

## Presentation Abstracts

Sunday, June 17

Afternoon Session

### **4:15 pm – Invited Speaker – The Financial Resilience of Independent Colleges and Universities**

*Michael Williams (Vice President, Ruffalo Noel Levitz)*

The Council of Independent Colleges has been providing an annual benchmarking report called the Financial Indicators Tool (FIT) for its members for over a decade. This report is based upon the Composite Financial Index (CFI) developed by Tahey, Salluzzo, Prager, Mezzina, and Cowen in 1980 and updated through the years in the various editions of Strategic Financial Analysis for Higher Education. The CFI's blend of limited complexity and remarkable clarity has proved useful in presenting the basics of financial health for colleges and universities to administrators and board members. With 14 years of CFI scores for the majority of Carnegie Bachelors and Master's private institutions, we decided to take look at the financial health of these institutions as reflected in the CFI over time. What we discovered was that this group of institutions fared surprisingly well even though this period of time (FY 2001 through FY 2014) included several years of national economic turmoil. This is a finding that some might not have predicted given the very public closing of several independent institutions in recent years. In addition, we looked at the characteristics of institutions whose CFI scores improved over this period of time and the characteristics of institutions whose scores went down. We all have our hunches what the characteristics of these two categories would be, but as we looked into this aspect of the research once again there were surprises. This presentation will be a review of our research.

Monday, June 18

Morning Sessions

### **8:30 am – Concurrent Sessions**

#### **Concurrent Session 1**

#### **Assessing Inclusiveness, and Engagement in Cultural Diversity and Global Learning: Lessons from NSSE's Topical Modules**

*Jillian Kinzie (Associate Director, Center for Postsecondary Research at Indiana University), Julia Cavallo (Director of Institutional Research, Saint Vincent College), Summer Kenesson (Director, Institutional Research, Pacific Lutheran University)*

The assessment of inclusivity and cultural responsiveness and global learning are current imperatives for higher education. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) added two new modules asking students more about inclusive educational practices and perceptions of their global learning experiences. Despite articulating goals to advance globalization and diversity, institutions have sometimes fallen short in the ways they have enacted these goals. Further, students' perceptions of institutional commitment to these goals vary and this in turn influences their experience. Therefore, it is important to understand the specific ways in which institutions enact their commitments and what influences students' perceptions of these commitments. This session highlights findings from these sets, examines how results vary by student characteristics, what results suggest about global learning practice and inclusivity. Discussion will then focus on campuses' use of these findings to create environments that support all students and to leverage the educational benefits of diversity and internationalization, including for example, to make the case for a more integrated campus diversity plan and a more comprehensive campus climate survey, and to spur further analyses of the impacts of students' perceptions of institution's emphasis on diversity and supportive environment on student success rates (e.g., academic standing, retention).

## Concurrent Session 2

### AI + IR: Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education

*William O'Shea (Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Pacific University)*

It may be tempting to dismiss artificial intelligence (AI) as irrelevant hype. While this may be appropriate for some of what we hear about AI, it may be hard to tell which parts. Regardless of hype or not, AI may already be appearing on our campuses in perhaps surprising ways and it seems that there is more to come.

What does this rising wave of AI mean for our students, our particular types of institutions, and institutional research? What are some of ethical issues around AI? What does AI even mean? This presentation will attempt to define and clarify AI and related concepts, explore current trends regarding AI in higher education, and suggest some implications, risks, and opportunities of AI from an IR perspective.

As stewards of data and information and as educators of information producers, users, and consumers, we need to develop our understanding and thinking about AI to best advise and help our institutions navigate a new and evolving landscape. My hope is that this presentation can help facilitate this development of understanding about AI by informing and sparking some conversations and sharing of knowledge, experiences, and concerns.

