# **EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT**

## Five Year Strategic Profile (2009/10 -2014-15)

By 2015 SUSLA is expected to have an average annual enrollment approximating 3,000 students. With the presence of student housing and enhanced student support services, SUSLA is expected to maintain a first time freshman retention rate of sixty-four (64) percent. Ultimately, improvements in student retention and academic persistence are expected to increase graduation completion rates. By 2015, SUSLA expects to maintain both an annual average graduation rate of twenty-four (24) percent and completion award production inventory of two hundred thirty-five (235).

SUSLA present student enrollment is predominantly African-American and female. Approximately, fifty (50) percent of our total enrollment profile are non-traditional students twenty-five (25) years and older. Prior to transitioning into the college academic environment, over fifty (50) percent of our freshman entry population require placement into development education coursework. Recognizing academic skill deficits coupled with challenging socioeconomic characteristics, SUSLA remains committed to knowledge enhancement of its student clientele. Attainment of the preceding is accomplished through a five (5) year strategic planning paradigm which maintains SUSLA institutional image as an "Agent for Change".

SUSLA is legislatively mandated to annually report on approximately fifty-two (52) performance measures identified for mission critical performance functions related to Student Success, Articulation and Transfer, Workforce Development, and Institutional efficiency. Forty (40) percent of aggregate performance measures address student success measures related to first time freshman retention, institutional graduation rates and award productivity. As required by law SUSLA has established baseline measurement criteria, annual performance benchmarks and five year target goals. A synopsis of student success target goals with accompanying planning assumptions follows.

### 1st to 2nd Year Retention

Identified in attachment, the six (6) percentage point decrease from the 2008-09 retention baseline value is attributed to the residual effect on freshman advisement resources resulting from the twenty-four (24) percent increase of the fall 2009 headcount. Of the 585 students comprising this increase, 215 or thirty-seven (37) percent were first time entry freshman. This increase limited our ability to provide qualitative advisement services to a freshman clientele which required more intrusive institutional support services.

During academic year 2009-10, SUSLA implemented its Quality Enhancement Plan **entitled** "Jaguar Pride: Ensuring Student Success through Structure Advisement." Implementation of this intrusive advisement concept is expected to improve entry student study skills and further enhance individual academic commitments. SUSLA expects increases in freshman retention, academic persistence and completion rates to occur during the (2011-12) year 2 reporting period with annual increases of one percent through the (2014-15) year 6 performance target goal. It should be noted that the year one actual reflect a second year retention rate for entry freshmen retained at the SUSLA home campus. However, the second year rate for SUSLA entry freshmen retained within Louisiana Public Postsecondary Education is fifty-four point four (54.4) percent. SUSLA's performance approximates the fifty-five (55) percent average national rate for community college.

## Institutional Graduation Rate

As identified in Attachment D, SUSLA institutional freshman cohort graduation rate has decreased eight (8) percentage points from the (2008-09) established baseline year. Although the fourteen point zero (14.0) percent completion rate is slightly less than the SREB peer average of seventeen (17) percent, SUSLA remains confident that the year 6 target graduation rate goal of twenty-four point three (24.3) percent is achievable.

In addition to the cited QEP implementation, SUSLA's confidence is further predicated on related initiatives originating from institutional effectiveness reviews. Engendered initiatives address improved cohort tracking procedures and development of academic persistence policies. Such initiatives should reflect noticeable increases during the year 3 target benchmark with a two (2) percent annual average through the (2014-15) year 6 performance target goal.

# Award Productivity

As noted in Attachment D, SUSLA's 2009-10 completion award productivity in the areas of certificates and associate degrees registered declined from the established 2008-09 baseline. Registered declines were two point eight (2.8) and twelve point nine (12.9) percent respectively. Although a decline was experienced in 2009-10, SUSLA believes implementation of strategic initiatives as cited in the freshman retention and institutional graduation rates contextual categories will yield similar increases commencing (2011-12) year 2 reporting period with annual gains of one percent through the year 6 target year 2014-15.

Historically, certificates have accounted for approximately twenty-five (25) percent of SUSLA's annual award production inventory. SUSLA expects this trend to continue through the 2014-15 performance target year.

## **Systemic Based Evaluation**

Southern University at Shreveport Louisiana (SUSLA) engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide researchbased planning and evaluation processes that involve a systematic review of its mission, goals, and outcomes. This concept is further mandated in Act 1465 of 1997 which requires all Louisiana state agencies to engage in multiyear strategic planning with emphasis on accountability and process improvement.

Through this planning concept, ACT 1465 engenders a framework which establishes accountability linkages between mandated strategic goals and agency performance attainment activities. All state agency program budgets, inclusive of public postsecondary institutions, are linked to long term strategic initiatives with established measurement indicators for performance assessment and accountability. SUSLA's Institutional Effectiveness (IE) planning

and review process is the internal management conduit which further links strategic initiatives to operating units supporting mission attainment activities.

During fiscal year 2009-2010, this interface was expanded to adopt annual performance targets and related reporting requirements as specified in the GRAD Act. Specifically, SUSLA's has modified current strategic initiatives to reflect consistency with student success performance target measures as defined in the GRAD Act. Implementation strategies have been developed to ensure inclusion of all instructional/non instructional program units in campus goal attainment activities. As mandated, institutional policies require periodic assessment of performance activities in context to established targets.

