



Support Services Review Annual review and Report

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
SSR Year ONE Review	4
SSR annual review meeting details	5
Quality Improvement Plans (QIP).....	10
SSR Process	14
ATTACHMENTS.....	19
Attachment 1- Year one success chart.....	20
Attachment 2 – SSR 5 Year Rotation	21
Attachment 3 SSR Timeline	22
Attachment 4 – SSR Rubrics	23

Executive Summary

The Support Services Review (SSR) is a representative, responsive form of assessment and self-evaluation to ensure continuous quality improvement and the enhancement of Austin Community College's administrative and student support services. The primary aim of Support Services Review is to provide staff and stakeholders the opportunity for collective and purposeful reflection to clarify and refocus on the services and outcomes in their respective areas, as appropriate.

The SSR and Quality Improvement Plan (QIP) is a common framework to provide ACC service unit staff and stakeholders the opportunity for collective and purposeful reflection to clarify and improve services and outcomes in their service units.

This report contains details of the SSR program and processes, as well as data compiled from the annual review of the program. The first year of the ACC SSR consisted of 13 units going through the review. During year one, we had one hundred (100) percent compliance with the review process.

SSR Year ONE Review

The following are the results and information from the SSR process annual review and the ACC feedback meeting held on July 15, 2011. The meeting was held to both support the assessment of the SSR process for improvement.

Year 1 details

- 13 functional level units
 - By executive divisions
 - President – 1
 - Provost – 1
 - Finance and Administration – 2
 - Operations – 9
- **March 1 –SWOT**
 - SWOT (deadline March 1)
 - 8 met the goals on time - 61.54%
 - 13 submitted as of 3/3/11 - 100%
- **June 1 – SSR**
 - SSR report (deadline June 1 – pushed to June 7th)
 - 6 met the goals on time - 46.15%
 - 13 submitted as of 7/8/11 - 100%
 - All units complied with reports July 13, 2011
- **June - July - Reports Reviewed - Units resubmit necessary addendums/ changes**
 - Evaluations
 - Average time to evaluate 11 days.
 - Average evaluation score 19 out of 36.
 - ALL evaluations completed 7/13/11 - 100%
- **August – Present** to Dean/ VP for review

[\(see attachment 1\)](#)

SSR annual review meeting details

Attendees:

Present: Anthony Owens Daniel Ohanlon, Dorado Kinney, Marcus Jackson, Mary Gilmer, Soon Merz, Steven Christopher*, Theresa Mouchayleh,

Absent: Ben Ferrell*, Geraldine Tucker, Richard Armenta, Stanley Gunn, Robert Bermea, Amanda Karel, Judy Green, Kathleen Christensen, Laurie Clark, Mary Hensley*, Michael Midgley*, Phyllis Kalz*, Richard Smith, Lyman Grant, Richard Griffiths, Terri Kelly, Yolanda Chapa

Other: Input was also collected via email to year one participants who could not attend

Overall

The overall feeling was that the process went well for being the first year. The following section includes comments that were referenced either from specific departments or dealt with the process on a global level. In the following sections, comments and suggestions were captured and clustered to assist with streamlining the report and the process.

- The purpose of the SSR is for intensive reflection and thought on the units processes, goals, and work
- Is this a process for the sake of a process or will we use this?
- We are building structure into the SSR process, as we need.
- The process is meant to be flexible.
- Timeline update needed to reflect real time.
- How to update in following years? What is the process and what is needed?
- Where do we put the information? Where all this information is be kept?
- Why do we not fill out a form or online process?
- The Distance Learning office is small, with six other staff members, and we heavily rely on other areas of the college, both academic and support services, to 'function/operate'. Some if not all the SWOT comments were about not only my office but also other College areas in general. With that said, any plans that our office has stated in the "SSR" will depend on the actions of those areas.
- A side note, the academic departments pay the person that is responsible for their department's report a \$1000 stipend. This should be offered to the non-academic departments. I estimate that the time that I put into these projects and the writing of the report to be 150+ hours. This is a lot of extra work to be doing while handling your regular duties. If the non-academic reports are not to be as thorough and thoughtful as the academic reports, then this needs to be defined in what is expected in the reports.
- How does this work with master plan?