## 9:20 am – Concurrent Sessions

### Concurrent Session 1

#### The Vital Role of Metrics in Diversity-Related Strategic Planning

*Karen Lee (Vice Provost of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, Point Loma Nazarene University),*

*Karen Lee (Assistant Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Initiatives, University of San Diego)*

This presentation will address how campuses can empower their diversity-related strategic initiatives by designing a framework or map with dashboard indicators to monitor improvements over time. Administrators from two private, four-year universities in southern California – an urban region of high demographic diversity, San Diego – will present examples from their respective institutions, addressing the importance of designing measurable outcomes and coordinating diversity efforts strategically across their campuses to enhance coherence, transparency, and accountability. In addition to sharing tools and practices for cultivating the diverse learning contexts at their institutions, each presenter will discuss relevant areas of development pertaining to infrastructure, communication, and training aligned to overall university strategic planning. Specific topics will include how to design or identify outcomes to measure intercultural competence, how to leverage disaggregated institutional data, and how to assemble a dashboard aligned to a strategic framework, as well as approaches to fostering buy-in from key university stakeholders.

### Concurrent Session 2

#### A Longitudinal Examination of Attrition Using National Student Clearinghouse Data

*Amanda Moske (Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, Hartwick College)*

This report concerns attriting students enrolled at Hartwick College within the last 12 years (2005-06 to 2016-17). National Student Clearinghouse data was used to address whether or not these non-returning students enrolled in subsequent higher education institutions. The percentage of attritors enrolling elsewhere exhibits a bowtie pattern. Prior to 2007-08, attritors preferred public 4-year institutions over private and public 2-year institutions. Between 2007-08 and 2010-11, transferring students exhibited a similar preference for both public and private institutions. Beginning in 2011-12, transferring students had a clear preference for 2-year public institutions compared to private and 4-year institutions. A classification decision tree algorithm was developed to assess higher order interactions among the variables of interest (i.e., first generation status, hiatus code, writing level, application rating, ethnicity/race, gender, attempted credits, completed credits, cumulative GPA, high school GPA, last term GPA, SAT/ACT score, unmet need). Preliminary results indicate cumulative GPA is the strongest predictor of an attritor's enrollment pattern, followed by completed credits and high school GPA.

## 10:30 am – Concurrent Sessions

### Concurrent Session 1

#### **STEM Degree Completion Among Underrepresented Students**

*Allison Hill (Institutional Research Student Intern, Trinity University), Diane Saphire (Associate Vice President, Institutional Research and Effectiveness, Trinity University)*

This presentation discusses the relationship of various factors to a student's probability of graduating with a science, technology, engineering, or mathematics (STEM) degree. Factors explored include self-reported intent, measures of academic preparedness, and demographic characteristics. Demographic characteristics analyzed include Pell eligibility, first-generation status, gender, and federal racial/ethnic designation. Relative significance of these factors is discussed through the development of a comprehensive binary logistic model based on three cohorts of students who have attended Trinity University within the past decade. Also discussed are trends observed in STEM interest rates, STEM degree graduation rates, and STEM retention among various demographic groups of interest. Particular attention is devoted to groups traditionally underrepresented in STEM including female students and underrepresented minority students.

### Concurrent Session 2

#### **A Sea of Data: Sharing Data Across Campus**

*Bethany Miller (Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Cornell College), Ellenor Anderbyrne (Director of Strategic Research and Assessment, Beloit College)*

Many colleges collect more data than the institutional research office knows what to do with: student survey data, institutional data, HEDS data, and more. In this “lightning” presentation, we will share multiple discrete examples of data sharing on their campuses. Examples will include both specific pieces of work and also useful types of events for sharing data. Attendees will leave with specific ideas for visualizing, presenting, and sharing data that most institutions have.

