

# Institutional Research Committee Meeting

## April 15, 2010 @ 2:00 p.m.

---

**Present:** Scott Godfrey, Brian Huschle, Mary Fontes, Shannon Nelson, Gerald Schulte, Julie Fenning, Mary Jo Bydal, Karleen Delorme, Becky Lindseth, Bob Gooden, Kent Hanson, Kristi Lane,

**Absent:** Anne Temte, Jeanine McDermott, Sherry Lindquist, Rocky Ammerman, Eugene Klinke

### **Discuss Organizational Climate Survey Options**

It was brought to Scott's attention that with the NCA visit approaching, we need to be able to say to the NCA committee that an organizational climate survey is an item that we are reviewing and progress has been made. Scott followed up on this information by sending an e-mail to the Institutional Research listserve requesting examples of their campus climate surveys. Scott provided a handout of sample surveys to the committee. Two of the colleges referenced the PACE surveys. Scott reported that there is not a standard survey that is being used by MnSCU at this time. The committee was asked to review these documents for discussion:

- The surveys from Itasca CC & Metro State University were more defined to student population and we already include those questions in a survey to students.
- The PACE personal assessment survey would be a better instrument for employees, but it costs about \$2,500 for the most basic package.
- The package to process the raw data that we would be able to analyze ourselves and produce tailored reports will cost more. Total cost for the survey is estimated to be about \$5,000 and would be administered every two years.
- We would be able to use the data to make change and be able to compare NCTC to other colleges across the nation. NCTC has no bench mark at this point.
- There was concern and discussion regarding who will develop, who will send out, who will analyze – it is very time consuming to process. Someone would need to be designated to do this.
- We need to invest to find out the value of the survey.
- With the purchase of the PACE assessment survey, a climate survey will be administered every year: CSSEE and CFSSEE in one year, PACE in the next. Moreover, dollars are included in the budget each year for surveys. As a result, money is available for the PACE due to existence of budgeted dollars in the years the CSSEE and CFSSEE are not utilized.

The decision was made to purchase the commercially developed organizational climate survey – PACE – FY2011 and to conduct this survey every two years. Scott Godfrey will take the lead on this project.

## **Review Grouplink Process Map**

Scott explained the Grouplink Process Map handout with the committee and stated that this map formalized what was discussed at the last meetings. The short-term would be where we are building up the repository.

There was discussion regarding the process map handout, clarifying both the short-term and long-term goals. Short term, the goal is to establish a valid repository of BOTH reports and pivots used in the creation of reports. It was clarified that, upon completing a ticket, both the report and the pivot used should be send to the IR Director for storage in the repository.

Long-term, any requests for data could be fulfilled using this repository. This will save time and increase efficiency for everyone involved. Ultimately, it will free up both the IR Director and the relevant data owners from continuously creating reports.

Questions were also raised regarding the security settings within the D2L shell that will house the repository. Because certain pivots and reports *may* contain private data, there will need to be guidelines regarding what actors have access to what data. Brian Huschle indicated that D2L is capable of creating different levels of access for users, and that this may work to secure sensitive data. Mary Fontes offered data redaction as an alternative until security measures could be created. Scott reminded the committee that this will not take effect until after the NCA visit, and that he will need to be trained in the use of D2L to be able to utilize the full potential of the software.

It was mentioned that modifications will need to be made along the way once this is implemented – we will continually improve the process.

### *External Agency Requests:*

- Think about data privacy.
- Need to verify any external agency requests and make sure we are in compliance with FERPA and Minnesota Government Data Practices.
- Internal requests could be asking for data for an external agency – this would need to be verified that the request is in compliance and that it hasn't already been requested.

Scott was directed to contact the following regarding external requests: Rocky Ammerman, Jo Schill, and Gene Klinke.

Recorded by: Diane Rapacz