SSR Orientation/Presentation

There was a cluster of comments that referenced the SSR orientation meeting, which was held in September of 2010. The meeting was informational and presented the process to all units participating in the year one review. The meeting had 15-20 folks who attended.

- **10/14/10** – Overview of SSR was OK, a little heavy on the ‘theoretical’ and ‘whys’; not enough on the detail, on the ‘how-to’s’
 - Ex. **SSR Basic 5?’ S #4 slide.** Survey’s reports are listed as ways – “How will unit measure the extent to which planned.” However, there are no support materials providing information on how the area undergoing the SWOT is to do this.
- More detailed procedural information/expectations/evaluation process on the SSR needs to be developed and tested for the next SSR.

Rubric

The rubric is the evaluation tool used by the SSR Subcommittee for the evaluation of the reports being submitted. The rubric was developed by the committee and used the same scale that is used in the CAS standards, while being kept simple enough to do what the committee needed. The rubric was not finished until mid spring, and so no units in year 1 had that tool to reference to for evaluation. The benefit is that people did not write “to” pass, but they wrote for the purpose.

- The rubric is simple, but there is not uniformity in the evaluations and feedback.
- The rubric was not supplied in advance so it did not help write report.
- In addition, there is no indication that these Rubrics are for Distance Learning.
- How can I be assured that these are indeed the rubrics for my area?
- Do “we” need a mission statement?
- Want the names of the evaluators
- Need for concrete examples for how to answer the questions.
- Explain difference between service and outcomes.
- Fill out online? Easy form for storage and holding of files
- Give departments’ access to rubric before completing the report there were two documents/attachments. The ratings in the Review Evaluation Rubrics do not match; and there is no explanation as to why they do not match.
- Kind of makes it hard to figure out how to respond.

Report

The reports area had a lot of issues and challenges in how to write the report. The rubric was not available to write to, so it was left that the unit needed to answer the 5-Fundamental Questions in simple essay format. The openness and fluidity in this, cause angst for many in completing the report. The reports were meant to be comprehensive in highlighting the needed materials, but also needed to include a Quality Improvement Plan. In some of the reports we received one but not the other part.

- The Unit Review Leaders (URL) writing the report felt like we were “winging it”
- The URL’s had the question of “What to do with the SSR report?”
- Clarify how to write the report – just answer the 5 questions isn’t good enough
- Report Issues:
 - Provide an online reporting process with well-defined request for report material.
- I had difficulty getting my report sent through email because the attachments were too large.
- Define what data or supporting materials are needed.
- Define acceptable metrics for measurement of success.
- Provide an example of what is an acceptable report.
- Determine if a self-study team is needed or not in addition to the SWOT.
- Define in pragmatic statements what the purpose of these reports is.
- How will this information be used?
- The above would make certain that ACC is assessing each department in the same manner and has a consistent approach to the reports.
- The URL’s needed to or shouldn’t get buy in from staff to write report?
- The units need help in figuring out how to measure change and by what means to measure?
- If the unit is changing goals and wants to move onto others because they have completed the QIP’s, how do they go about doing that?
- Second evaluation or follow up? Is there a requirement to rewrite and add improvements into the report? Is there a re-evaluation of the report after a second draft is submitted?
 - If not why re-write?
- The 5 questions. Supply examples to tell us how to write answers.
 - **“A concise, written report responding to the five fundamental questions that…”** is a very subjective statement and does not provide good direction. There should be an example of what the ‘finished product’ should look like, so departments participating in the SSR process know how to proceed and what needs to be delivered. The paragraph is one long four-line sentence of what one is supposed to do. There are 5 points here that need to be covered; a bulleted list with what each point should cover would be a better solution. An even better solution would be to provide the ACC SSR Evaluation Rubric (or completed one) – that way one knows exactly what is expected and what the evaluation criteria is.
 - In addition, you may want to clarify the scope of the report for those submitting in the future.
 - Do you want him or her to focus on every threat & weakness or only on the ones that really stand out?