As a result of this session, participants will be able to:

- Find a free, online resource to generate Sankey diagrams
- Retrieve specific data sharing ideas when data arrives
- Have a specific example of closing the loop that may be useful on their campus
- Have access to examples that could be used for various stakeholders and their level of interest regarding specific data

## 11:20 am – Concurrent Sessions

### Concurrent Session 1

#### **Assessment of Curricular Inclusivity**

*Katherine McGuire (Director of Institutional Research, Oxford College of Emory University)*

Cultural diversity and the academic success of diverse students are topics that have received much attention at institutions of higher education in recent years. It is a rare college that has not participated at least once in a campus climate study. Fewer institutions have studied empirically the degree to which they are making the curriculum more inclusive and in which instructors are implementing inclusive course design and pedagogies. Saunders and Kardia (1997) have stated that “inclusive classrooms are classrooms in which instructors and students work together to create and sustain an environment in which everyone feels safe, supported, and encouraged to express her or his views and concerns.” Student diversity and inclusive pedagogies have been found to have positive impacts on student engagement and student learning outcomes (Gurin, et al., 2002; Hockings, 2010; Thomas, 2010; Wlodkowski, 1995). Conversely, practices which serve to exclude diverse students, such as microaggressions, have been found to prevent open dialogue and create barriers to student learning (Solorzano, 2000; Sue, 2010).

This presentation will discuss quantitative and qualitative methods for assessing the degree to which an institution's curriculum and classrooms are inclusive of diverse students. The focus will be only on the aspects of inclusivity that are central to the academic mission of colleges and universities, rather than “campus climate”

generally, which may include residence life, student clubs and social organizations, and other out-of-class peer interactions. Some issues that will be discussed are strategies for assessing curricular inclusivity from institutional documents; assessment of classroom environment for inclusivity and inclusive pedagogy; and how to get faculty and student buy-in to drive institutional change.

## **Concurrent Session 2**

### **Assessing Introductory Courses: Creating Conversations about Learning Through Student Surveys**

*Laura Palucki Blake (Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, Harvey Mudd College), Katherine Van Heuvelen (Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Harvey Mudd College)*

Those familiar with the one-minute-paper frequently praise it as a learning tool-both for faculty and for students. It provides some real-time guidance on the development and engagement of students as well as valuable information for instructors they can use to guide the pace and delivery of content over the course. In this presentation, we will share how we adapted idea of the one-minute paper to embed formative assessment into the redesign of our Introductory Chemistry sequence through the use of daily in-class surveys.

After briefly discussing the structure, methodology and reporting of the in-class survey, we will detail how this relatively simple technique has turned out to be a profound practice that has helped to reinvigorate our Introductory Chemistry sequence and connect teaching more explicitly to learning for the course and the department. The redesigned course relies on active learning, guided inquiry, and group work, and the in-class surveys were designed to identify successful pedagogical practices as well as to quickly detect and resolve problems in the course.

Finally, we will discuss how we have used the results of the in-class survey as summative assessment to demonstrate the impact of the course redesign on 1) student workload; 2) instructor/student relationships; 3) student's ability to link related ideas and construct knowledge; 4) student's ability to successfully engage in collaborative group work with their peers, and, 5) student's ability to relate chemical concepts to real-world phenomena and problems facing society.

**Monday, June 18**

Afternoon Sessions

### **1:30 pm – Concurrent Sessions**

#### **Concurrent Session 1**

##### **The Lifeline Project: Suicide Prevention at Lawrence University**

*Kristin McKinley (Director of Research Administration, Lawrence University), Julie Haurykiewicz, (Associate Dean of Academic Success, Lawrence University)*

In 2008, Lawrence University submitted a grant proposal to the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) for a Garrett Lee Smith Campus Suicide Prevention Grant; in September 2009, Lawrence was selected to become one of 22 Garrett Lee Smith Cohort 4 campus grantees. The University was awarded \$300,000 for three years to develop, implement, and evaluate a suicide prevention program on campus.