Presently, there are seventy-three (73) instructional and non-instructional units which support SUSLA's institutional effectiveness review process. These units are further organized under the following five (5) operating divisions: Academic Affairs, Community Workforce Development, Institutional Advancement/University Relations, Finance and Administration, and Student Affairs. Cited divisions are responsible for mission critical requirements such as instruction, institutional support, student services, auxiliary enterprises, operations/maintenance, and public service.

SUSLA's IE program is consistent with the reporting structure which supports development of the state fiscal year operating budget. All budgeted reporting units are linked to institutional strategic initiatives through annual submissions of IE planning and reporting documents. IE annual plans are due September 1st of each fiscal year culminating with final report submission on May 31st of the same reporting period. During the fiscal year, information arising from this process is used to ascertain unit performance regarding mission attainment, strategic initiatives and annual funding priorities. A description of SUSLA's IE reporting process follows.

### Institutional Strategic Plan

SUSLA is guided by its own Five-Year Strategic Plan which interface with similar access and success performance requirements found in companion strategic plans advanced by the Southern University System, the Board of Regents, and Louisiana Vision 2020. The institutional strategic plan establishes performance targets in support of Act 1465 and collateral initiatives consistent with university mission.

Performance attainment activities are assessed annually through a strategic operational plan. Identified performance with general trend data is further reflected in documentation supporting annual state appropriations for SUSLA. Mission critical performance requirements address such areas as student access, academic quality, matriculation success, accountability, and assessment. Cited performance requirements are consistent with the core values which support SUSLA's institutional mission (Excellence, Integrity, Accountability and Service). These values are further reflected in planning and implementation processes for the five (5) operating divisions.

## **Divisional Strategic Plans**

Planning activities at the divisional level address development of implementation strategies in support of institutional initiatives which originate from SUSLA's Five-Year Strategic Plan. Specifically, divisional strategic plans are required to establish annual performance targets in support of SUSLA's strategic initiatives and ensure consistency with institutional mission.

If applicable, planning activities must factor, but not limited to, intergovernmental initiatives affecting student access, collateral performance requirements originating from such institutional support programs as Title III Federal Programs or Carl Perkins, and accreditation requirements for mandated academic programs. Planning activities at this level must reflect inter divisional coordination with special emphasis on attainment of core learning competencies.

# Institutional Effectiveness Plans and Reports

Organizational accountability is cornerstone to SUSLA's institutional effectiveness program. The university has developed an assessment framework which addresses five (5) functional areas affecting institutional accountability. Identified areas are as follow:

- Policy Accountability
- Program Accountability
- Performance Accountability
- Process Accountability
- Probity/Legal Accountability

Selection of Policies Pursued Establishment and Achievement of Goals Efficient Operations Planning, Allocating and Managing Expenditure Compliance

All seventy-three (73) reporting units listed in SULSA annual operating budget are required to established annual performance objectives in support of SUSLA's strategic initiatives and institutional mission. If applicable, established objectives must be consistent with requirements arising from external support funding, program accreditation requirements, and governing board mandates. This process engages both instructional and noninstructional units in reporting activity of plans and results through utilization of the Institutional Effectiveness Plan (IEP) and Institutional Effectiveness Report (IER) forms.

The IE planning process commences on September 1st of each fiscal year and provides an opportunity for budget units to present outcomes and goals, which are linked to the mission and goals of SUSLA and guided by best practices learned from assessment results from the previous year's report. This process is completed on May 31st of each fiscal year with documentation of performance achieved. IE planning and reporting forms are designed to ensure reporting consistency in critical mission attainment, provide an interface with collateral strategic initiatives, and establish a framework for performance measurement.

For instructional units, additional categories were added for identification and assessment of institutional learning outcomes and academic program competencies. SUSLA's current IE reporting timeframes is collateral to the state Fiscal Year (FY) budget preparation processes. All

instructional units at SUSLA have identified student learning outcomes which are assessed annually for improvement in academic service delivery.

SUSLA applies an assessment continuum methodology to academic program evaluation, utilizing various tools to provide data, including, but not limited to, internal and external reviews, program accreditation, and certification of students. Such tools include outcomes assessment reports, institutional effectiveness plans, program reviews, as well as program accreditation and national board exams of students in applicable high workforce development academic programs. Instructional program assessments are conducted according to specific schedules unique to each program and as required by external agencies. When considered together, this approach ensures an effective evaluation of educational programs.

#### Planning and Priorities Budget Committee

An integral component of the Model is the interface with the Planning and Priorities Budget Committee which recommends funding of critical operational recommendations that originate from the Institutional Effectiveness process. Therein and as practiced, prior to the end of the fiscal year and after completion of the IE reports, critical mission budget requirements are forwarded to the Committee, for priority funding during the next fiscal year.

Accordingly, these requests are deliberated upon by the Committee and ultimately prioritized to align with institutional goals and objectives. A summary report notes those prioritized funded request that will be integrated into the budget for the fiscal year. Non funded recommendations are monitored until future funding opportunities prevail. The committee meets on a quarterly basis during the fiscal year. Committee meetings are scheduled on the 15th of the first month in the quarter.

#### Institutional Report Card

The institution publishes an annual institutional report card which highlights evidence of SUSLA's systematic based evaluation and resulting implications on continuous process improvement. Institutional annual report cards are due in December of the fiscal year.