QIP

The quality improvement plan should be used to reference the SWOT results and how the unit plans to address any Weakness’s or Threats. The unit was also required to submit baseline data or delineate when/ where/ what data it will use in the future. A major part that was not connected in this first year of the SSR was using the data. Some units have data, some do not, and yet some it is very difficult to come up with tangible and measureable goals and outcomes.

- QIP to target improvement of services and intended outcomes

- There is no clear indication as to how the QIP is to be submitted, what is expected of the document or parameters on how this will be evaluated by OIEA.
- Where to put the QIP details?
- Training on measurable indicators

Evaluations

- The SSR subcommittee reviewing the reports did not know how to use the rubric for evaluations.
 - Rubric Comments
 - Question #2 – WEAKNESS statement – comment deals with Strengths / Opportunities – why?
 - Question #3 – OPPORTUNITIES statement – comment deals with Weakness / Threats – why?
 - Some of the evaluations were just blank with no comments but rated a zero
- Comments needed on evaluations; if you rate something, a zero instead of a five then you should be able to say why you did that. If you just leave it blank, what is the purpose?
- Inter-rater reliability is extremely low. In looking at the review results on one report between different reviewers, there was a large variance in the rating. This appeared not just on one but almost all 13 reports. This would tell us that there are differences in how the evaluators are evaluating each report and what thought processes or methodology they are using. If you also look at the larger set of numbers, they have a very large range. That might be of concern, if we have a standard rubric to evaluate standard questions, I would expect some clustering in numbers and not the range we had in year 1.

Committee

- Work together on training on how to evaluate and standardize what we are looking for.
- What is the evaluator's philosophy on evaluating?
 - finding what's wrong or what's good

Communication

- Use year one reports for training and post online
- Send out emails to next year's staff sooner
- FAQ vs. training manual or reference guide

Swot

- Should supervisor be in room or not?
- SWOT Issues:
 - get a big enough room to have everyone face each other and have walking access to a post-it board
 - plan ahead and send out a questionnaire to participants before the SWOT to complete and bring to the SWOT, this would allow thoughtful input, not just brainstorming input

- define who is a desired participant for the SWOT, do we want just customers or do we want a mix of customers and customer contact employees
- do we want supervisors present at the SWOT
- Give expectations of behavior and requirements for participants
- How to get students involved in SWOT?

SWOT Facilitators

- One facilitator stayed on task, time-wise; the other did not watch her time and the process toward the end were rushed. Need to tell facilitators to stay on task to ensure one gets all the comments.
- Process to get facilitator was good.

Participants

- “I had two sessions with about 35-40 people participating, which I was told, was a good turnout. Not sure if that was a good cross representation of college faculty and staff. Though I tried to recruit students through Student Government, Phi Kappa Theta, Student Activities Office, and Student Organizations, I only had two students participate. I felt the SWOT to be truly representative; there should have been a lot more students. SWOT Comments – there were no real surprises in what participants said, one person told me, “that was a good thing” “it’s good that you know what the issues were”. Guess it just validated what I have been aware of for a while.
- In regards to the SWOT for student services (areas that report to the campus dean of student services), the analysis needs to focus on the areas of advising, counseling, testing, assessment, OSD, & student judicial. The analysis I received included things like transportation, course scheduling, etc as weaknesses. Although would like to be kept abreast of those items, it is difficult to develop a plan of action for improving items that do not fall under my purview.
- Questions to answer:
 - Are we keeping the portion of the SSR, which will require revising the report? How will we enforce this?
 - How will we close the loop? –
 - Do we need to increase the committee?
 - Date for the orientation?
 - Get some response and quotes about SSR supporting the process on the gains forward and how it went post on web

Quality Improvement Plans (QIP)

The plans developed in the SSR process are the feeder into the ACC College Master Plan. Each department can work with the administrator who is in charge of the business cluster of the master plan system. The insertion of the QIP's into the system allows request to be made through the thorough and structured process of planning at ACC. The Institutional Planning Council, a part of the shared governance process here at ACC assists in the selection of the initiatives and efforts, which will be funded and pushed forward.