The Lawrence Lifeline Project was a comprehensive approach to lowering suicide risk factors and enhancing protective factors, including life skills and social networking, among Lawrence University students using community-based, culturally competent approaches. The two mutually reinforcing goals of the Lawrence Lifeline Project were to (I) Strengthen Systemic and Sustainable Structures to effectively address the mental health needs of students particularly those at high risk; and (II) Change Campus Culture to reduce stigma, reduce suicide risk factors ingrained in the academic and social culture on campus, and promote awareness and use of mental health services. The objectives that allowed us to meet these goals will be discussed.

## Concurrent Session 2

### **Leveraging Resources for Data-Informed Decision Making**

*Leah Ross (Senior Director for Research and Initiatives, Association for Institutional Research), Bethany Miller (Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Cornell College), Erika Farfan (Director of Institutional Research, Kenyon College), Jason Rivera (Director of Institutional Research, Dickinson College)*

If data and information are not used, they have no impact. As a result, the expertise and effort required to transform data into timely, usable, and actionable information is wasted, and opportunities to improve student success are missed. In this time of increased demand and expectations for data, analytics, information, and evidence, institutions seek to leverage resources to enhance data-informed decision making. How can institutional research play a central role in these efforts while partnering with professionals across the institution who have relevant skills and knowledge? This session explores the roles of IR professionals in curating data use through a user-focused approach to this work.

## 2:20 pm – Concurrent Sessions

### Concurrent Session 1

#### **Transformative Experiences in College: Results from the Whitman Study of Student Learning Experiences**

*Neal Christopherson (Director of Institutional Research, Whitman College)*

The Whitman Study of Student Learning Experiences (WSSLE) is a longitudinal study of a single cohort of students at Whitman College. Seventy-Five students from the class of 2016 were randomly sampled to participate and were interviewed 5 times during their four years at Whitman. One goal of this research is to identify the most influential aspects of a liberal arts education—the transformative experiences that lead to personal and academic growth, changes in perspective, or affect plans after graduation.

This research suggests that transformative experiences in college are largely the result of interacting with other people and with the broad campus community. Interview data will be used to describe academic growth, personal growth, and how students transition out of college, as well as the importance of out-of-classroom experiences and interaction with difference. The presentation concludes with suggestions for ways colleges can make transformative experiences more likely for students.

### Concurrent Session 2

#### **Systematic Peer Review of Program Assessment Practices: Benefits, Challenges and Lessons Learned**

*Rob Bohall (Director of Assessment & Institutional Research, George Fox University), Rebecca Hernandez (Associate Provost of Local and Global Engagement / Chief Diversity Officer, George Fox University)*

In the fall of 2017, the university assessment committee at George Fox began a four-year cycle of strategically reviewing assessment practices of academic and administrative programs university-wide. This session will present the rationale for undertaking the sizable effort, the process followed and specific tools developed. We will include challenges encountered and benefits realized.

The committee, made up of faculty and administrators from across the university, divided into three teams of four people and developed a formal program review schedule. The committee collectively developed a standardized review form (<https://bit.ly/2Gx4yYZ>) covering essential elements of program mission and desired outcomes, assessment plan, and results/analysis.

Program documentation reviewed by each team includes degree outcomes (for academic programs), assessment plan, assessment results report, and program self-evaluation from a past faculty conference. Teams review the available sources of documentation and meet with program assessment leads to discuss.

The primary challenge has been limited capacity of the assessment committee, especially on teams with less committed members. Secondary challenges center on managing the large volume of documentation and communications.

Among the benefits, program assessment leads have been grateful for the constructive feedback and attention from the committee. Committee members say they find benefit in seeing how programs in other disciplines approach assessment. And the university as a whole benefits by programs embracing more robust assessment planning and practices.

### **3:15 pm – Building Assessment so that It Matters for Our Students and Our Faculty**

*Leah Adams-Curtis (Director of Assessment, Knox College), Mary Alice Kirkpatrick (The Furman Advantage Coordinator, Furman University), Susan Warner Taylor (Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Baldwin Wallace University), Charlie Blaich (Director, HEDS Consortium and Center of Inquiry)*

The foremost goal of assessment is to use evidence to improve the quality of learning and teaching. Although the amount of assessment at colleges and universities is on the rise, it is unclear how much of this increase is leading to improvements in student learning or merely fulfilling the needs of institutional reporting requirements. In this session, the three panelists will give their perspectives and provide examples of how they've structured assessment at their institutions so that it promotes faculty development and student learning.

