Faculty and Staff Satisfaction with Support Services Provided:

Please indicate the proportions (%) of respondents who rated each aspect as “excellent” or “good” (separately and combined). The Campus Support Services standard is met whenever 75% or more of responses fall in the “good” or “excellent” categories (combined).

In Spring 2007, the Institutional Research (IR) Office distributed e-mail invitations to its primary clients (i.e., members of the Leadership Team, and others), asking them to participate anonymously in an online survey about their experiences with the IR Office. The following table summarizes feedback from the 56 respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with:</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding Good / Excellent (Combined %)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>42% 53%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response time</td>
<td>59% 37%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of procedures</td>
<td>-- --</td>
<td>N.A. 1</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of reports and presentations</td>
<td>71% 23%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff helpfulness</td>
<td>74% 21%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff knowledge</td>
<td>71% 24%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of service</td>
<td>60% 33%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department-specific indicators (if applicable):

1. The small office does not have set standards that clients follow in order to obtain services.

Table continues on next page …
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The following indicators were rated on a 4-point scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree)</th>
<th>“Strongly Agree”</th>
<th>“Agree”</th>
<th>Strongly agree / Agree (Combined %)</th>
<th>Internal Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information received from IR is dependable &amp; accurate</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information from IR is clear &amp; understandable</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers demonstrate integrity &amp; ethical behavior</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers are available and approachable</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers show an interest in feedback and improving performance</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR has had a positive impact on decision making, planning and operations at Cypress College</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change since last quality review

_Briefly summarize the extent to which satisfaction has improved or declined since the last quality review cycle._

The office previously participated in quality review in Spring 2005. At that time, the office met or exceeded all but one standard. Although the vast majority of the respondents in 2005 agreed that “information from IR is clear and understandable,” at 89% we fell just short of the 90% standard we set for ourselves. This was an area that we felt we could improve, and the office established goals and objectives to do so. For example, we prepared and distributed an inventory of available research and instructions on how to access various reports. We also provided training to all academic department chairs to review the data and reports provided for Instructional Quality Assessment (IQA). These efforts, and others, appear to have been successful. The latest data for this indicator show that 91% of our respondents agreed that “information from IR is clear and understandable.”

Several other areas show subtle improvement over time, as higher proportions of respondents rated the office in the top category (“excellent” or “strongly agree”). Compared to the 2005 data, the 2007 results show that higher percentages of respondents strongly agreed that “information from IR is dependable and accurate” (48% in 2005 vs. 52% in 2007), researchers are available and approachable (68% vs. 74%), and that IR has had a positive impact on decision making, planning and operations at Cypress College (47% vs. 59%). In addition, greater percentages of respondents gave “excellent” ratings to the following areas: hours of operation (34% in 2005 vs. 42% in 2007), quality of reports and presentations (52% vs. 71%), and overall quality of service (55% vs. 60%).
Narrative

Reflect on standards met and any standards not met.

Standards Met – To be used when department wants to improve on an indicator even though a standard for this indicator has been met. Use this section to briefly reflect upon major accomplishments.

The responses to the quality review survey show that the IR Office exceeded the standard for client satisfaction in each of the core quality review measures. More than 90% of the respondents rated the IR Office as “good” to “excellent” in areas such as hours of operations, response time, quality of reports and presentations, staff helpfulness, staff knowledge, and overall quality of service. The IR Office elected to include a number of unit-specific measures, and set a higher standard (90%) for these. We selected these measures because we felt they reflect characteristics that are vitally important for an effective, high caliber IR office to have. We are pleased to find that we met this high standard for all six measures. These elements will serve as crucial building blocks as the IR Office strengthens its efforts to support a college-wide culture of evidence. And they mirror three of the core values of the college (integrity, collegiality, and excellence).

Major Accomplishments Since 2005

Among the most significant accomplishments of the Institutional Research Office are the development and completion of several new reports and plans. A comprehensive *Institutional Effectiveness Report* was developed in Fall 2005 to provide the college with a single resource for monitoring what we do, how well we do it, and to use information to make changes for improvement. The report was published in 2005 and 2006, and is expected to be an important annual report for the college.

The office also provided extensive support in the development of the *Cypress College Educational Master Plan 2006-2016*. Researchers provided demographic and economic trend data, identified unmet demand for classes, served on the EMP Taskforce, provided relevant training to the Leadership Team, and worked throughout the summer of 2006 to complete the report.