Some samples and highlights of different quality improvement plans and initiatives from the year one process are listed below.

- 1. Using the answers to the first two questions, what improvements to primary services and/or intended outcomes will occur during the next five years?**

Department of Arts and Humanities

Based on our SWOT analysis, the following improvements are planned for the next five years:

- 1. Define and strengthen the Division Office Team (CAs, webmaster, graphic designer, administrative assistants)**
 - a. Clarify roles and responsibilities of each team member
 - b. Create a master plan for division projects that tracks tasks and responsibilities
 - c. Will facilitate more proactive and strategic workflow
 - i. Coordinate efforts between administrative assistants
 - d. Improve adherence to operational and administrative standards
 1. Increase communication and cross training
 2. Facilitate staff development
 3. Provide consistent support for departments
- 2. Support for new faculty**
 - a. Create orientation handbooks that are division and department specific
 - b. Utilize mentor program to provide ongoing guidance
- 1. Promote Arts and Humanities courses, events, performances and exhibitions**
 - a. Within ACC
 1. Personalized invitations with free tickets mailed to ACC board members
 2. b. Monthly schedule of events (in addition to annual calendar) that will be printed and posted at every campus as well as posted on the website and distributed via email
 - ii. Utilization of social media
 - iii. Upgrade and maintain division and departmental websites
 - iv. Create videos that promote departments and specific course offerings
 1. Use the videos to promote arts and humanities classes
 2. 2. Videos will be posted on the website and can be used for a variety of recruiting purposes
 - v. Special emphasis on hard-to-fill classes

- vi. Carnival ah!
- vii. Showcase each department
- b. In the community
 1. a. Strengthen and expand community partnerships to increase opportunities for student performance and exhibition of work

- a. AMOA / Laguna Gloria
- b. ProArts
- c. Downtown Arts Alliance
- d. VSA
- e. Pumphouse
- f. E.A.S.T.
- g. State Theatre

- h. Long Center
- i. Zach Scott
- j. Salvage Vanguard
- k. Resistencia
- l. Domy Books
- m. Monkeywrench Books
- n. Daugherty Arts

2. Produce and sell book of faculty artwork
 - a. Use proceeds for scholarship awards
 - a. Create and periodically update the Austin Poets Directory
 - b. For prospective students
 - b. Create open-house events for local high school and home school students
3. Use promotional videos created in the division
 - c. Showcase examples of student work

4. How will the unit measure the extent to which planned improvements have resulted in better service or intended outcomes for students or other key stakeholder

Improvement	Measure	Baseline	Target
Define and Strengthen Division Office	Customer Satisfaction Survey	TBA	50% Improvement over 5 years
Support New Faculty	Customer Satisfaction Survey	TBA	50% Improvement over 5 years
Promote A&H Courses, Events, Performances, and Exhibitions	1. # items of advertising	20	100% Improvement over 5 years
	2. Partnership/Collaboration	2	Add 1 per year over 5 years
	3. Open Houses/HS students	0	Add 1 School/year over 5 years

Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability

Based on our primary services/outcomes and our multiple SWOT analyses, the following improvements are planned for the next five years.