Tuesday, June 19

Morning Sessions

### **8:30 am – Invited Speaker – Data Rich, but Information Poor: The Value of Improving Federal Data Systems**

*Amanda Janice Roberson (Assistant Director of Research and Policy, Institute for Higher Education Policy)*

Accurate and complete data can empower college choices, promote student success, and inform federal, state and institutional policies. Yet existing postsecondary student data systems are disconnected, duplicative, incomplete, inefficient, and burdensome. Worst of all, we cannot answer pressing questions about student success and educational equity. This presentation will outline why a federal student-level data network (SLDN) would be useful and how it might be structured.

Recent IHEP research underscores the need for a coordinated and comprehensive network that leverages data from existing federal systems to paint a more complete picture of student outcomes. Reliance on relevant privacy and security principles, effective data governance strategies, and clear operations and capacity requirements can create a secure and effective student-level data network that answers essential questions about access, progression, completion, cost and post-college outcomes today.

We can protect students' right to information alongside their right to privacy. Student privacy and data security are integral to the development of a federal SLDN. There are ways to mitigate risk and still provide students, policymakers, and institutions with valuable, aggregate information for decision-making.

### **9:45 am – Evaluating the Quality of Administrative and Academic Assessment Reports while Providing Formative Feedback**

*Kristy Crickenberger (Assistant Director of Assessment, Washington and Lee University)*

This session will provide an overview of the process used to evaluate annual assessment reports submitted by academic programs, administrative units, and student support units at Washington and Lee University. A summary of the guidelines given to program chairs and unit leaders will be discussed, as will the formative rubric used to evaluate each report. The rubric elements provide the basis for targeted feedback for assessment report authors, and a synopsis of WandL's experience with providing such feedback will be described. Finally, the session will include a description of additional strategies used by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to increase meaningful engagement with assessment data by faculty and administrators in an effort to encourage them to seek continuous improvement.

### **10:35 am – Beyond Surviving: Changing How We Look at Student (And Employee) Thriving**

*Ross Conover (Associate Director of Institutional Research, St. Mary's College of Maryland)*

In 2015, SMCM began long term project to address issues related to student and employee thriving. The Thrive Analysis was designed to identify systemic, environmental, and cultural components of an institution that impact student attrition and employee departure/satisfaction. Students and employees participated in surveys and focus groups where they were

asked probing questions about their experiences on campus. From this data, themes emerged and the institution was able to develop a list of priorities that would begin to address the cultural and administrative barriers to thriving on campus. The study provided actionable intelligence and allowed the institution to directly identify the barriers to thriving and specifically address the concerns of the student and employee populations. This study addressed an often-overlooked component of student and employee success. It provided the opportunity to directly address the barriers of thriving and further positioned the college to develop a master plan on how to ensure that students were getting the most out of their experience at the institution and that employees were satisfied while working for the institution. This study goes well beyond a satisfaction survey, and really begins to address ways to change the culture of an institution to ensure that the barriers to thriving for faculty, staff, and students are at a minimum. This presentation will provide a framework for institutions to take a head on approach to addressing the issues that impede student and employee success. It also allows for an on-going analysis to ensure that an institution can stay nimble as the campus population change and ensure that the institution is continuously meeting the needs of students and employees.

