

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENT TOOL RESULTS SUMMARY

The Achieving the Dream Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool is an online self-assessment to help colleges assess areas of strength and improvement in the Institutional Capacity Framework. Institutions may also use the tool to measure changes in capacity over time. The purpose of this *Results Summary* is to display the aggregated responses from all college participants and disaggregated results by functional area and role to identify areas where there is a convergence of opinion or divergence of opinion. The results may be used for individual reflection and as a springboard for campus conversations on overarching themes, strengths to celebrate and build on, opportunities to improve and actions to build capacity.

Northeast State Community College
Fall 2018



LEVELS KEY

LEVEL 1

Minimal level of capacity in place with a clear need to build strength.

LEVEL 2

Moderate level of capacity established.

LEVEL 3

Strong level of capacity in place.

LEVEL 4


Exemplary level of capacity in place.

RESULTS SUMMARY (N=10)

LEADERSHIP & VISION	DATA & TECHNOLOGY	EQUITY	TEACHING & LEARNING	ENGAGEMENT & COMMUNICATION	STRATEGY & PLANNING	POLICIES & PRACTICES
LEVEL 4	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 3	LEVEL 4
AVERAGE RATING 3.5	AVERAGE RATING 3.0	AVERAGE RATING 3.1	AVERAGE RATING 3.4	AVERAGE RATING 3.1	AVERAGE RATING 3.3	AVERAGE RATING 3.5

LEADERSHIP & VISION

The commitment and collaboration of the institution's leadership with respect to student success and the clarity of the vision for desired change.



RESULTS BY CATEGORY (N=8)

Vision

1. Does the college have a clear and compelling vision for student success?
2. Is the student success vision used to set priorities and direct action?



Leadership

3. Does the Board of Trustees provide leadership for student success?
4. Does the president actively support efforts to improve student success?
5. Does student success drive personnel decisions such as hiring and performance evaluations?
6. Do college leaders seek transformational change to improve the student experience?
7. Do college leaders encourage open dialog and risk-taking?
8. Do faculty initiate and lead efforts to improve student success?
9. Does a culture of shared leadership for student success exist across all levels of the college?



Culture of Evidence

10. Does the Board of Trustees use data to promote the college's vision for student success?
11. Do college leaders share and use data to inform decision-making?
12. Is there a climate of accountability and expectation of the use of data for decision-making?



DATA & TECHNOLOGY

The institution's capacity to collect, access, analyze and use data to inform decisions, and to use powerful technology to support student success.

LEVEL	AVERAGE RATING
3	3.0

RESULTS BY CATEGORY (N=10)

LEVEL 1 2 3 4

Data

1. Does relevant data exist to inform decision-making?
2. Does reliable data exist to inform decisions?
3. Are data readily accessible to those who need it?
4. Are measures of student success defined, documented and used?
5. Are data collected at various points along the student experience continuum?
6. Are student success data translated into meaningful information?
7. Do data analyses yield insights about the past and future?



Technology

8. Have student success technologies been adopted to improve student outcomes?



Culture of Evidence

9. Do the Information Technology (IT) and Institutional Research (IR) staff collaborate to optimize processes for data use?
10. Does the college use benchmarking to identify strategies for improvement and innovation?
11. Does the college use data to examine and improve student outcomes?
12. Does the college evaluate student success initiatives to inform decision-making?



EQUITY

The commitment, capabilities, and experiences of an institution to fairly serve low income students, students of color and other at-risk student populations with respect to access, success, and campus climate.

LEVEL	AVERAGE RATING
3	3.1

RESULTS BY CATEGORY (N=9)

LEVEL 1 2 3 4

Leadership and Vision

- 1. Does the college have a clear and compelling definition of equity? 3.3
- 2. Is equity a primary consideration in the college's student success efforts? 3.3

Strategy and Planning

- 3. Does the strategic plan include goals to advance equity? 3.1
- 4. Does the college have a formal entity to coordinate equity efforts? 3.1
- 5. Are equity considerations embedded in college unit plans and practices? 3.1

Engagement and Communication

- 6. Is the college community broadly engaged in conversations about equity? 2.8

Policies and Practices

- 7. Does the college consider equity when proposing and evaluating policies and practices? 3.2
- 8. Are hiring and retention policies in place that address equity and diversity? 3.2

Teaching and Learning

- 9. Are faculty and staff prepared to work with a diverse student population? 3.3
- 10. When teaching, do faculty take into consideration the various ways that students learn due to different cultural values? 3.3
- 11. Are equity concepts, such as inclusion and social justice, embedded within the curriculum? 3.3
- 12. Are equity concepts embedded in co-curricular and academic 3.3

Data and Technology


- 13. Has the college defined metrics to promote and enhance equity? 2.9
- 14. Does the college routinely disaggregate student data into sub-populations to identify achievement gaps? 2.9

Culture of Evidence

- 15. Is disaggregated student data used to address achievement gaps? 2.8

TEACHING & LEARNING


The commitment to engaging full-time and adjunct faculty in examinations of pedagogy, meaningful professional development, and a central role for them as change agents within the institution. Also, the college's commitment to advising, tutoring, and out-of-classroom supports as well as restructuring developmental education to facilitate student learning and success.




RESULTS BY CATEGORY (N=10)

LEVEL 1 2 3 4


Instructional Practices and Support Services




Developmental Education




Structured Program Maps



Professional Development




Culture of Evidence



ENGAGEMENT & COMMUNICATION

The creation of strategic partnerships with key external stakeholders, such as K-12, universities, employers and community based organizations, and internal stakeholders across the institution to participate in the student success agenda and improvement of student outcomes.