- a. Automate Data Request via Enhancement of TIPS: The Information Portal System (TIPS) was designed to automate data request processes by providing a self-service center for data users. TIPS will be populated with various reports giving users the ability to generate data in many different ways without requesting special programming from OIEA staff. We plan to continue to add new reports for users and enhance capabilities of TIPS during the next five years. This improvement will address issues identified in the SWOTs including:
 - i. Weaknesses, iii – Too many projects/requests, not enough time/staff
 - ii. Opportunities, iv – Improved products through new processes/tools
 - iii. Threats, i – Unrealistic expectations

- b. Standardize Data Request Process: While TIPS can provide users with easy and flexible access to data, OIEA provides other services. Currently, we have a process for requesting data, but not for these other services. During the next year, we will develop detailed procedures to standardize the way request are made which will form the basis for enforcement of those procedures. This improvement will address issues identified in the SWOTs including:
 - i. Weaknesses, ii, iii, v, vii
 1. Planning and prioritization of projects
 2. Too many projects/requests, not enough time/staff
 3. Standardization of procedures
 4. Misperceptions of OIEA function
 - ii. Threats, i – Unrealistic expectations

- c. Cross-Train OIEA Staff: OIEA does not have enough staff to have redundancy in positions. Due to the workload, each staff member has specific assignments with few overlaps. Therefore, when a staff member is out of the office for an extended period, there is no backup for that position. We plan to develop a system for cross-training similar positions so that there is a backup. Cross training will also provide staff member's insight into other projects. This improvement will address issues identified in the SWOTs including:
 - i. Strengths, i, ii, iii, iv
 1. Qualified staff
 2. Diversity of knowledge and skills
 3. Quality products
 4. Good customer service
 - ii. Weaknesses, ii, iii
 1. Planning and prioritization of projects
 2. Too Many projects/requests and not enough time/staff

- d. Educate Users: OIEA has always supported users by providing training users on a one-on-one basis. During the next five years, we plan to develop a comprehensive system of training for users of our services.
 - i. Using TIPS
 - ii. How to use data
 - iii. Instructional Program Review (IPR) process
 - iv. Support Services Review (SSR) process
 - v. Master Plan (MP) process
 - vi. Survey development and analysis
 - vii. Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)

4. How will the unit measure the extent to which planned improvements have resulted in better service or intended outcomes for students or other key stakeholders?

To measure the effectiveness of the planned improvements, OIEA will monitor the following performance indicators:

Improvement	Measure	Baseline Data	Target
Automate Data Requests via Enhancement of TIPS	1. Number of users of TIPS 2. Number of reports available on TIPS	1. TBD 2. 12	1. 50% increase over 5 years 2. Increase over previous year
Standardize Data Request Process	1. Number of requests by exception	1. TBD	1. Less than or equal to 25%
Cross-Train OIEA Staff	1. Percent of positions with a backup	1. 30%	1. 75%
Educate Users	1. Number of workshops	1. 3	1. Increase over previous year

SSR Process

The SSR process is designed to:

- Replace the former Internal College Survey with a comprehensive planning and evaluation tool
- Provide valuable feedback from the users of College support services
- Support continuous quality improvement
- Assess the level of compliance with effectiveness standards of the Commission on Colleges and Austin Community College
- Answer the Five Fundamental Questions of SSR
- Document accountability and accreditation compliance

The Principles of Support Services Review:

- is one component of ACC's institutional effectiveness and accountability processes
- is an integral part of ACC's ongoing assessment, planning, and Master Planning processes.
- should not be burdensome to review team members or to staff and administrators.
- requires integrity for critical reflection, accurate assessment, and genuine follow-through.

The SSR process is intended to answer the following fundamental questions in each the college's service units.

Five Fundamental Questions

1. What are the primary services or outcomes provided by the support service area and what is the impact of those services and outcomes on students and other key stakeholders?
2. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats present that enhance or hinder the unit's ability to provide those services and meet expected outcomes during the next three years?
3. Using the answers to the first two questions, what improvements to primary services and/or intended outcomes will occur during the next three years?
4. How will the unit measure the extent to which planned improvements have resulted in better service or intended outcomes for students or other key stakeholders?
5. How will the planned improvements align with and contribute to the Mission and Intended Outcomes of Austin Community College?

The SSR process also supports in part compliance with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation of Austin Community College.

SACS comprehensive standard 3.3.1

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas (Institutional Effectiveness):

3.3.1.2 Administrative support services

3.3.1.3 Educational support service

SSR Rotation ([see attachment 2 – 5year cycle](#))

As a starting point, administrative and student support service offices at or above the level of Director in current ACC organization charts should be prepared to participate in the SSR process.