### **11:25 am – Student Affairs Professionals’ Commitment to and Competency in Assessment: Spotlighting an Often Untapped Partner in Evidencing Student Learning**

*Sara Finney (Professor, Department of Graduate Psychology and Associate Director of Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University), S. Jeanne Horst (Associate Professor, Department of Graduate Psychology and Associate Assessment Specialist for the Center for Assessment and Research Studies, James Madison University)*

Given limited resources and time, many of us would welcome the contributions of others to support, guide, or sustain the assessment-related work on our campus. Often professionals on the academic “side of the house” are unaware of the assessment-related competencies of professionals on the student affairs “side of the house”. Student affairs professionals are guided by several professional standards regarding the development and assessment of evidence-based programs that improve student learning and development. There is a striking similarity between the student affairs standards and the evidence-based decisions and practices endorsed by faculty. Given the mutual goal of learning improvement, a tremendous efficiency could be reaped if faculty partner with student affairs professionals to create, evaluate, and improve programming. To facilitate this potential partnership on your campus, we will examine the assessment-related student affairs professional competencies/standards (i.e., ASK Standards, ACPA and NASPA Professional Competencies, CAS Standards). Simply being exposed to these standards may result in a new appreciation for the assessment-related skills and goals of student affairs practitioners. We will then map these standards to the typical assessment process, showcasing how both faculty and student affairs professionals are engaging in very similar processes when empirically evaluating learning improvement. Moreover, by spotlighting these commonalities, emphasis can be placed on sharing assessment-related education and training opportunities across divisions, not only for efficiency in training but also to foster collaboration.

## **Tuesday, June 19**

### Afternoon Sessions

### **2:25 pm – Whose Data Is It Anyway? Data Sharing Across Campus Departments and Campuses**

*Laura Palucki Blake (AVP of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, Harvey Mudd College), Marco Antonio Cruz (Director, Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, Pitzer College), Junelyn Peoples (Director of Institutional Research, Scripps College), Colleen Wynn (Director of Institutional Research, Claremont McKenna College)*

Panelists will discuss data sharing between the institutional research office and other departments at each of their campuses: Admission, Financial Aid, Dean of Students, Business Office, Human Resources, Development, etc. They will include information about appropriate access, relevant policies and procedures, and statements of understanding, as well as security and permission. Panelists also intend to highlight methods for building collaborative relationships to help ease the process. The presentation will include examples of what has worked well at their own campus and across campuses, opportunities for improvement, and any future plans for data sharing. The panel will then invite conference participants to join in a larger discussion around best practices for data sharing.

### **3:35 pm – Gathering Useful Information on Your Institution’s Climate for Diversity and Equity**

*Catherine Gagne (Director of Assessment, Providence College), Charlie Blaich (Director, HEDS Consortium and Center of Inquiry), Kathy Wise (Associate Director, HEDS Consortium and Center of Inquiry), Adrea Hernandez (Research Analyst and Data Manager, HEDS Consortium and Center of Inquiry)*

Higher education institutions across the country are cultivating policies, practices, and structures that assure an equitable and hospitable community for all students, staff, and faculty. In order to better understand our campus climate, Providence College sought to assess campus members’ attitudes, behaviors, and experiences regarding inclusiveness. The College convened a working group of various staff members to explore assessment instruments devoted to diversity and inclusiveness. Following its review, the group decided it would be best to devise its own comprehensive instrument using several samples as its basis.

In addition to being administered at Providence College, the Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS) collaborated with five HEDS institutions to use the instrument developed by Providence College and determine how it might be revised to serve a broader range of institutions. These five institutions administered the survey in spring 2017. The HEDS staff then reviewed and analyzed the data from these five institutions to develop a new version of the survey that was administered in spring 2018 to thirteen institutions. Overall, while the results of these different versions vary slightly, they all point to the need for continued work toward improvement on important aspects of diversity and equity at participating institutions.

