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Overview of the Quality Initiative

1. Provide a one-page executive summary that describes the Quality Initiative, summarizes what was accomplished, and explains any changes made to the initiative over the time period.
**Quality Initiative Description**

During the college’s strategic planning process, adapting and implementing the academic program review model for administrative (non-academic) units was identified as an objective to support the goal of managing long-term decision making with data-informed models. Academic programs had a long-standing history of program reviews, but administrative units had never completed such a comprehensive self-study for the purpose of assessing and improving performance. The five administrative units include Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, Enrollment & Student Services (ESS) [now divided into two separate operational units: Enrollment & Recruitment Services and Student Success & Retention Services], Facilities & Information Technology, and Marketing & Communications. The intent is that one administrative unit will be reviewed each year on a 5-year rotation beginning with the two units in Enrollment & Student Services. ESS was selected because of organizational and functional changes that were implemented based on the college’s first strategic enrollment management (SEM) process completed in December, 2013. The QI provides the units the opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the changes, functions and processes, and identify opportunities for improvement.

**Accomplishments**

The lack of sufficient technology resources was identified as a concern by the QI Reviewers and became a key milestone for the project, so the QI process began with the exploration of process management software systems. The QI provided the college with the opportunity to identify technology solutions that would facilitate the management of not only the administrative unit review process (QI) but also other processes including the strategic plan, academic master plan, strategic enrollment management plan, academic department review, academic program/discipline review, administrative unit annual goals and student learning outcomes assessment. A wide range of college stakeholders participated in vendor demonstrations, and Higher One’s Campus Labs Compliance Assist and Baseline solutions were selected as best meeting the college’s needs. System implementation began in January, 2014.

A Quality Initiative Project Working Group (QIP) was established to undertake the development of the administrative unit review process. Two staff members from each of the 5 areas were each identified to serve on the QIP. This group had ongoing meetings where they considered the various measures that should be included in the review. After much discussion and research, it was agreed that the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) provided a best practices approach to assessing effectiveness of non-academic and support services. The group recommended that templates be created, using the CAS Self-Assurance Guides and General Standards, in Compliance Assist (the Campus Labs’ system) to facilitate the new administrative unit review process.

**Changes Made to the Initiative**

The most significant changes to the initiative were 1) modifying the aggressive timeline in the QI Proposal and 2) using the CAS Standards as the basis of the review instead of adapting the college’s academic program review model. Exploring, selecting, licensing and implementing a software system in 1-2 months was simply unrealistic given the scope of the college’s needs above and beyond managing the QI. Additionally, as a result of the SEM planning process, ESS was reorganized into two units and the hiring of new senior directors for the areas was not completed until February, 2015. These delays required the milestone dates be revised with the first administrative unit review process beginning in the 2015 calendar year.

When the QIP began researching administrative review models, the group decided that the CAS Standards provided a better framework for non-academic review than adapting the existing academic program review model as had been outlined in the QI Proposal.
Scope and Impact of the Initiative

2. Explain in more detail what was accomplished in the Quality Initiative in relation to its purposes and goals. (If applicable, explain the initiative’s hypotheses and findings.)

The purpose of the QI is to develop an administrative unit review process by adapting the current academic program review process for administrative units. Through this QI, the college achieved the purpose. Administrative unit stakeholders served on the Quality Initiative Proposal Working Group (QIP) to achieve the stated goals as follows:

- Use the current academic program review as the foundation for the administrative unit review development process: group members reviewed the current program review resources and templates.
- Conduct a literature review to identify peer institutions that had established administrative unit review processes: group members conducted the literature review and identified institutional contacts.
- Contact institutional representatives: group members contacted institutional representatives to discuss processes, including technology and other resources.
- Explore software and process management technology solutions: initially 3 potential software vendors – TaskStream, TracDat and Weave Engaged – were identified as possible solutions, and Campus Labs and Strategic Planning Online were added based on recommendations from other institutions.
- Select and license a software solution: Higher One’s Campus Labs was selected as best meeting the college’s needs for both the scope of the QI and to facilitate management of other processes the strategic plan, academic master plan, strategic enrollment management plan, academic department review, academic program/discipline review, administrative unit annual goals, student learning outcomes assessment and survey administration.
- Draft an institutional review process and submit for review: group members determined the CAS Self-Assurance Guides and General Standards represented a best practice framework for the review process. An overview of the group’s recommendations and CAS was presented to Administrative Council.
- Establish an administrative unit review calendar: administrative units agreed to the following calendar:
  
