AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

University Registrar

Division or Department: N/A

Prepared by: Yvette Ceasar-Williams   **Date: 06/19/2018**

Approved by: Lillie Frazier Bell   **Date: 06/19/2018**

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

The Registrar ensures the integrity, accuracy, and security of all academic records of current and former students; facilitates effective student registration and enrollment; builds secure student data files and sets policy and procedures for their responsible use; maintains up-to-date course schedules, catalogs, final examination schedules; manages efficient use of classrooms; and supervises and maintains the Banner and degree audit systems. The Registrar supervises the processes for the articulation of transfer credits, graduation and certification of graduate, baccalaureate, and associate degrees; enrollment and degree verification, production of official transcripts, diplomas, and commencement ceremonies. The Registrar counsels and advises students, faculty, and staff on academic matters; and interprets and enforces policies and regulations of the University, Board of Regents and Supervisors, and FERPA.

Methodology: The assessment process includes:

(1) Data from assessment tools (both direct – indirect, quantitative and qualitative) are collected and submitted to the Unit Assessment Coordinator;

(2) The Unit Assessment Coordinator will analyze the data to determine whether or not the applicable outcomes are met;

(3) Results from the assessment will be discussed with the appropriate staff;

(4) Individual meetings will be held with staff, as needed;

(5) The Unit Assessment Coordinator, in consultation with Unit Coordinators, will determine proposed changes to the measurable outcomes, assessment tools for the next assessment period and any appropriate service changes.

Academic Services and Veteran Affairs

Service Outcomes:

SO 1. The Academic Services and Veteran Affairs Unit ensures the timely processing of Veteran Affairs documents and certifications of enrollment each semester for new, transfer, visiting, and continuing VA students; facilitates the class schedule information for access to students and faculty for effective registration and enrollment, and facilitates the commencement ceremonies.

Source Map:
U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs – Education and Training
University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors
Louisiana Board of Regents Legislative Response (Louisiana Military Friendly Campus)

Measure 1.1 (Indirect - Survey)

The Veteran Services Office coordinates all veterans, dependents, guardsmen, and reservists' benefits for those attending classes and using the G.I. Bill. The students' satisfaction rating with the processing of their data forms and certifications, staff's attitude, and assistance will increase from 50% in fall 2017 to 75% by spring 2018.

Finding: Target Not Met.

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the satisfaction rating was not met. A small number of the 107 out of 9,269 students enrolled responded to the survey. For the Academic Year 2017/18, a 63% satisfaction rating was achieved for identified VA students even though the desired satisfaction rating was not met. In the 2016/17 Academic Year, the satisfaction rating of 1.15% was not met for the responses received from all 9,269 enrolled students. This was a very low satisfaction rating for the number of students surveyed electronically. A total of 107 students responded with a satisfaction rating of satisfied/very satisfied out of the 246 students who responded at all giving a 43.5% satisfied/very satisfied rating. This was good but did not provide an accurate accounting of VA students receiving service. At the end of the 2016/17 Academic Year, our plan of action to increase the satisfaction rate of eligible veteran benefits recipients was by changing the population of students surveyed to only include those with VA benefits. We also chose to survey VA students in fall 2017 and then again in spring 2018 to determine if our satisfaction rating increases from 50% in the fall to 75% by the end of spring.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to change the population of students surveyed to only include those with VA benefits resulted in a 49% satisfaction rating of satisfied/very satisfied for fall 2017 and a 14% satisfaction rating of satisfied/very satisfied for spring 2018.   Each VA student receiving in-person assistance in our VA area was asked to complete a written survey. A total of 100 VA students were asked to complete the survey. Out of 100 VA students surveyed during fall 2017, there were 49 who

completed the survey. During the spring 2018 semester, only 14 students completed the survey.   By following our decision to just survey VA students instead of all enrolled students, we are now able to get a more accurate view of the service provided to our VA students. We still did not meet our goal of a 50% for fall 2017 and 75% for spring 2018 which could be because the spring 2018 VA students could have been returning students who had already completed the survey during fall 2017. Of the total 63 VA students who completed the survey for the Academic Year 2017/18, we have a 63% satisfied/very satisfied rating. The analysis reflects that we are meeting the needs of our VA recipients.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: The 63% satisfaction rating for the Academic Year 2017/18 is evidence that we are providing sufficient service to our VA recipients. To increase the availability of staff providing services to our VA students, the Director of Academic Services will attend VA training over the summer. This should ensure that there is someone available always to provide sufficient service to the students who come into our VA office. By doing so, the satisfaction rating should increase to 75% for the Academic Year 2018/19.