Institutional Research supported campus planning other ways as well. Examples include the development of 2006-2008 action plans for the Strategic Plan, proposing a new *Schedule of Major Planning* to better align with the six year accreditation cycle, and providing an updated *Room Utilization Report* so that deans and other administrators can improve efficient use of existing space and identify ways to effectively redesign space in future remodeling efforts. The director’s involvement in a variety of management retreats and leadership team events was also designed to support campus-wide planning.

Of course, the office also completed a number of cyclical projects and responded to ad-hoc requests. Significant survey projects completed during this time frame include the *Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory*, the *Campus Climate Survey* of faculty and staff, and routine quality review surveys (for 26 instructional departments, 9 student services programs, and 9 campus services areas). Other surveys conducted have helped the campus prioritize needs related to campus technology and staff development.

The office monitors emerging campus needs, and seeks ways to meet them appropriately. In response to anticipated needs, the director worked with others to secure funding and approval for two new positions: a second Research Analyst, and a faculty SLO Coordinator. Both positions will help the college meet accreditation standards and state reporting requirements.

Standards Not Met – Please provide any insight into significant challenges or obstacles that may have contributed to low satisfaction. Identify the types of changes necessary for improvement.

All standards were met. We asked respondents to tell us what more we could do to better serve them. Several simply encouraged the office to “keep up the good work.” A few suggested that we continue efforts to increase campus awareness and understanding of campus research (examples: “Explain how the data should be interpreted and what it means when discussing the [unknown] future.” “Explain how IR benefits the campus in
terms of funding, equity, productivity, enrollment, etc.” “Provide campus summaries of key indicators at Opening Day and highlight campus and district performance relative to the State performance.”)

### Long-range Plan and Objectives

In the following section, identify general goals and specific, measurable objectives your area plans to achieve within the next three years. Programs should identify 3-5 goals, with at least one goal per year. Goals set for next year that require fiscal resources must also be submitted as a Budget Request and Action Plan (separate form).

I. **Goal: Increase campus awareness and understanding of institutional research, and it’s relationship with planning and budgeting**

Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): 

1. Objective: Provide information about Institutional Research to the Instruction and Staff Development offices for inclusion in training for new personnel
   - Person(s) responsible: Director, Institutional Research
   - Timeframe: By August 1, 2007
   - Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

2. Objective: Explore interest among deans in having the director attend a division meeting in fall 2007 to discuss research reports and answer faculty questions
   - Person(s) responsible: Director, Institutional Research
   - Timeframe: By September 30, 2007
   - Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

3. Objective: Write and distribute one Research Bulletin per term on topics other than demographics.
   - Person(s) responsible: Director, Institutional Research
   - Timeframe: By November 1, 2007 and review annually.
   - Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

II. **Provide research to support instructional and student services strategies for student success.**

Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): Direction 1, Goal 2

1. Objective: Conduct a literature review of the effectiveness of tutoring in various academic settings.
   - Person(s) responsible: Director, Institutional Research and professional expert.
   - Timeframe: By July 1, 2007
   - Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

2. Objective: Develop and implement a study of various tutoring services on campus to determine effectiveness.
   - Person(s) responsible: Director, Institutional Research and professional expert.
   - Timeframe: Design in Fall 2007; complete and distribute by September 2008.
   - Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA
3. Objective: Develop pilot study of special instructional support services or programs that fall outside of existing quality review processes.
   3.1. Person(s) responsible: Director, Institutional Research.
   3.2. Timeframe: Design in Fall 2007; complete and distribute by March 2008.
   3.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

III. Engage in relevant professional development activities likely to enhance the services of the Institutional Research Office.

   Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): Direction 3, Goal 3

1. Objective: Research Analysts shall each attend at least one relevant regional/state conference or institute per academic year.
   1.1. Person(s) responsible: Research Analysts and Director, Institutional Research.
   1.2. Timeframe: Review annually.
   1.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

2. Objective: Director shall attend one relevant state/national conference or institute per academic year.
   2.1. Person(s) responsible: Director, Institutional Research.
   2.2. Timeframe: Review annually.
   2.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

3. Objective: Explore feasibility of implementing advanced (e.g., tracking and reporting) components for web surveys.
   3.1. Person(s) responsible: Director, Institutional Research.
   3.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

Reminder: If fiscal resources are needed for next year’s goals, submit a separate Budget Request and Action Plan for budget unit review.