  | Enrollment & Recruitment Services       | January - October 2015 |
  | Student Success & Retention Services   | January - October 2015 |
  | Academic Affairs                       | January - October 2016 |
  | Facilities & Information Technology    | January - October 2017 |
  | Administrative Services                | January - October 2018 |
  | Marketing & Communications             | January - October 2019 |

- Conduct training sessions: director of institutional effectiveness met with staff. Campus Labs staff conducted Compliance Assist training webinars.
- Complete first administrative unit review cycle: the first administrative unit review reports will be completed by October 1, 2015. Academic Affairs begins the review cycle in January, 2016.
3. **Evaluate the impact of the initiative, including any changes in processes, policies, technology, curricula, programs, student learning and success that are now in place in consequence of the initiative.**

The impact of the QI has been college-wide and resulted in changes in processes, policies, technology, programs and student learning.

**Changes in Processes & Policies:**

For the first time, administrative units have an established assessment process and cyclical review calendar. While the original intent was to adapt the current academic program review structure, the decision to use the CAS Standards ensures that non-academic support services are applying appropriate high-quality assessment measures developed by higher education representatives to their self-study. CAS templates provide structure, guidance and tools that will assist administrative unit staff to appropriately assess performance and identify opportunities for improvement in core processes to support the college’s mission and improve student learning.

Academic program and discipline areas have been following the institution’s program review process for many years, but thinking about ongoing assessment of non-academic units also led to the development and implementation of a new academic department review process. At the 2006 reaffirmation visit, there were 3 academic divisions. These divisions have subsequently been reorganized into 5 academic departments. The current 5 departments, nor the previous 3 divisions, have not undergone a self-study process. The 5 academic departments are:

- Business, Law & Technology
- English, Languages & Fine Arts
- Math, Aviation, Geology, Physics & Computers
- Science & Health
- Social Sciences

In order for the institution to learn from its operational experience and work to systematically improve its performance as outlined in Criterion 5 and Core Component 5.D., the academic departments represent another component of the college that must assess its performance.

Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Dr. Kim Jacobs-Beck, the English, Languages & Fine Arts department chair at the time, drafted an academic department review template which was reviewed by the college dean, associate dean, senior assistant dean and 5 department chairs. Once the review components were established, a template was created. Beginning in the 2015 calendar year, the new academic department review process was launched simultaneously with the QI. The previous rotating academic program review calendar was revised so that the academic programs and discipline areas within the academic department are reviewed during the same cycle as the academic unit. The Science & Health Department, and all of its academic programs and discipline areas, is the first academic department undergoing review.

As the college and academic departments considered the impact of the QI on the development of new review processes, the department chairs expressed concern that a 5-year comprehensive academic program review approach did not support a culture of continuous improvement based on program measures. While student outcomes measures such as retention, persistence and completion are reviewed by academic departments and faculty each year, the 5-year period in between reports creates a sense that addressing changes had to wait for the formal report cycle. To address this concern, an annual academic program progress update report template was created. This report, a compilation of quantitative and qualitative measures, enables program and area faculty to review current academic year performance against the previous year and to
identify opportunities for improvement that can be addressed through short-term goals. The first annual academic program progress update reports are being submitted in the summer of 2015.