Measure 1.2 (Direct – Knowledge)

Academic Services enters all class schedule information for each fall, spring, and summer semesters. Having a training booklet for registering courses through eNSU for scheduled of classes preparation, department heads' knowledge will be enhanced regarding the process and need for timely submissions.

Finding: Target Not Met.

Analysis: A training booklet was not created for registering courses through eNSU due to the late hiring of the Computer Support Specialist. The new Director of Academic Services found a solution of simply making the electronic courses inactive for those not registered with ECE. This prompts those faculty members to register the electronic courses required. After discussion with the ECE staff-member who approves or denies the registrations submitted by faculty, it was determined that no tangible data can be retrieved to provide evidence of their timely or untimely submissions. The registration of the electronic courses is a part of the SREB (Southern Region Electronics Board) guidelines for universities offering courses electronically. The guidelines are published on the ECE website for usage of the appropriate faculty members.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: Based upon the finding and analysis, there aren't sufficient resources to assess this measure as well as the fact that it is no longer needed.

Measure 1.3 (Indirect – Survey)

Academic Services coordinates all aspects of the commencement ceremonies to ensure a successful and memorable experience for the graduates, parents, faculty, staff, visitors, and community. Early preparation of and retrieval of the participants on

the program and script, stage and sound preparation instructions, effective communication with the Graduation/Audit Unit on program completion and diplomas/covers, photographer confirmation, confirmation of floral decorations, etc. will minimize problems on the day of commencement. The satisfaction rating of the graduates will increase from 80% in fall 2017 to 90% at the end of spring 2018.

Finding: Target Met.

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the satisfaction rating was not met. A small number of the 103 out of 9.269 students enrolled responded to the survey. For the Academic Year 2017/18, a 98.38% satisfaction rating was achieved for fall 2017 and a 97% satisfaction rating for spring 2018. In the 2016/17 Academic Year, the satisfaction rating of 1.1% was not met for the responses received from all 9,269 enrolled students. This was a very low satisfaction rating for the number of students surveyed electronically. A total of 103 students responded with a satisfaction rating of satisfied/very satisfied out of the 241 who responded at all giving a 42.7% satisfied/very satisfied rating. The was good but did not provide an accurate number of actual candidates attending commencement. At the end of the 2016/17 Academic Year, our plan of action to increase the satisfaction rate of candidates was by changing the population of students surveyed to only include graduates. We chose to survey the fall graduates on December 15, 2017 and spring graduates on May 11, 2018 to determine if the satisfaction rating increases to 90% by end of spring 2018.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to change the population of students surveyed to only include actual graduates resulted in a 98.38% satisfaction rating for fall 2017 and a 97% satisfaction rating for spring 2018 for the entire ceremony. At the end of each ceremony, each graduate was surveyed as they were receiving their diplomas. A total of 370 graduates were surveyed at the end of the fall 2017 ceremonies. A total of 364 out of 370 graduates responded to the survey as being satisfied with the entire ceremony resulting in a 98.38% rating. A total of 3 graduates responded unfavorably resulting in a 0.81% rating of unsatisfied. A total of 3 graduates who did complete the survey at all resulted in 0.81%. The last two ratings for the 3 who didn't respond favorably as well as the 3 who did not participate could be highly likely attributed to the fact that these students may not have graduated but were allowed to participate in the ceremony since the commencement program is unofficial until all candidates have been certified by their deans. A total of 365 graduates for the fall 2017 ceremony responded to the arena area appearance with a very good/good rating of 98.65%, and total of 2 responded with very bad resulting in a rating of 0.54%. A total of 3 (0.81%) did not participate in the survey. A total of 366 graduates responded to the qualify of sound during the ceremony with a very good/good rating of 98.92%. There was 1 graduate who responded with a very bad rating of 0.27%. A total of 3 (0.81%) graduates did not participate. A total of 501 graduates were surveyed at the end of the spring 2018 ceremonies. A total of 486 out of 501 graduates responded to the survey as being

