functions for institutional-level assessment of student learning and for the VSA to OIR, providing the office with a survey research/testing staff position with OIE continuing to be responsible for using the data to “close the loop” at the university level;
  - Assign OIR responsibility for environmental scanning and evaluation of organizational capacity (as per new HLC criteria and guidance from the Associate Provost for IE); and
  - Consider elevating the position of Associate Provost for IE to executive level and having the incumbent report to the President instead of to the Provost or having the Associate Provost of IE report to the President on accreditation and to the Provost on other matters.

- Charge OUS with the academic success of undergraduate students, improving undergraduate student retention (a major focus of the new HLC standards), General Education (not its assessment), undergraduate curriculum review, and undergraduate academic advising.

- Charge the Graduate School with responsibilities parallel to the functions assigned to the OUS if not already done (the Dean of the Graduate School was not involved in this visit).

- Remove Faculty Development from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, creating a full-time position for an Associate Provost (or Director) for Faculty Development, assigning him or her responsibility for the current faculty development effort, ICES, external faculty recognition, serving the needs of graduate students as well as faculty, and possibly for the Faculty Technology Center;
  - Address some of the staffing deficits in this area by offering unpaid internships to graduate students and developing a network of volunteer faculty fellows to extend the reach of the office, but consider adding at least one additional full-time staff member in addition to the new Associate Provost (or Director);
  - Charge the Associate Provost (or Director) for Faculty Development to support both the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies and the Dean of the Graduate School but not to report to either of them; and
o Add responsibility for “closing the loop” on the assessment of faculty engagement (FSSE) to this office, relying on OIR to collect and report on the data.

- After restructuring and the development of a comprehensive institutional effectiveness policy, rethink the allocation of budgets and the assignment of space across offices charged with IE responsibilities.

Recommendations for the Strategic Plan for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness

As stated in the introduction, the original purpose of this external review was to develop recommendations for goals to be included in the OIE’s strategic plan. Most of the following recommendations are implied by the suggestions for restructuring outlined above and all of them are intended to support the ultimate goals of improving WMU’s effectiveness and increasing faculty and administrative awareness of the importance of assessment to continuous improvement:

- Revise OIE’s mission;
- Lead the examination of the structure and workflow of IE efforts across existing offices;
- Oversee the development of a comprehensive institutional effectiveness policy;
- Develop an OIE communication plan, including increased attention to reporting out data to faculty and administration;
- Coordinate the development of processes to educate and engage the University in continuous self-assessment and improvement; and
- Develop IE training programs for associate deans, unit heads, and program coordinators.

In addition, initiative-specific recommendations to be addressed by the OIE include:

- Review the new HLC policies regarding institutional effectiveness and work with senior leadership to come into compliance with new expectations (e.g., including a review of assessment data as part of the budget allocation and de-allocation process).
- Expand support for specialized accreditation;
  - Include the formatting, printing, and submission of reports;
  - Provide a centralized support system for visits; and
  - Provide a more coordinated response to reviews.
- Train specialized accreditation coordinators and arrange for them to share best practices and lessons learned.
- Improve communication regarding the services available for units undergoing specialized accreditations and expectations for documentation.
- Work with the Provost’s Council to establish metric targets and to prioritize initiatives developed to support the strategic plan.

Note that the SWOT analysis also includes suggestions regarding faculty development, ICES, and external recognition of faculty which are not directly related to the IE function.
OVERVIEW

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness at WMU desires to foster a culture of

1. continuous quality improvement
2. best practices
3. effectiveness through efficiency and the appropriate alignment of resources to priorities
4. appreciation, transparency, and information-sharing through the building of effective relationships with key stakeholders in University governance
5. safety and a liberalness of ideas

that all may learn.

What is Institutional Effectiveness?

The Association for Higher Education Effectiveness (AHEE) defines Integrated Institutional Effectiveness (IEE) as:

"...the purposeful coordination and integration of functions that support institutional performance, quality, and efficiency; those functions include strategic planning, outcomes assessment, institutional research, regional/specialized accreditation, and program/unit review." This includes "cross-functional institutional initiatives, assuring implementation, monitoring progress, and facilitating change as needed." (https://www.ahee.org/about).