Some ACC support service units at the Director level have too few staff or perform narrow functions that might reasonably be combined into larger functional planning units. When this is the case, the SSR and QIP should include a description of the planning unit in view of current organizational structures and the rationale for ‘rolling up’ smaller services units into larger functional planning units.

Not all support service units will perform the SSR in the same fiscal year. Support Service Review and QIP will be performed on a five-year cycle, with the written SSR and QIP being completed in the first year with four annual follow-ups to ensure that service units are on target to achieve planned improvements or, if necessary, to revise the QIP

Approximately one-fifth of ACC’s administrative and student support service units will be doing SSR in a given year. College leaders will prioritize and determine the order in which their service units do SSR, if you have any question about your service unit’s SSR, ask your next level supervisor

Unit Review Leaders (URL) and Review Team

The appropriate administrative unit head will designate a unit review leader. In most cases, the charge to perform SSR will come from the leadership above the support service unit as shown in ACC organization charts. Often the EVP, VP, or AVP will designate the unit review leader to be responsible to see that the SSR and annual follow-ups are completed in a timely manner.

In accordance with ACC Policy C-5 Open Communication and Shared Governance and Administrative Rule 3.05.005 Shared Governance Process, the unit review leader will appoint a review team comprised of support service unit staff, key personnel, and outside stakeholders to bring a broad range of perspectives and expertise to complete the support service review and to implement the improvement plan.

Staff members who perform the essential functions of the unit have first-hand knowledge and experience vital to plans for improved services and, in all likelihood, will be charged with carrying out and assessing the improvement plan.

You should include your VP in early planning to allow for realistic appraisal of the resources available for proposed improvements and to smooth the reporting and presentation phase toward the end of the SSR process.

Other Key personnel on the review team should include administrators and staff from other administrative areas that depend on services that your service unit provides or on whose services your unit depends.

Outside stakeholders should be included to represent the interests of those we serve or, perhaps, provide us services. For example, student support service's stakeholders may include school district personnel, people who perform similar functions at other institutions, current or prospective students and their parents. Administrative support service's stakeholders may include important vendors, contractors, officers of agencies that ACC reports to, or community leaders.

SSR Timeline ([see attachment 3 – annual timeline](#))

The annual timeline is designed to allow enough structure to ensure the process is completed in a timely manner, but enough flexibility to allow service units to easily meld the review into daily operations and processing.

Support Service Review Report

Each unit will write a Support Service Review Report (SSR/QIP) to document the steps of the SSR process thus far. The following recalls certain of the Five Fundamental Questions and outlines things to include in the SSRS.

1. What are the primary services or outcomes provided by the support service area and what is the impact of those services and outcomes on students and other key stakeholders?

- a. Identify the customers that your unit serves
- b. Identify the services or products you provide your customers
- c. Identify the impact or benefit of your services and product for your customers

2. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats present that enhance or hinder the unit's ability to provide those services and meet expected outcomes during the next three years?

- a. Conduct a facilitated SWOT analysis to identify service unit Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats that enhance or hinder your ability to perform your services for your customers. Contact OIEA to schedule for a SWOT facilitator

- b. Explain how the results of the SWOT analysis are incorporated into your plans for improvement

5. How will the planned improvements align with and contribute to the mission and intended outcomes of Austin Community College?

- a. Show how improvements align with and contribute the ACC's mission to promote student success and improve communities by providing affordable access to higher education and workforce training

Write a Five-Year Quality Improvement Plan

Write a five-year Quality Improvement Plan that documents planned improvements and their assessment. The following recalls the remaining Fundamental Questions and outlines things to include in the QIP.

3. Using the answers to the first two questions, what improvements to primary services and/or intended outcomes will occur during the next five years?