**Changes in Technology**

Based on QI Proposal Reviewers’ feedback, the institution licensed a technology solution that facilitates the new administrative unit review process, as well as other college processes, and which directly supports the institution’s capacity to sustain continuous improvement and use data to inform decision making, as outlined in the strategic plan. The cloud-based Campus Labs Compliance Assist and Baseline solutions enable the collection, analysis and distribution of data in ways that the college wasn’t previously able to do. This technology is transforming the way the college approaches and manages planning, accreditation, surveys, reviews and outcomes assessment. Other than the administrative unit review process, these processes were beyond the QI’s scope, but the inclusion of a technology resource as a goal to support the QI has had benefits for all levels of the college. Without the Campus Labs system, the QI would have been another process managed by the one-person Institutional Effectiveness Office; consistency across units would have been difficult to maintain; collaboration among staff writing the reviews would have been challenging; distribution of the final report would have been limited to a pdf document on a Blackboard organization site; and linking evidence to the report as well as identifying how the unit review supports other organizational plans such as the mission and strategic plan would have been impossible. The QI technology component allowed the college to re-envision how it approaches planning and links various assessment activities across the organization to its mission and student learning.

**Changes in Student Learning and Success**

The QI provides a structure and process for administrative units to assess performance; the new academic department review process provides a structure for academic departments to assess its performance as a cohesive academic structure that directly supports instructional delivery; the new annual academic program progress update report process provides structure for a renewed focus on student outcome and program performance measures and short-term goals at the academic program level; and the Campus Labs platform provides the infrastructure to expand the scope of planning and sustain institutional assessment at a level never before possible. The intent of each of these processes is for the college to engage in systematic and integrated planning and work systematically to improve its performance so that it may achieve its mission providing “student-centered undergraduate education and life-long learning” for its students.

As the first administrative unit completing the review process, the Enrollment & Recruitment Services and Student Success & Retention Services units are using the CAS Self-Assessment Guides to measure performance of the support services they provide. For the first time, non-academic staff are exploring concepts, such as student learning outcomes assessment, that have previously been used only by the academic structures. Staff are thinking about how the services they provide, such as orientation, athletics, academic advising and student life programming support student learning and impact student success. While identifying and developing student learning outcomes for co-curricular areas is a new concept and in the very early stages, understanding how all components of the college impact student learning will help staff to be more intentional in determining how best to address students’ needs.

A new dean and new leadership in student services and academic affairs areas have invigorated collaboration; in fact, a four-member team attended the Higher Learning Commission’s Persistence and Completion Workshop in October, 2014 that included both the interim associate
dean for academic affairs and interim assistant dean for enrollment & student services. Academic Affairs and Student Success & Retention leaders have regular meetings and collaborate to eliminate barriers to student success. These areas are committed to ongoing performance assessment and open communication that began with the cross-college QI development and has extended into other processes including the SEM plan and early alert system implementations.

4. **Explain any tools, data, or other information that resulted from the work of the initiative.**

The QI work has resulted in the development of an administrative review template that will be used for the 5 administrative unit reviews as well as CAS templates for the administrative units’ programs and services (e.g., academic advising, TRIO grant programs, athletics, career services, orientation programs, etc.). These tools, along with resources and user guides, directly resulted from the QI. Upon completion of the review reports, data and other performance-related assessment results will be used to inform quality improvement strategies; staffing, space allocation and resource acquisition decisions; and refinements to the review process itself.

5. **Describe the biggest challenges and opportunities encountered in implementing the initiative.**

**Challenges:**

The biggest challenges include:

- Adhering to the aggressive timeline in the QI Proposal
- Implementing new technology
- Supporting non-academic staff’s understanding of an historically academic approach to ongoing review during a period of significant organizational change

As outlined in the executive summary, the timeline had to be modified because of various factors including the extended time that it took to identify, select, license and implement the Campus Labs platform, and the hiring of new senior directors for the two organizational units that replaced ESS. These factors delayed the first administrative unit review launch an entire academic year.

Once the Campus Labs platform was selected and licensed, implementation began. A strength of the Compliance Assist module used for the review reporting is that it is highly customizable; this was also one of the biggest challenges for the college because it required significant human resource commitment to design and develop the templates and processes to fit the college’s needs. Now that the administrative unit, academic department, academic program and discipline area review templates have been created and the two new administrative units and the Science & Health Department are completing the reviews, report design and development is the next software feature that is being addressed.

