### DEPARTMENTAL MISSION STATEMENT:

The offices of Institutional Planning, Research, and Effectiveness serve the university mission through comprehensive planning and continuous advancement of the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data.

The offices provide support to the campus community through interdepartmental data collaborations, accountability for internal and external reporting, and resources for outcome assessment and plans for growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Methods and Procedures</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Planned Improvements Based on Assessment Results/Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Assist academic programs, student support units, and administrative offices in developing and carrying out institutional effectiveness plans.</td>
<td>The IE departmental/program rubric was developed during the spring of 2016. The university-wide IE committee will use the rubric to review departmental/program IE reports. 80% of IE committee members will use the rubric to evaluate department/program IE reports. <strong>Baseline</strong> - In 2016-17, 87% of university-wide IE committee members used the rubric to evaluate department/program reports. <strong>Benchmark</strong> - 80% of university-wide IE committee members used the rubric to evaluate department/program reports. <strong>Target</strong> - 90% of university-wide IE committee members used the rubric to evaluate department/program reports by the next two consecutive years.</td>
<td>SurveyMonkey was used to evaluate each of the 34 department/program IE reports.</td>
<td>At the beginning of FMU's academic year, three new members of the IE university-wide committee were appointed and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness was hired. Department/program IE reports for the 2017-18 were reviewed in fall 2018. 100% (7 out of 7) committee members reviewed and used the IE rubric for the 34 department/program IE reports. The benchmark and target was met. During this IE cycle, the rubric was reviewed, revised and voted on by the IE committee. Majority of the revisions and suggestions will be implement in the next IE cycle. <strong>Benchmark and Target Met</strong></td>
<td>The IE campus-wide IE committee will continue to use the IE rubric for the 2019-20 IE cycle. The new rubric will be implemented during the next IE cycle. The changes to the rubric will be reported to the Departments/Programs via workshops, meetings, and emails.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal
2. Engage faculty and staff in learning opportunities in support of the preparation of institutional effectiveness plans and reports.

### Desired Outcome
The desired outcome is to provide learning opportunities for department/program and support services for submitting yearly IE reports.

### Assessment Methods and Procedures
Provide yearly workshops for academic, student, administrative support services and department/program units across campus. To engage in programmatic learning opportunities, attendees (academic, student, and administrative support services) will be asked to rate their satisfaction level of the workshops.

**Baseline** - In 2016-17, the workshop format was not used, instead one-on-one sessions were held with departments and support units. During workshops, no surveys were deployed during 2016-17 academic year.

**Benchmark** - Hold at least 2 yearly workshops for academic, student, administrative units and department/program units. A satisfaction survey (academic, student and administrative support services) will be conducted after the each workshop and initial meetings will yield at least an average of 5 out of 7 (71.4%) for question one and a 7 out of 10 (70%) for questions 2 to 4.

**Target** - Hold at least 2 yearly workshops for academic, student, administrative units and department/program units. A satisfaction survey (academic, student, and administrative support services) will be conducted after the each workshop and initial meeting will yield at least an average of 5.5 out of 7 (78.6%) for question one and a 7.5 out of 10 (75%) for questions 2 to 4.

### Results
For this academic cycle, there were seven workshops and various initial meetings. There were four Academic & Student Support Services workshops, 2 Administrative Support Services workshops two department/program workshops, and various initial meetings.

The survey results from 17 responses from 40 units:

**Question 1** - My questions regarding the IE report writing process were answered to my satisfaction on a Likert scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). On average score was 6.7 (95.7%).

**Question 2** - On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is not very helpful and 10 is extremely helpful, how do you rate the helpfulness of the information provided in today's workshop? The average score was 8.4 (84%).

**Question 3** - On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is not very clear and 10 is extremely clear, how do you rate the clarity of the information provided in today's workshop? The average score was 8.5 (85%).

**Question 4** - On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is not at all satisfied and 10 is extremely satisfied, how do you rate your overall satisfaction with today's workshop? The average score was 8.6 (86%).

### Planned Improvements Based on Assessment Results/Action Items
The Benchmark and Target was met. Since this is first year that the survey has been deployed, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will continue to monitor the results for the next academic year. To increase the number of respondents, the survey will be deployed immediately after each workshop in person and by email.
### 3. Assist academic programs in developing and carrying out institutional effectiveness plans by deploying a web-based interim-report development system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Methods and Procedures</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Planned Improvements Based on Assessment Results/Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deploy a web-based data capture system to collect interim (mid-year) IE reports from each academic program. The desired outcome is to have all departments/programs participate in Interim IE reports process.</td>
<td>The number of programs that submit web-based reports before the established deadline. <strong>Baseline</strong> - In 2016-17, 22 of 29 programs used the web-based interim IE report system. That was a 76% participation level. <strong>Benchmark</strong> - 28 out of 34 departments/programs will use the web-based interim IE report system. That will be 82.4% participation level. The committee will convene to discuss ways to improve the reporting system for departments/programs. <strong>Target</strong> - All departments/programs (100% participation level) will use the web-based interim IE report system for the next two academic years. On a yearly basis, the IE committee will convene to discuss ways to improve the reporting system for departments/programs.</td>
<td>There were no interim reports for 2018-19 academic year, but all 34 departments/programs submitted yearly IE reports. After assessing department/program IE reports (2017-18 academic year), the IE committee voted unanimously to require only end of the year IE reports. The IE committee voted on this outcome in fall 2018. <strong>Benchmark and Target was not met</strong></td>
<td>This desired outcome will be discontinued unless it is needed or required by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and campus-wide units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Desired Outcome</td>
<td>Assessment Methods and Procedures</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Planned Improvements Based on Assessment Results/Action Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify FMU's desired outcomes to address the university's plan assumptions.</td>
<td>For the IE cycle, the desired outcome is to increase the number of outcomes to address the university's plan assumptions.</td>
<td>The assessment method is to identify the number of desired outcomes campus-wide after collecting academic, student and administrative support service yearly reports. <strong>Baseline</strong> – The total number of desired outcomes campus-wide were not reported. <strong>Benchmark</strong> - Academic, student and administrative units will report at least 4 desired outcomes in a given year. At least 70% of all units will report 4 or more desired outcomes. <strong>Target</strong> - Academic, student and administrative units will report at least 4 desired outcomes in a given year. At least 80% of all units will report 4 or more desired outcomes.</td>
<td>There were 139 desired outcomes for the academic and student support services. Only 3 out of the 25 units (88%) identified less than four desired outcomes. There were 95 desired outcomes for the administrative support services. All 15 units (100%) identified at least four desired outcomes. Each unit's desired outcomes were matched with the university's plan assumptions. Those results were presented in the cumulative report and will be presented to the individual units during workshops and meetings to identify areas to improve. <strong>Benchmark and Target Met</strong></td>
<td>The majority of the academic, student and administrative units reported at least four or more desired outcomes. The outcomes were matched to the university's plan assumptions, and this was the first year that the support services were assessed using an IE rubric. The new IE rubric will continue to be used for the next academic year. Each of the university's units will be assessed using an IE rubric and by an IE committee which will be representative of the support services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>