The following diagram on page 2 illustrates the cross-functional institutional initiatives described in the aforementioned definitions.
Institutional effectiveness is a combination of the tasks required to develop, initiate, and maintain the organization's performance that includes strategic planning, strategic implementation, process evaluation, strategic monitoring, and outcome evaluation.

- Development of a strategic plan begins with an analysis of the institution's risks and risk appetite (Enterprise Risk Management), and intentional goal setting to mitigate those risks. It then incorporates strategic budgeting and strategic human resources management so that appropriate resources are made available to ensure success of planning initiatives.

- Strategic implementation creates and administers processes that ensure that barriers to success are identified and mitigated, including the removal of potential workarounds that cause delays in implementation.

- Process evaluation is a method of assessing how a program is being implemented that focuses on the program's operations, implementation, and service delivery.

- Strategic monitoring bridges the gap between planning and operations through regular observations and minor course corrections. Records of these observations feed into outcome evaluations.

- Outcome evaluation measures the program's outcomes and assesses the program's overall effectiveness. It also provides necessary information about program changes made between implementation and operationalization.
PLANNING

Formerly Goal 3

Objective 1.1: Liaise with the Strategic Management Executive Council (SMEC) to manage and communicate reporting for University Strategic Planning. – NEW: combines portions of the original Objective 3.1 with portions of former strategy 5.3d. (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.1a: Integrate the actions of SMEC and CRÔM to inform strategic planning.

      Success Measure: Define the role of CRÔM Action Teams. (In Progress)

      Success Measure: Division and unit plans use standard terminology as their plans are revised to align with the University Strategic Plan. (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.1b: Revise plan-reporting metrics to provide increased accuracy and relevancy of data metrics availability. (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.1c: Implement process for aligning progress measures to resource management processes. (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.1d: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for strategic planning. – Formerly Strategy 5.3d. (In Progress)

Objective 1.2: Implement a new electronic system (i.e., Compliance Assist: Planning from Campus Labs) to support and measure the University Strategic Plan progress. (In Progress)

   Strategy 1.2a: Gain approval of using the preferred system for data collection and reporting of University Strategic Plan success measures. (In Progress)

      Success Measure: The preferred system is fully implemented by April 2018. (In-Progress)

   Strategy 1.2b: Create USP template for progress reporting. (In Progress)

      Success Measure: IE enters the data for initial mid-year report by October 2017. (In-Progress)

   Strategy 1.2c: Train divisional designees to use the new system for reporting progress. (In Progress)

      Success Measure: Trainings have been completed by November 2017. (In-Progress)
Strategy 1.2d: Regular divisional progress reports are submitted using the system during the set, semi-annual intervals. (In Progress)

  *Success Measure: All divisions report their fiscal year priorities in October/November using the common template and reporting format. (In-Progress)*

  *Success Measure: All divisions report progress toward their fiscal year priorities in December/January and May/June. (In-Progress)*

Objective 1.3: Align the Academic Affairs divisional plan with the revised USP for immediate implementation. (In Progress)

  *Strategy 1.3a: Revisions are made upon approval of the USP to match its direction. (In Progress)*

  *Success Measure: A revision and implementation structure is in place to make any necessary realignments. (In-Progress)*

  *Strategy 1.3b: Academic Affairs planning reports 2016-17 inform prioritization of resources for 2017-18. (In Progress)*

Objective 1.4: Strategic alignment of Academic Affair (AA) unit budgets that support University Strategic Plan (USP) priorities. (In Progress)

  *Strategy 1.4a: Demonstrate how AA budgets align with University Strategic Plan (USP). (In Progress)*

  *Success Measure: Unit budgets demonstrate strategic allocation of resources to support USP priorities. (In-Progress)*
ACCREDITATION AND PROGRAM REVIEW

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness places emphasis on programs using the outcomes from the different forms of program review (e.g., accreditation, WMU's integrated program review, STARS, etc.) to continuously improve the quality of their programs. This section is broken into “external review” (i.e., regional and specialized program accreditation), and “internal review” (i.e., WMU's integrated program review).