RESULTS BY CATEGORY (N=10)

LEVEL 1 2 3 4

Internal Engagement and Communication

1. Does the college engage multiple internal stakeholders in student success work?
2. Do college leaders communicate a sense of urgency to improve student success outcomes?
3. Is the value of student success regularly communicated to the college community?
4. Does the college empower those engaged in student success work to take action?



External Engagement and Communication

5. Does the college include external stakeholders in student success efforts?



Culture of Evidence

6. Do faculty and staff examine and discuss student success data and strategies for improvement?



STRATEGY & PLANNING

The alignment of the institution with the umbrella goal of student success and the institution's process for translating the desired future into defined goals and objectives and executing the actions to achieve them.

LEVEL	AVERAGE RATING
3	3.3

RESULTS BY CATEGORY (N=10)

LEVEL 1 2 3 4

Planning

1. Does the college's strategic plan focus on student success?
2. Is the student success agenda integrated into other core work?



Resource Alignment

3. Do revenue and resource allocation decisions support student success?
4. Does the college pursue external grant funding to support student success?
5. Is professional development appropriately aligned to advance student success?



Strategy Execution

6. Does the college focus on a set of high-priority student success goals?
7. Is responsibility for student success goals clearly defined and broadly shared?
8. Does the college have a group of individuals responsible for coordinating and executing the student success agenda?




Culture of Evidence

9. Does the institution use key performance indicators to measure student success?
10. Are short-term measures defined so that their achievement ultimately leads to the accomplishment of student success goals?
11. Is there an established culture of continuous improvement?




POLICIES & PRACTICES

The institutional policies and practices that impact student success and the processes for examining and aligning policies and practices to remove barriers and foster student completion.



RESULTS BY CATEGORY (N=10)




AVERAGE CAPACITY RATING BY ROLE


This page presents average capacity rating by respondent role so that institutions can identify areas of consensus and divergence.

A capacity rating of 0.0 from a particular role indicates no respondent from that role has completed the assessment of this capacity area.


Leadership & Vision

Administrator (N=8)		3.5
Full-time Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Adjunct Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Staff member (N=0)	0.0	
Other (N=0)	0.0	


Data & Technology

Administrator (N=10)		3.0
Full-time Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Adjunct Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Staff member (N=0)	0.0	
Other (N=0)	0.0	


Equity

Administrator (N=9)		3.1
Full-time Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Adjunct Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Staff member (N=0)	0.0	
Other (N=0)	0.0	


Teaching & Learning

Administrator (N=10)		3.4
Full-time Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Adjunct Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Staff member (N=0)	0.0	
Other (N=0)	0.0	


Engagement & Communication

Administrator (N=10)		3.1
Full-time Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Adjunct Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Staff member (N=0)	0.0	
Other (N=0)	0.0	

Strategy & Planning

Administrator (N=10)		3.3
Full-time Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Adjunct Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Staff member (N=0)	0.0	
Other (N=0)	0.0	

Policies & Practice


Administrator (N=10)		3.5
Full-time Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Adjunct Faculty (N=0)	0.0	
Staff member (N=0)	0.0	
Other (N=0)	0.0	

AVERAGE CAPACITY RATING BY FUNCTIONAL AREA


This page presents average capacity rating by respondent functional area so that institutions can identify areas of consensus and divergence.

A capacity rating of 0.0 from a particular functional area indicates that no respondent from that functional area has completed the assessment of this capacity area.


Leadership & Vision




Data & Technology




Equity




Teaching & Learning




Engagement & Communication



Strategy & Planning



Policies & Practice



ABOUT THE INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY ASSESSMENT TOOL

The Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool is an online self-assessment to help colleges assess their strengths and areas for improvement in the seven key dimensions encompassed in the Institutional Capacity Framework. The assessment asks a broad range of college stakeholders to assess their institution's capacity across four levels, from a low of Level 1 (minimal) to a high of Level 4 (exemplary). The *Results Summary* report summarizes the assessment results for the institution by aggregating respondent ratings by capacity area and by respondent roles and functional areas.

How Are the Average Ratings Calculated?

For each question in the assessment, there are four answer choices representing four levels of capacity. Additionally, there is an "I don't know" option if the respondent is unfamiliar with the topic or has no basis to judge. After a respondent makes their selection, the following points are assigned:

- Level 1: One point
- Level 2: Two points
- Level 3: Three points
- Level 4: Four points
- "I don't know": Not calculated

The points are summed for all respondents who completed the assessment of a given capacity area. The average rating is calculated by dividing the sum of points by the total number of questions answered. The "I don't know" responses are not weighted in this calculation.

How Are Capacity Levels Designated?

The level of each capacity area is designated by rounding the average rating of that capacity area to the nearest level in order to give colleges a high-level overview of their institutional capacities. For example, if the average rating for the Equity section was 2.48, the capacity level would be rounded to Level 2.

Is a Response Summary Available By Question?

Yes, the *Response Distribution* provides a response distribution for each of the 77 questions in the Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool. A summary of "I don't know" choices is also included in this report. The report is available on the college's community on ATD Connect.

How Do I Interpret the Ratings?

Collectively, the *Results Summary* and *Response Distribution* reports highlight the average and distribution of responses by capacity area, subcategory and by question. Additionally, the reports highlight the level of convergence of opinion, and divergence of opinion based on respondent role and functional area of work. The reports reflect an institution's perspective of their current level of capacity and serve as a springboard for large group dialogue on identified strengths to celebrate and build upon, areas where there are opportunities to improve, areas to build alignment where there is divergence of opinion and areas to target for improved communication where there are large numbers of "I don't know" responses.

Please note that the Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool is not a scientific tool based on rigorous psychometrics principles and should not be used as one. The ratings are meant to provide a general indicator of institutional capacity at a given time and to provide actionable insights.

Additional Questions

For additional questions, please email Achieving the Dream at ICAT@achievingthedream.org.