The ESS reorganization into Enrollment & Recruitment Services and Student Success & Retention affected not only the administration of these units as new academic advising staff positions were also created and filled. Testing Services and Career Services were reassigned to Academic Affairs, and programs and services within the former ESS unit were aligned under one of the two new units. Within the units, existing ESS job descriptions were audited and, where necessary, positions were created, redefined or abolished. The reorganization of ESS was not only a major organizational change but also signified the college’s commitment to improving student enrollment, persistence and completion outcomes through implementation of the strategic enrollment management plan. Implementing a new review process that the majority of these support staff are unfamiliar with during a time of major change has been challenging. The
CAS Standards and Self-Assessment Guides in the Compliance Assist module provide structure for the review, but staff still struggle with the learning curve that exists for the first cycle of any new initiative.

**Opportunities:**
The biggest opportunities include:

- Implementing an integrated technology platform that supports campus planning, early alert/student success and other areas of need beyond the QI
- Developing other review processes to support continuous improvement and institutional effectiveness
- Collaborating to improve student success
- Developing student learning outcomes for co-curricular programs and services

The Campus Labs management platform implementation has led to improvements beyond simply managing the QI. Because the Campus Labs modules are integrated, the college decided to pilot the Beacon early alert/student success module (the SEM plan identified the use of an early alert/student success solution as a priority initiative). Beacon includes alert, update and encouragement notification capabilities to enable early intervention for at-risk behaviors as well as non-cognitive assessments to identify student-reported characteristics that may impact persistence and completion. Additionally, since UC Clermont College (UCCC) is a regional college of the University of Cincinnati (UC) and UC’s Student Activities and Leadership Development uses the CollegiateLink student engagement platform to promote and measure student engagement, the college is investigating future use of CollegiateLink in addition to the existing Campus Labs modules.

As outlined in #3 above, the QI led to the development of an academic department review process, realignment of the 5-year academic program and discipline area review calendar to coincide with the academic department review cycle and development of an annual program progress update report for all academic programs and discipline areas. These new processes support continuous improvement and may not have been conceptualized had it not been for the QI effort and Campus Labs implementation. The software’s reporting capabilities will improve the use of data in planning at all levels and monitoring progress on strategic priorities in ways that weren’t possible before.

The new dean, interim associate dean and senior directors are committed to collaboration. Campus Labs training, Beacon implementation, revised orientation and academic advising models and an intentional focus on improving student success has led to open and sometimes difficult discussions among administrators, faculty and staff. Staff from Academic Affairs and Student Success & Retention have been collaborating on the Beacon implementation and preparing for the full-college launch this fall. Many of these staff are new to the college or in new roles and are working together toward a shared goal of improving student success. Staff across many areas of the college are making a genuine effort to break through typical communication silos to work together to achieve shared goals. The QI provided structure for a reflective self-study exercise that has led to purposeful reflection on other processes and procedures.

Finally, programs and services are exploring the concept of student learning outcomes (SLOs) for co-curricular areas. Faculty and academic staff have been measuring SLO achievement for
more than 10 years, but this concept is very new to most of the non-academic areas. To further understanding of how SLOs can be applied to improve student learning through co-curricular programs and services, the interim associate dean for academic affairs is planning workshops during the 2015-16 academic year. Co-curricular staff will also be invited to attend future assessment workshops hosted by the Academic Assessment Committee.

Commitment to and Engagement in the Quality Initiative

6. Describe the individuals and groups involved at stages throughout the initiative and their perceptions of its worth and impact.

Individuals and Groups Involved by Stage:
Development Stage:
Primary responsibility for QI oversight was assigned to Director of Institutional Effectiveness Susan Riley. Additionally, two representatives from each of the 5 administrative units participated in the Quality Initiative Project (QIP) Working Group:

- Julie Eagen, Enrollment & Student Services
- Mae Hanna, Marketing & Communications
- Susan Jackson, Business Administration
- Maria Keri, Business Administration
- Kris Loughran-Strater, Enrollment & Student Services
- Terry Moore, Marketing & Communications
- Glenda Neff, Academic Affairs
- Kevin Peck, Facilities & Information Technology
- Mary Stearns, Academic Affairs
- Mel Sweet, Facilities & Information Technology

Software Solution Identification Stage:
Various college stakeholders, including QIP Working Group members, administrators, department chairs, faculty and staff attended demonstrations of the 5 software vendors.