External Review

The former “Accreditation” category has been renamed “External Review” in order to create a culture that accreditation is a form of external program review.

It satisfies IE's desire to:

- Build culture of best practices of accreditation
- Fully utilize the results of program review
- Prepare the institution for HLC reaccreditation
- Overcome fear, reduce protectionism tendencies as the relate to accreditation
- Ensure implementation of the Signature initiative

GOAL 2: MAINTAIN HLC “GOOD STANDING” ACCREDITATION STATUS, THE HIGHEST STANDARD AVAILABLE.

Formerly Goal 1

Objective 2.1: WMU is in compliance with HLC Assumed Practices for complaints and faculty qualifications. (In Progress)

Strategy 2.1a: Complaints tracking process is implemented into the CRM by spring 2018; and fully operational by Summer I 2018. (In Progress)

Success Measure: Complaint tracking system is accessible by all through WMU website.

Strategy 2.1b: Faculty Credentials policy is finalized and implemented by spring 2018.
Success Measure: Documentation of all unit policies, procedures, and forms are available by December 31, 2017. (In-Progress)

Objective 2.2: WMU successfully implements the Signature quality initiative that meets HLC expectations by fall 2018. (In Progress)

Strategy 2.2a: Work with the Division of Student Affairs to finalize the personnel structure by the end of fall semester 2017. (In Progress)

Success Measure: All necessary stakeholders are engaged through the committee structure. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2b: The Signature timeline is met, so that piloting begins in fall 2016 and full implementation begins fall 2017. (In Progress)

Success Measure: The Signature is fully implemented fall 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Annual progress reports are submitted for the evidence prior at the close of each fiscal year. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2c: The Signature becomes self-sustaining with a long-term plan. (In Progress)

Success Measure: The budget protocol is established for the program to run in perpetuity. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2d: Submit the report to HLC on the level of success achieved in 2018. (In Progress)

Success Measure: The report and findings are reviewed and approved by HLC in 2018-19 FY. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2e: Work with student affairs to populate the staff and faculty involved in pathway communities. (In Progress)

Success Measure: Pathway Community Leaders have been identified by September 1, 2017. (In-Progress)

Strategy 2.2f: The Signature Quality Initiative meets the HLC evaluation criteria for genuineness of effort during the Quality Initiative. (In Progress)

Success Measure: By fall 2017, ensure that the Signature program is informed that HLC will evaluated the quality of the initiative on the following:

a. Seriousness of its undertaking of the Signature designation. (In-Progress)

b. The scope and impact of the Signature Program designation. (In-Progress)

c. Commitment and engagement in the Signature designation. (In-Progress)
d. Adequate resource provision for the Signature designation. *(In-Progress)*

Objective 2.3: Achieve reaffirmation in WMU's 2020-21 decennial review. *(In Progress)*

Strategy 2.3a: Orient and gain commitment of the HLC Advisory Council to participate in the assurance system for full participation by spring semester 2017. *(In Progress)*

*Success Measure: Identify need for assurance system training for HLC Advisory Board. One person will be trained to use HLC's electronic system by end of spring 2018.* *(In-Progress)*

Strategy 2.3b: Streamline the evidence collection process to request only necessary information by fall 2018. *(In Progress)*

*Success Measure: Evidence collection process is identified by spring 2018.* *(In-Progress)*

Strategy 2.3c: Populate the assurance system with evidence that demonstrates WMU's compliance with HLC's criteria for accreditation and federal compliance standards by the end of spring 2019. *(In Progress)*

*Success Measure: All evidentiary items are referenced and linked in the report by the end of spring 2019.* *(In-Progress)*

*Success Measure: The assurance argument system is closed and submitted for review eight weeks prior to the scheduled visit.* *(In-Progress)*