## **Wednesday, June 20**

### **Morning Sessions**

### **8:30 am – The Matrix Revolutions: Collaboration Between IR and IT in a World Awash with Data Reporters and Analysts**

*Ken Brown (Chief Information Officer, Whitworth University), Kristen Handley (IT Data Specialist, Whitman College), William O’Shea (Director, Institutional Research and Assessment, Pacific University), Mike Tamada (Director of Institutional Research, Reed College)*

College campuses have more offices with more access to more data and more reporting tools than ever. What is the role of IR and IT in aiding – and perhaps managing – this changing ecology? How do we effectively implement data governance to ensure proper use of all this data? AIR has suggested models of a "federated network" and a "matrix" of data and analytical personnel. Some data users have observed a wall between IT and the offices that use data including IR – what are some of the ways that colleges are bridging this wall?

No one strategy for data governance or departmental collaborations will work for every institution. The panelists come from schools that have a range of strategies and experiences at collaborations between IR and IT and will share their stories and offer tips and suggestions.

### **9:40 am – Approaches to Student Success and Retention from an IR Perspective**

*Bethany Miller (Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, Cornell College), Susan Canon (Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, St. Olaf College)*

Student Success and retention is at the forefront of conversations on many campuses and in larger higher education circles. Ways to engage campus wide participation in student success and retention will continue to be part of larger strategic conversations as well as how to use the proliferation of data available to help inform the work of student success and retention. This presentation proposes to give the audience an opportunity to understand the traditional role of IR in student success and retention, while focusing on charting new ways for IR to be engaged in data around student success and retention, identifying appropriate data to support student success and retention initiatives, and engaging others in the work of using data to support student success and retention in dynamic ways.

### **10:35 am – Doing More with Less: Developing an Institutional Research Student Intern Program**

*Ann Palcisco (Associate Director of Institutional Research, Kenyon College), Erika Farfan (Director of Institutional Research, Kenyon College)*

Each year the Office of Institutional Research at Kenyon College receives many, many requests for information—way more than just two staff can handle, but our budget doesn't have room for another employee. In addition, to increase capacity of the office and to provide interested undergraduate students with a high-impact learning opportunity around data, we developed a student intern program. Starting with just one student in 2012, the program has grown steadily to 4-6 interns per year who plan, administer, analyze, and present data throughout the college to a variety of audiences. This presentation will cover the advantages and lessons learned from starting and growing an intern program as a way to increase your office's capacity on a tight budget. We'll start with budgeting for student workers and hiring processes then move to managing and developing students into rock star data analysts. We'll share our documents (job descriptions, review rubric, confidentiality agreement, etc.) to help you get started. We'll conclude by discussing plans for the future of the program, the challenges and surprises of the program, and how our interns themselves view the program.

### **11:25 am – Doing What We Do for the Institution, for Ourselves: Strategic Planning for IR, IE, and Assessment Functions**

*Gina Johnson (Assistant Executive Director for Partnerships and Membership, Association for Institutional Research), Jason Rivera (Director of Institutional Research, Dickinson College)*

Institutional research, effectiveness, and assessment professionals are often involved in strategic planning initiatives as part of their scope of work, from identifying metrics to measure the progress of strategic initiatives, to collecting, analyzing, and reporting on data to evaluate success. But what about strategic planning for institutional research offices and teams themselves? Intentionally, periodically reviewing the purview of the team and setting goals that align with the strategic direction of the greater organization allows these professionals to ensure they are evolving to meet the expanding data and information needs of themselves and their constituents.

This interactive session will demonstrate how to use materials from the Association for Institutional Research (AIR) to design a strategic planning process for an IR, IE, or assessment function. The resources will be explained and real-life examples from an institution that used the tools for strategic planning will be shared. Attendees at the session will have the opportunity to work with several of the resources to experience how they can be used for strategic planning purposes and will begin the process of outlining what an IR, IE, or assessment strategic planning process in their setting might include. The resources will include tools designed to guide the strategic conversations, such as the Statement of Aspirational Practice for Institutional Research, the Duties and Functions of Institutional Research, and the AIR Code of Ethics. Attendees will leave the session with practical takeaways for designing their own strategic planning process for their IR, IE, or assessment function.