Review Stage:
The proposed administrative unit review model was reviewed by Administrative Council (dean’s direct reports, denoted by *, and other staff who regularly attend the meetings):

- Dean*
- Associate Dean of Academic Affairs*
- Senior Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs
- Assistant Dean of Marketing & Communications*
- Interim Assistant Dean of Enrollment & Student Services*
- Assistant Dean of Facilities & Information Technology*
- Director of Business Affairs*
- Director of Business & Outreach Services
- Director of Development*
- Director of Institutional Effectiveness
- Faculty Senate Liaison
Campus Labs Implementation Stage:
The director of institutional effectiveness and director of business affairs worked with UC Office of General Counsel and UC Central Purchasing to negotiate the contract and financial terms.

Campus Labs implementation involved:
- Susan Riley, director of institutional effectiveness
- Kim Jacobs-Beck, interim associate dean of academic affairs
- Jennifer Radt, senior director of student success and retention (former interim assistant dean of enrollment & student services)
- Meagan Schalk, academic evaluator

Administrative Unit Review Launch Stage:
As the first administrative unit undergoing review, the following programs in the Enrollment & Recruitment Services and Student Success & Retention Services units are completing reviews:

Enrollment & Recruitment Services
- Financial Aid
- Orientation
- Registration
- TRIO Programs (Educational Talent Search, Upward Bound, Educational Opportunities)
- Undergraduate Admissions

Student Success & Retention Services
- Academic Advising
- Athletics
- Counseling
- Disabilities Services
- Student Life
- Veteran’s Services

Perceptions of Worth and Impact of QI by Individuals Involved:
Quality Initiative Working Group:
Establishing and implementing an administrative unit review process is key to ensuring that we are providing the best academic support services possible to our student population. Each of our institutional support units has a different mission and focus but creating a formalized process and structure will allow for consistency across those units. It will also allow units to evaluate current processes, programs and staffing to determine what is/is not working with the goal of establishing new programs or initiatives that may support our mission even more. Many times, we get stuck in a “this is how we’ve always done it” mentality and never evaluate if it is actually accomplishing the goal we set for ourselves or the students. A consistent review process across the academic and non-academic units will provide the structure for all areas to do a self-study by establishing goals, implementing initiatives to meet those goals, measuring if those goals were met and then establishing areas for improvement.

Director of Testing Services Julie Eagen

The Quality Initiative Group was comprised of a diverse group of staff and deans of the college. The group was mainly new to the unit review process, and not heavily involved in the academic accreditation process, but was motivated and quite willing to assist with this piece. Because my
area was not the first chosen for review, my involvement after the first few months has been minimal. But I was made aware of my department being due for review in the next few years.

The value of this type of review remains unclear to me. Having spent my career in the business world (and about ten years on the business side of academics), I am less familiar with this style of review, and am admittedly skeptical on its efficacy. However, any thoughtful review of our processes is bound to improve results.

**Business Officer Maria J. Keri**

The Quality Initiative was very valuable, resulting in an impact on the implementation of Enrollment and Student Services’ plan for student recruiting, department staffing, functions and processes. It prompted us to use data to make more informed decisions in the department and also encouraged that use across the college. The five-part program review process is a model that I will be using on a micro level to evaluate outreach programs, and I look forward to seeing the process completed in Academic Affairs during the next cycle.

**Director of Business & Educational Outreach Glenda Neff**

As Sr. Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, I have been involved with this type of review at the program and discipline levels for many years; as a member of the Quality Assurance Committee and QIP Working Group, I felt confident that extending this type of reflective self-assessment to other administrative units is a good step. While we have encountered some slight modifications in implementation with the purchase of the data management system and the changing structure of the leadership team in ESS, we are making good progress.

**Senior Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs Mary F. Stearns**

**Administrative Council:**

The Quality Initiative focusing on the Administrative Unit Review is a welcomed addition to the HLC accreditation requirements. A periodic and comprehensive review of the performance of all college units will help to ensure a positive experience and learning environment for our students. Continuous improvement of our academic departments and programming has always been a hallmark of the reaccreditation process. The administrative unit review will provide us an opportunity to further develop our student focused culture and to identify areas for improvement.