Strategy 2.3d: Investigate and recommend web-based software so the institution will be able to recognize, provide evidence of faculty/staff credentials, scholarly works, and creative accomplishments. *(In Progress)*

*Success Measure: The preferred system is implemented by fall 2017.* *(In-Progress)*

Strategy 2.3e: Analysis of HLC Accreditation Readiness will be ongoing beginning fall 2017. *(In Progress)*

*Success Measure: Implement process of Heat Map evaluation and reporting by fall 2017.* *(In-Progress)*

*Success Measure: Stakeholders are identified and lists are created with contact information by fall 2017.* *(In-Progress)*

Strategy 2.3f: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for institutional accreditation measures. – Formerly Strategy 5.3d. *(In Progress)*
GOAL 3: LEAD THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT OF WMU’S RELATIONSHIP WITH AGENCIES THAT PROVIDE ACCREDITATION, CERTIFICATION, AND LICENSURE TO ITS PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES TO MAINTAIN COMPLIANCE WHILE SUPPORTING STRATEGIC PLANNING.

Formerly Goal 2

Objective 3.1: WMU continually provides learners with highly recognized academic and learner-support programs and award-winning facilities by actively seeking and obtaining accreditation, certification, licensure, or “approval” from prominent professional organizations. (Ongoing)

Strategy 3.1a: Academic and learner-support program coordinators actively seek accreditation and certification through the most prominent professional organizations in each of their areas. (In-Progress)

   Success Measure: IE ensures that curriculum review documents for all new programs, effective fall 2018, reference the accreditation or certification standards of the agency, and provide evidence of collaboration with an agency liaison. (In-Progress)

Objective 3.2: WMU maintains a relationship in good standing with agencies that provide its academic and learner-support programs and institutional facilities with accreditation, certification, licensure, and “approvals.” (Ongoing)

Strategy 3.2a: Programs and facilities comply with the standards, requirements, and mandates of their professional organizations and state agencies. (In-Progress)

   Success Measure: IE coordinates with academic programs to respond to new and revised requirements with five business days prior to agency deadlines. (In-Progress)

   Success Measure: IE reviews initial site visit reports and program responses, prior to agency deadline, to ensure any cited weaknesses have been addressed, and that errors of fact have been corrected. (In-Progress)

Strategy 3.2b: Programs and facilities comply with the standards and requirements of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), and with WMU policies and procedures. (In-Progress)

   Success Measure: All academic programs that can be accredited, where that accreditation provides a significant benefit to the program’s students or graduates, are maintaining continuing accreditation or are in pursuit of new accreditation. (In-Progress)

   Success Measure: Programs and facilities submit final drafts of all documents to Institutional Effectiveness for review by posted IE deadlines. (In-Progress)
Objective 3.3: WMU fosters a culture of compliance with accreditation, certification, licensure, and approval through transparency and communication. (Ongoing)

Strategy 3.3a: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as WMU’s point of contact regarding the accreditation, certification, and licensure status of academic programs and University facilities. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE informs WMU leadership of all impending reporting, visits, and actions mandates from agencies at the time deadlines are posted. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE directs the operations and administration of the WMU Accreditation Library, including maintenance and auditing of the library's electronic holdings on a continuous basis. (In-Progress)

Internal Review

GOAL 4: LEAD THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF WMU’S INTEGRATED PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING ENDEAVORS TO SUPPORT STRATEGIC PLANNING EFFORTS TOWARD QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.

Objective 4.1: WMU espouses a culture of continuous assessment through program evaluation. (Ongoing)

Strategy 4.1a: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness ensures that administrative programs effectively execute the policies and processes associated with conducting institutional-level integrated program review and planning projects. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE provides a minimum of three face-to-face training opportunities to self-study completers during January 2018. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE provides a minimum of one face-to-face training opportunity to “next-level” and “division-level” program reviewers during April 2018. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE provides one-on-one technical assistance and supplemental training to self-study completers and program reviewers on a continuous basis. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE develops and initiates communication plans to inform self-study completers, program reviewers, WMU leadership, and other University stakeholders of all upcoming events and phase-related activities at key points within the process. (In-Progress)