satisfied with the entire ceremony resulting in a 97% rating. A total of 15 responded unfavorable resulting in a 3% rating of unsatisfied. This unfavorable rating could be attributed to the fact that these 15 students may not have graduated but could participate in the ceremony. A total of 498 graduates for the spring 2018 ceremony responded to the arena area appearance with a very good/good rating of 99.4%, and total of 3 responded with bad resulting a rating of 0.60%.   A total of 498 graduates responded to the quality of sound during the ceremony with a very good/good rating of 99.4%. There were 3 graduates who responded with a bad/very bad rating of 0.60%. By following our decision to only survey graduates instead of all enrolled students, we are now able to get a more accurate viewpoint of the service we are providing our graduates during this special occasion. We exceeded our goal of achieving 90% by the end of spring 2018 by achieving a 97% rating. The analysis reflects that we are meeting the needs of our graduates.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: The 97% satisfaction rating for the Academic Year 2017/18 is evidence that are providing a valuable service to our graduates. Our ratings of 98.65% for appearance during the fall 2017 ceremony and 99.4% for the spring 2018 ceremony as well as the 98.92% for sound during the fall 2017ceremony and 99.4% for the spring ceremony indicate that we are satisfying our graduates. We will continue to provide exemplary service to our graduates to increase their satisfaction rating to 100% by the end of spring 2019.

Student Academic Services and Transcript Evaluation

Service Outcomes

SO 2. The Student Academic Services and Transcript Evaluation Unit ensures the accuracy of information and assistance provided to current and former students, faculty, and staff; and accuracy of transfer credits.

Source Map:
University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors
Louisiana Board of Regents'

Measure 2.1 (Indirect - Survey)

Student Academic Services is the first point of contact for current and former students, parents, faculty, and other staff. It is essential that accurate information is provided as well as processing their requests in a timely manner. The students and faculty satisfaction rating with the completion of their requests, our staff's attitude, and our staff's assistance will increase from 75% in fall 2017 to 85% by the end of spring 2018.

Finding: Target Not Met

AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the satisfaction rating was not met. A small number of the 158 out of 9.269 students enrolled responded to the survey. For the Academic Year 2017/18, a 60% satisfaction rating was achieved for students receiving in-person service even though the desired satisfaction rating was not met. In the 2016/17 Academic Year, the satisfaction rating of 1.70% was not met for the responses received from all 9,269 enrolled students. This was a very low satisfaction rating for the number of students surveyed electronically. A total of 158 students responded with a satisfaction rating of satisfied/very satisfied out of the 246 who responded resulting in a 64.23% satisfaction rating. This was good but did not provide an account number of students receiving services from our office. There was an average of 169 faculty advisors who responded as being satisfied/very satisfied out of the average 230 who responded to the survey resulting in a 73.4% rating. This was good but did not give an accurate number of faculty/staff who receive services from our office. Of the 1,020 faculty/staff surveyed, there as a 16.57% rating of satisfied/very satisfied. At the end of Academic Year 2016/17, our plan of action to increase the satisfaction rating was to survey students, faculty, and staff when services are rendered.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to survey the students, faculty, and staff when services are rendered responded with very good for their office visit resulting in a 60% rating. Each student, faculty, and staff receiving services in our front desk area were asked to complete a written survey. Due to the volume of visitors to our office and phone calls, only of 50 students, faculty, and staff were asked to complete the survey. During the fall 2017 semester, a total of 38 out of the 50 responded positively that they received the assistance needed or was directed to the appropriate person resulting in a 76% rating. A total of 38 out of the 50 responded with very good for our staff's attitude during their visit resulting in a 76% rating.   A total of 12 (24%) students, faculty, and staff chose not to participate in the survey.   For spring 2018, a total of 22 students, faculty, and staff responded with very good on their office visit resulted in a 44% rating. A total of 22 out of 50 responded positively that they received the assistance needed or was directed to the appropriate person resulting in a 44% rating. A total of 22 out of the 50 responded with a very good for our staff's attitude during their visit resulting in a 44% rating. A total of 28 (56%) did not participate in the survey. Even though our rating was not met, our analysis reveals that we are providing satisfactory services to those who come into our office.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: The 60% rating for the Academic Year 2017/18 is evidence that we are providing sufficient services to our students, faculty, and staff. For the Academic Year 2018/19, we will focus more on the services we provide the students since everything processed within our office is centered around the students' academic or career successes.

AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

Measure 2.2 (Indirect – Survey)

Transcript Evaluation is critical in determining admission eligibility, pre-requisite requirements for registration, and degree completions determination. Students and their advisors' satisfaction rating with the speed and accuracy of transfer evaluations will increase from 80% in fall 2017 to 90% by the end of spring 2018.

Finding: Target Not Met.