**Dean Jeffrey C. Bauer**

Our Quality Initiative will help us to assess just how well we are providing services to our students and to ourselves: crucial to our student centered mission as an open access college. Although the focus of each unit may differ, a formalized process and structure will provide consistency across the institution and yet another opportunity for continuous improvement. Many of these units have undergone restructuring in recent years, so our unit review process will provide with some evidence of effectiveness of these changes. Also, our very first unit review of Enrollment & Student Services will support our strategic enrollment management initiative and enhance our recruitment and retention efforts.

**Former Dean Gregory S. Sojka**

The Quality Initiative, developing an Administrative Unit Review, will prove to be a useful reflective tool for each unit. I have been working with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness on building a template for the reviews based on the CAS Standards, and am finding that reading the standards is making me think about implementing better practices in my own unit. I also
believe that the review of administrative units will offer us more opportunities to be strategic about growth, expenditures, and developing priorities, and will make us more accountable.

**Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs Kim Jacobs-Beck**

UC Clermont’s HLC Quality Initiative is a strategic process to assist the Administrative team to review our current policies and effectiveness and outline best practices in effective instruction and future programming at the college. As Director of Development I collaborate with every department and unit on campus to ensure that we are not only meeting our campaign goals, but showcased in the community as a top college in the region. This initiative is a tool that provides our team the opportunity to have discussions and make significant change on campus.

**Director of Development Dana Parker**

The Quality Initiative will add yet another layer of formal, internal, assessment for Facilities and Information Services. It will also build an additional layer of consistency across the institution due to the fact that all areas within the institution will be reviewed using the same guidelines. It should also help keep a focus on services that directly affect academics and learning outcomes for our students.

Ensuring that our students have a clean, comfortable, safe, and technologically advanced environment in which to learn plays a key role in their daily classroom success. Ensuring that Clermont College has a consistent review process in place for service improvement can only serve to strengthen the overall academic experience for our students.

**Assistant Dean for Facilities & Information Services Steve Young**

**Enrollment & Recruitment Services:**
I view the Quality Initiative as a wonderful opportunity to intentionally reflect on our organizational structure, strategies, and tactics as they relate to our mission. I believe this will help facilitate our thoughts and conversations around how we operate and use our human, financial, technology, and other resources most effectively. Higher education is in a period of rapid change in many ways, and this process is a tool to help our students and the college toward even more positive outcomes.

**Senior Director for Enrollment & Recruitment Services John Stiles**

**Student Success & Retention Services:**
The Enrollment & Student Services Unit was the first to undertake the process of the administrative unit review. Our staff met in September 2014 for a day long retreat where we established three unit goals and entered them into Compliance Assist. Our staff has met periodically since then to review and update as necessary. I feel that this process has allowed our unit to work together to establish performance outcomes as a team and has provided an opportunity for individual staff to have their voice heard. The Unit Review process will provide a foundation for units to evaluate, examine, and make necessary improvements to service delivery to benefit the students at UC Clermont.

**Senior Director for Student Success & Retention Jennifer M. Radt**

7. **Describe the most important points learned by those involved in the initiative.**

- Get buy-in: Involve a wide variety of stakeholders during the initiative’s earliest stages, and be prepared to make changes based on stakeholder feedback.
Do the research: Take advantage of networks and connections. Identify similar initiatives at other institutions and talk with those involved. These conversations help to identify opportunities and challenges that might arise during the initiative cycle.

Set a realistic timeline: Research and stakeholder feedback takes time, so set a realistic timeline, and be prepared to modify as necessary once work on the initiative begins.

Expect resistance: Not everyone embraces change easily or enthusiastically. Take time to evaluate how campus culture will affect plans. Identify change champions and anticipate that there will be naysayers. Often, resistance comes from where it’s LEAST expected! Be open to tweaking the process as it’s developed. Some of the earliest ideas may need to be modified in order to achieve success.