- a. Review your answer to Questions 1 and 2 to identify improvements to your services and products that will benefit your customers
- b. How have you incorporated SWOT results into your planned improvement
- c. Focus on the five most important areas for improvement

4. How will the unit measure the extent to which planned improvements have resulted in better service or intended outcomes for students or other key stakeholders?

- a. Identify existing baseline data related to the services and outcomes of your unit
- b. If such data are not available, identify means to assess the extent improvements have resulted in better services and outcomes
- c. Set realistic benchmarks for improvement that can be updated at least annually
- d. Identify what is to be assessed, when assessment will occur, and how assessment results will be tracked over time

Years 2 through 5 of the SSR review Cycle

The Quality Improvement Plans must be updated with assessment data and reports on status and future changes or modifications. If the original QIP's have been completed, the administrative unit will also update the SSR report and select new Quality Improvement Plans for the duration of the 5-year cycle.

Review / Evaluation of Support Services Review Reports and Quality Improvement Plans

- SSR/QIP will be submitted for review and evaluation to the Support Services Review Subcommittee.
- The committee will use a standard rubric to evaluate the completeness in answering the 5- Fundamental Questions NOT the content as the committee is not the subject matter experts.
- SSR/QIP will be submitted for review and approval by service area leadership before implementation.
- SSR/QIP may be subject to review and comment by larger organizational units such as cluster groups to align and prioritize planning, Master Planning, and budgeting.
- SSR/QIP will be submitted to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability to be reviewed and kept to establish compliance with accountability and accreditation standards.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1- Year one success chart

<u>Function</u>	Unit leader	Orientation	SWOT	SSR Report received	SSR evaluations sent - dept	Dean/AVP Review
<i>* <u>Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability</u></i>	Soon Merz	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>Dean, Arts, and Humanities</u></i>	Lyman G	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>Procurement</u></i>	Anthony Owens	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>Professional Development</u></i>	Terry	y	y	y	y	8/30/2011
<i>* <u>Learning labs.</u></i>	Terri Kelly (interim)	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>Bridge - Supp Instruction</u></i>	Mary Gilmer	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>OSD - Special Populations</u></i>	Steve Christopher	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>SS Deans EVC</u></i>	Dorado Kinney	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>SS Deans SAC</u></i>	Yolanda Chapa	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>Distance Learning</u></i>	Robert B	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>IT System Svc</u></i>	Rick	y	y	y	y	
<i>* <u>IT App Development Dir</u></i>	Andrew C	y				
			3/3/2011	6/13/2011		
<i>* <u>IT Support Svc</u></i>	Theresa H	y				
			3/3/2011	6/13/2011		

Attachment 2 – SSR 5 Year Rotation

Support Services Review Rotation Calendar					
	FY 10-11	FY 11-12	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15
President	* Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability	* Internal Audit	* Center for Community based non-profit * Center for Public Policy	* External Affairs * Alumni	* Govt Relations * President * Public Info college marketing
EVP / Provost	* Dean, Arts, and Humanities	* CE, Associate Dean * Bus Operations * Customized Training (Corp) * Community Programs * Alternative Teacher Cert (CE) GED Testing * Articulation and Transfer * Workforce Dev Ctr Dir * Dean, Mathematics and Science * College Access Programs	* Child Care School Mgr * Adult Basic Ed * International Programs	* Dean, Applied Tech, Multi-Media, Pub Svc * Dean, Business Studies * Dean Social and Behavioral Sciences * Dean, Computer studies and Adv Tech	* Exec Dean Health Science * Dean, Communications
EVP Finance / Admin	* Procurement * Professional Development	* Building and Grounds * Accounting	* EVP - Finance & Admin * EH&S * Student Accounts * Employment Svcs * Benefits * Compensation	* Facilities and Construction * Finance & Budget * Restricted Accts	* Payroll * Records * Bookstore
EVP College Operations	* Learning Svc * Bridge - Supp Instruction * OSD - Special Populations * SS Deans EVC * SS Deans SAC * Distance Learning * IT App Development Dir * IT Support Svc * IT System Svc	* Admissions and Records * SS Deans PIN * SS Deans RVS * Instructional and Computing Technology * ACCNet * Institutional Records * Student Assistance and Veterans Affairs	* Enroll Mgt / Mobile GO/ Recruitment/ Advising * Men of Distinction * African Am Cultural Ctr * SS Deans CYP * SS Deans NRG * SS Deans RGC * SS Deans RRC * VCT * Instructional Development Services * Campus Mgt NRG * Campus Mgt RRC * Early College Start	* El Centro * Library * Campus Mgt CYP * Campus Mgt EVC * Campus Mgt PIN * Campus Mgt RVS * Tech Prep * CCPP * Grants * ISS * College Connection	* Community Outreach * Student Life * IT Security Officer * Campus Mgt HBC * Campus Mgt RGC * Campus Mgt SAC * Police * P-16 * Centers