Strategy 4.1b: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness leads the Administrative Program Review and Planning project team tasked to identify appropriate standards, develop evaluation questions,
determine appropriate data collection methods, and produce reports on findings and continuous use of results. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE constitutes a project management team of administrative program-level peers by September 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that all technology and PMT document revisions are completed by November 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that the conversion from the project management team to an oversight committee coincides seamlessly with the launch of the official reporting period – January 1, 2018. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that an observation team is constituted, trained, and provided with accurate and appropriate materials by February 1, 2018. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE ensures that the oversight committee completes its duties and reporting requirements by June 30, 2018. (In-Progress)

Strategy 4.1c: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness serves as WMU’s point of contact regarding integrated program review and planning. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE uploads PDF copies of completed reports to the Integrated Program Review SharePoint™ site within five business days of each completed phase. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: IE updates the Administrative Program Review and Planning website (http://wmich.edu/effectiveness/program/administrative) with the most current versions of all relevant documents and timelines. (In-Progress)

---

INTEGRATION

GOAL 5: PROVIDE HIGH-CALIBER STEWARDSHIP OF IE RESOURCES AND SERVICE TO UNIVERSITY DIVISIONS THAT PROMOTE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS.

Objective 5.2: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness establishes budget priorities that clearly align projected expenses with its mission and goals, and those of the University. (In Progress)

Strategy 5.2b: The Office of Institutional Effectiveness uses a zero-based budgeting model to allocate effectively its annual funding to program priorities. (In Progress)
Success Measure: Draft a proposal for conducting administrative program review during FY 2018 that includes a cost analysis of resources (i.e., personnel, technology, and other operations) by September 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Perform a cost/benefit analysis to determine whether IE should continue reimbursing annual accreditation fees, or if funds should be reallocated to units by October 31, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Perform a mission-alignment analysis for projected strategic planning expenses (i.e., personnel, technology, and other operations) by November 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Perform a mission-alignment analysis for projected integrated program review expenses (i.e., personnel, technology, and other operations) by November 30, 2017. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Create a semi-permanent “standard of practice” to be used between fiscal years 2018 and 2020 for all IE-related budgeting activities by January 5, 2018. (In-Progress)

Success Measure: Draft a fiscal year 2018 “zero-based” budget projection based on the individual budget analyses by February 28, 2018. (In-Progress)

Objective 5.3: Establish a software-platform user-group organizational structure and governance to manage and communicate reporting. (In Progress)

    Strategy 5.3a: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for student success and assessment of learning measures. (In Progress)

    Strategy 5.3b: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for student engagement measures. (In Progress)

    Strategy 5.3e: Establish a user group to manage and communicate reporting for student, faculty, and staff complaint measures. (In Progress)

Objective 5.4: Support cross-functional institutional initiatives, assuring implementation, monitoring progress, and facilitating change as needed. (In Progress)

    Strategy 5.4a: Provide support to the Office of the General Counsel in developing a university-wide policy on policies. (In Progress)

    Strategy 5.4b: Provide support to the Office of Community Outreach in developing the application for Carnegie classification on engagement. (In Progress)

    Strategy 5.4c: Provide support to WMU’s Campus Compact Action Planning Team. (In Progress)
GOAL 6: MANAGE THOSE POLICIES AND PRACTICES THAT RELATE POSITIVELY TO EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION AND WORKPLACE ENGAGEMENT.

Objective 6.1: Become a leader in sustainable office practices to improve workplace. (In Progress)


Success Measure: IE is able to achieve 50 percent of the points toward a Green Certificate by spring 2018. (In-Progress)

Objective 6.2: Professional development activities are designed to increase employee performance and office efficiencies. (In Progress)

Strategy 6.2a: All IE staff will participate in the StrengthsQuest assessment and subsequent professional activities. (In Progress)

Success Measure: IE staff find meaningful growth areas that lead to increased employee satisfaction. (In-Progress)