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the satisfaction rating was not met. A total of 147 out of the 9,269 students surveyed resulted in a 1.59% satisfaction rating. For the Academic Year 2017/18, a 20.75% satisfaction rating was achieved but we did not meet our desired rating. A total of 110 out of 1,020 faculty/staff surveyed resulted in a 10.78% satisfaction rating. A total of 147 out of the 245 students who responded satisfied/very satisfied to the survey resulted in a 60% rating. A total of 110 faculty/staff out of the 230 who responded satisfied/very satisfied to the survey resulted in a 47.82% rating. This was good but did not give us the desired rating we expected. The low numbers are possibly a result of the students, faculty, and staff who chose not to participate in the surveys. Of the 147 out of 245 students who responded with a satisfactory rating of 60% is a good indicator that we are providing a satisfactory service. The 47.82% satisfactory rating from the 110 out of 230 faculty and staff who responded is slightly low but still indicates that we are providing a satisfactory service.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to only survey the students who have transfer credits and their advisors resulted in an 85.24% satisfaction rating of those responding (52 out of 61) for fall 2017.   Each student with transfer credits and their advisors were surveyed electronically for both fall and spring semesters after each term's census date. A total of 61 out of 294 responded satisfactorily resulting in a 20.75% rating for students and advisors for fall 2017. Determining students from advisors was not easily defined from this survey. For spring 2018, the students with transfer credits and their advisors were surveyed separately.   A total of 8 out of 563 students with transfer credits responded to the survey resulting in a 1.42% participating rating. A total of 555 students out of 563 did not respond to the survey resulting in a 98.58% non-participation rating. These low ratings are a result of the small number of responses from the surveys. A total of 13 out of 124 advisors responded favorably resulting in a 10.48% rating. The responses are an indication that we are satisfactorily meeting the needs of our transfer students and their advisors even though responses were low and our target was not met.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: The 85.24% satisfactory rating for the Academic Year 2017/18 for the students with transfer credits who responded to the survey is evidence that we are providing sufficient service to them and their advisors. We will change our plan to focus on the students with transfer credits and increase their satisfaction rating to 60% by the end of spring 2019.

Records and Transcript Production

Service Outcomes

SO 3. Records and Transcript Production ensures the accuracy and security of all current and former students' records. The primary focal points are to facilitate effective student registrations and enrollments, generate enrollment and degree verifications; and production of official transcripts.   This unit builds secure data files for current and former students and counsels/advises current and former students, faculty, and staff on academic policies and regulations.

Source Map:
University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors
Louisiana Board of Regents'
National Student Clearinghouse

Measure 3.1 (Indirect - Survey)

Records monitors all students' records daily. Updates and adjustments are made to records using student requests (major changes, residency redetermination, catalog changes), Registration Credits and Graduation Council appeal committee decisions, approved grade change requests, approved academic standing reinstatements, and approved out-of-state waivers from the Scholarship Office. By completing all updates and adjustments in a timely manner, this aids in the students being eligible to register and/or enroll in the appropriate courses for their degree programs as well as having an accurate accounting of tuition and registration fees.   The students' satisfaction rating with the timeliness and accuracy of processing record updates and academic decisions will increase from 75% in fall 2017 to 85% at the end of spring 2018.

Finding: Target Not Met

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the satisfaction rating was not met. A small number of the 160 out of 9,269 students enrolled responded to the survey resulting in a 1.73% satisfaction rating. A small number of the 114 faculty/staff out of 1,020 responding to the survey resulted in a 11.17% satisfaction rating.   For the Academic Year 2017/18, a 4.61% satisfaction rating was achieved for those students responding to the survey for fall 2017 and 0.41% for spring 2018. In the 2016/17 Academic Year, the satisfaction rating of 1.73% was not met for the responses received from the 9,269 enrolled students. This was a low rating for the number of students surveyed electronically. The low response may possibly be attributed to the fact that most of the enrolled students did not have adjustments to their student records. The low response from faculty/staff may possibly be attributed to the fact that all faculty are not advisors, and most staff work with student information daily and may not be able to easily identify which students' records affected their processes. At the end of the 2016/17 Academic Year, our plan of action was to send out a survey to all students and advisors during the first week of October during fall 2017 and the first week of March during spring 2018.

AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to send the survey out earlier to all students and advisors resulted in a 4.61% satisfaction rating for fall 2017 and a 0.41% satisfaction rating for spring 2018. After consulting with IT staff to obtain a file of all students with records updates, it was determined that specific changes to students records on specific Banner forms could not be obtained. All students who could be identified with records updates were surveyed electronically. A total of 48 students responded with a satisfaction rating of very satisfied/satisfied out of the 51 students who responded to the survey giving a rating of 94.11% for fall 2017 and a total of 6 students out of 6 giving a rating of 100% for spring 2018. Even though we did not meet our target, the analysis reflects that we are meeting the needs of the students.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: The 94.11% satisfaction rating for fall 2017 and 100% for spring 2018 for Academic Year 2017/18 are evidence that we are providing sufficient service when updating students' records. To increase the satisfaction rating of students with records updates, we will try to focus on mainly identifying the students with major changes and grade changes to be surveyed and . Since there is a high volume of grade changes and major changes during the year, this should result in an accurate assessment of the updates processed and result in a 65% satisfaction rating for Academic Year 2018/19.

Measure 3.2 (Indirect)

Records ensures that all current students' enrollment data is uploaded every 30 days to the National Student Clearinghouse during each semester, and degree completions are uploaded at the end of each semester. Timely uploading allows for the enrollment data to be accessible for students' self-service of enrollment verifications, the National Student Loan Data System accessibility for students' financial aid eligibility statuses, and employer/prospective employer verification of degree completions.   With this information being readily available at the beginning of each semester and making students aware of this service, the volume of on-line self-service for students and employers/prospective employers will increase from 3,200 in academic year 2016/17 to 4,000 for academic year 2017-18.

Finding: Target Met.

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the desired volume was not met. The volume did increase to 3,250 but not enough to reach our target of 4,000. For Academic Year 2017/18, the volume increased to 4,160 which was above our target. In the 2016/17 Academic Year, the volume of on-line requests reached 81.25% of our 4,000 targets.   From this finding, we knew that the on-line verifications were meeting the needs of the students and employers/prospective employers even though our desired target was not met. Our plan was to increase the awareness of this on-line service.

AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to increase the awareness that the on-line verification service is available resulted in us meeting and exceeding our target volume of 4,000. Our on-line verification service resulted in 4,160 requests being processed on-line with minimal assistance from staff.   By following our decision to increase the awareness of the on-line verification service, we can determine the increase in on-line requests processed successfully with minimal assistance from staff and the ease of access to the information needed by outside individuals/entities.   The analysis reflects that we are meeting the needs to the students and employers/prospective employers.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: The 104% volume reached for Academic Year 2017/18 is evidence that we are providing a valuable service to students and employers/prospective employers. To increase the volume of on-line service, we will notify all currently enrolled students after the enrollment count that this on-line service is available to them 24 hours a day.

Measure 3.3 (Indirect - Survey)

Transcript Production ensures that all current and former students' official transcripts of their academic work are generated in a timely manner upon request. The validation of each student's record is completed first before generating the transcript whether electronically or a paper copy. Unofficial transcripts are readily available on-line and contain all the students' academic information. The satisfaction rating of the timeliness of generating students' official transcripts through on-line self-service will increase from 75% in fall 2017 to 85% by the end of spring 2018.

Finding: Target Not Met.

Analysis: For Academic Year 2016/17, the satisfaction rating was not met. A small number of the 129 students out of 9,269 students enrolled responded to the survey. For the Academic Year 2017/18, a 0.77% satisfaction rating was achieved for all students identified as having requested official transcripts through the on-line service for fall 2017 and 1.6% for spring 2018. In Academic Year 2016/17, the satisfaction rating of 1.39% was not met for the responses received from all 9,269 enrolled students. This was a very low satisfaction rating for the number of students surveyed electronically. A total of 129 students responded with a satisfaction rating of 52.44% out of the 246 who responded to the survey. This was good but did not provide an accurate analysis of the students who used our transcript service. At the end of the 2016/17 Academic Year, our plan of action was to change the population to survey to include only those who requested a transcript. By doing so, we anticipate a more reliable number of responses to determine the satisfaction level.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to change the population of those surveyed to include only those who requested a transcript resulted in a 0.77% satisfaction rating of

very satisfied/satisfied for fall 2017 and 1.6% for spring 2018. This was a very low satisfaction rating for the number of students surveyed electronically. A total of 9 students responding to the survey for fall 2017 resulted in a 100% satisfaction rate. A total of 20 students responding to the survey for spring 2018 resulted in an 83.33% satisfaction rating out of the 24 students who responded. A total of 4 students responding to the survey resulted in a 16.67% unsatisfactory rating of the 24 students who responded. By following our decision to only survey students who request a transcript, we can get a more accurate view of the transcript service provided to students. For fall 2017 and spring 2018, we also analyzed the volume of transcripts processed through our on-line system (3,100 for fall and 3,600 for spring). Based upon the percentage of volumes of transcripts processed (97.25% fall and 97.55% spring), the percentages of volume are an indication of the students' satisfaction level with the service we provide.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: Based upon these findings, we have been doing a good job with meeting the transcript needs of our students. We will change our plan to focus on the volume of transcripts produced through our on-line service. By doing so, we will be able to ascertain the students' satisfaction rating based upon the volume of transcripts successfully produced.