Last Updated 8/30/2011 9:26 AM

Support Services Review Timeline

WHEN	WHO	WHAT
October	Administrative Unit Review Leaders (URL) & OIEA Staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSR orientation meeting Units submit mission statements to OIEA
October - November	Administrative Unit Review Leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> URL prepare data for SWOT use Data must be submitted to participants and facilitator 2-3 weeks prior
November - March	Administrative Unit Review Leaders	Conduct SWOT
November - March	Administrative Unit Review Leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Begin Writing Quality Improvement Plan and Support Services Review Report As soon as swot is completed
March - June	Administrative Unit Review Leaders	Develop/Refine Quality Improvement Plan and Support Services Review Report
April 1	Administrative Unit Review Leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALL SWOTs to be completed SWOT results due to OIEA
June 1	Administrative Unit Review Leaders	Quality Improvement Plan and Support Services Review Report due to OIEA
July 1	Support Services Review Subcommittee	Review Support Services Review Reports and Quality Improvement Plans provide feedback to units
July - August	Selected Administrative Unit Review Leaders	Revise Quality Improvement Plan and Support Services Report, if desired and resubmit update
July - September	Administrative Unit Review Leaders	Present findings to appropriate leaders and stakeholders
October - January	Administrative Unit Review Leaders	Implement Supervisor Approved Quality Improvement Plan and/or Request Funding through the Master Planning Process
March 1 Successive Years	Administrative Units	Submit Quality Improvement Plan UPDATES

Attachment 4 – SSR Rubrics

Austin Community College Support Services Review Evaluation Rubric

	0	1	2	3	Total	Comments
	not done	not met	partially met	Fully met		
1. What are the primary services or outcomes provided by the support service area and what is the impact of those services and outcomes on students and other key stakeholders?						
The SSR report clearly describes the primary services or outcomes of the area.						
The SSR report clearly describes the impact of those services on students or stakeholders.						
2. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats present that enhance or hinder the unit's ability to provide those primary services and meet the expected outcomes during the next five years?						
The SWOT report has clearly described the STRENGTHS of the area and how those affect the provision of services.						
The SWOT report has clearly described the WEAKNESSES of the area and how those affect the provision of services.						
The SWOT report has clearly described the OPPORTUNITIES of the area and how those affect the provision of services.						
The SWOT report has clearly described the THREATS of the area and how those affect the provision of services.						
3. Using the answers to the first two questions, what improvements to the primary services and/ or intended outcomes will occur during the next five years?						
The improvements outlined in the QIP address the primary services or outcomes						
The QIP clearly integrates the findings of the SWOT analysis.						
4. How will the unit measure the extent to which planned improvements have resulted in better services or intended outcomes for students or other key stakeholders?						
The SSR report includes measurable indicators to evaluate the impact of improvement(s) on services or outcomes for students or stakeholders.						
The QIP includes baseline data for proposed improvements.						
The QIP includes measurable targets for proposed improvements.						
5. How will the planned improvements align with and contribute to the Mission and Intended outcomes of ACC?						
The SSR report clearly demonstrates alignment of the QIP with the mission and/ or intended outcomes of the college.						
General Comments:						
					0 TOTAL	

0%