Build in opportunities for feedback along the way: Continuous improvement is impossible without stakeholder buy-in and feedback. Design opportunities for campus constituents to share their opinions and experiences, and use the feedback to improve the process, if appropriate.

Plan to modify the process: A learning institution evaluates its processes throughout the cycle. Support opportunities for open discussions with those involved in the process to identify what can be improved based on their experience.

Beyond the process-related important points outlined above, we are already learning, even though we are still in the first administrative unit review reporting cycle, that the QI will improve planning, resource allocation and overall decision-making across the college by providing an assessment infrastructure. In order to meet the standards of quality required by the Criteria for Accreditation and ensure a culture of continuous improvement, UC Clermont College must systematically measure its performance at all operational levels and integrate the results into planning. Prior to the QI, assessment was limited to academic programs and discipline areas; post-QI, assessment encompasses the entire organization.

Resource Provision

8. Explain the human, financial, physical, and technological resources that supported the initiative.

**Human:**

Significant human resource commitment was devoted to the QI as has been outlined in this report. The Quality Assurance Committee (10 members from administration, faculty and staff) reviewed the various QI proposals that were submitted internally and selected the administrative unit review as the official QI. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness Susan Riley and the QIP Working Group members identified potential software vendors, facilitated vendor demonstrations, researched administrative review models, contacted representatives from other institutions about their experience with software solutions and administrative unit review models, reviewed the CAS Standards and recommended the CAS Standards for the QI structure. A number of faculty and staff attended the software vendor demonstrations. The dean, business officer and director of institutional effectiveness facilitated the licensing and purchasing process through the UC Office of General Counsel and UC Central Purchasing.

During the Campus Labs implementation, the interim associate dean of academic affairs, interim assistant dean of enrollment & student services, director of institutional effectiveness and academic evaluator had weekly webinar conferences with the Campus Labs Implementation Team. These 4 UCCC staff developed the system structure, created roles and users, created templates and reports and trained faculty and staff. These activities required hundreds of staff hours which also represents a financial commitment by the institution. After the templates were
built and the senior directors in the ESS units were hired, the staff (in programs and services outlined in #6) had multiple training sessions as they began the first administrative unit reviews.

Financial:
The human resources involved represents a financial commitment because staff time was devoted to various aspects, including the Campus Labs implementation, of the QI; however, the primary financial resource that supported the QI was licensing of the Campus Labs Compliance Assist and Baseline modules. The three-year contract for these modules exceeds $130,000.00. Although other software products may have been less expensive, the Campus Labs platform was the best solution for the college for the QI as well as other planning, management and reporting needs.

Physical:
The QI required no additional physical resources.

Technological:
The Technology Services staff participated in software vendor demonstrations. During the Campus Labs implementation, Director of Core Services Mel Sweet facilitated login authentication through UC’s IT Services. He also provided technology support during the on-campus training hosted by Campus Labs. Campus Labs is a cloud-based solution and unlimited customer support is provided by its staff.

Plans for the Future (Feature Milestones of a Continuing Initiative)

9. Describe plans for ongoing work related to or as a result of the initiative.

The QI has been implemented and administrative unit reviews will continue, as outlined in #2 above, with one administrative unit reviewed each year on a 5-year cycle. Academic Affairs will begin its unit review in January, 2016; staff discussed the review purpose, process, timeline and template at the July retreat. Developing SLOs in co-curricular program and services will be the topic of workshops this fall.

The associate dean of academic affairs, director of institutional effectiveness and academic evaluator currently serve as Campus Labs site administrators, although responsibility for oversight and support for the administrative unit review process is assigned to the director of institutional effectiveness. This structure will remain intact for the foreseeable future.

10. Describe any practices or artifacts from the initiative that other institutions might find meaningful or useful and please indicate if you would be willing to share this information.

The college would be willing to share information about the administrative unit, academic department, academic program and discipline area review practices and how CAS Standards and Self-Assessment Guides were used to develop the templates for these processes. We would also be willing to talk to other institutions about our experience with Campus Labs and the Baseline, Beacon and Compliance Assist modules that have been implemented as a result of the QI, and share the rollout strategies used for these modules.