Measure 3.4 (Indirect)

Records ensures that all permanent student records documents of current and former students are scanned into Paperflow that is our digital imaging system. Each document type is batch scanned, matched and merged with the identifying number and name on the Banner system, and indexed to the corresponding data file. These data files can be accessed for retrieval from Papervision. The volume of documents scanned into Paperflow will increase from 14,000 images in fall 2017 to 25,000 images by the end of spring 2018.

Finding: Target Not Met.

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the volume of scanned documents was not met. With the high turnover of employees in that position, the volume of scanning was slightly reduced. For the Academic Year 2017/18, the volume for fall 2017 exceeded our target even though we fell short during spring 2018. In the 2016/17 Academic Year, the volume of student record documents scanned steadily increased due to the filling of the position and others assisting. There was a computer hardware problem that caused a loss of 10 days for scanning images resulting in only 12,054 scanned images for 2016/17. At the end of the 2016/17 Academic Year, our plan of action to increase the volume of scanned documents was to train and have more employees scanning on a second scan station.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to train and have more employees scanning on a second scan station resulted in a higher volume of documents scanned. The plan

initially began with multiple employees scanning for one week, and then was changed to two employees primarily scanning half-days unless one of them was out from work for the day. The volume of documents scanned during fall 2017 was 20,909 which exceeded our target of 14,000. At the end of fall 2017, the scanning of documents slowed down tremendously due to one of the scanning positions becoming vacant again. Documents scanned during spring 2018 was only 1,047 resulting in 4.19% of our target. The analysis reflects that we still need improvement in the volume of documents scanned.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: The 20,909 documents scanned is evidence that we are capable to reaching our target which aids in the retrieval of the students' documents. The hiring of another employee who strictly works with records and primarily scans documents should increase the volume of documents scanned to 50,000 by the end of Academic Year 2018/19.

Measure 3.5 (Indirect - Survey)

Records ensures that it disseminates the current NSU, Board of Supervisors, Board of Regents, and FERPA regulations and policies when communicating with and advising current and former students, faculty, and staff. Continuing to provide the most current policies and regulations will help reduce any violations that could negatively affect the unit and University. At the beginning of each fall semester, faculty and staff will be encouraged to review and complete the FERPA tutorial and students to review the Student-Right-To-Know information on the Registrar's Office web page.   The faculty, staff, and students' understanding of the academic policies, procedures, and regulations will increase from 70% in fall 2017 to 85% at the end of spring 2018.

Finding: Target Not Met.

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the target was not met. There were 118 faculty/staff out of the 1,020 surveyed who responded with an 11.37% Average Understanding. A small number of 118 faculty/staff responded with an Average Understanding out of the 225 who actually responded to the electronic survey resulting in a 51.58% understanding of the FERPA regulations. For the Academic Year 2017/18, none of the faculty/staff were asked to complete the tutorial.   For the 2016/17 Academic Year, 73 faculty/staff responded out of the 225 who responded with Superior Understanding resulting in 32.44%. Of the 73 faculty/staff responses out of the 1,020 surveyed, resulted in 7.16% with Superior Understanding. Even though we did not meet our target, the ratings of understanding indicate that the faculty/staff are benefiting from the FERPA information they receive.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year the FERPA Tutorial was not set up to allow completion and scoring to analyze the understanding of faculty/staff. Due to the delay in hiring our new technical person, our plan to enhance and update the FERPA Tutorial was not completed by the beginning of the spring 2018 semester. The analysis

reflects that this is something that we need to make readily accessible to faculty/staff and include reporting of all who have completed the tutorial.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: Based upon the findings, it continues to be beneficial to have all faculty and staff complete the FERPA Tutorial during the beginning of each fall and spring semesters. We need to develop our Tutorial to try to increase the Average Understanding and Superior Understanding of faculty and staff to reach our target goal of 80% completion by the end of spring 2019.

Graduation and Degree Audit

Service Outcomes

SO 4. Graduation and Degree Audit ensures the accuracy of the degree audit system, graduation and certification of graduate, baccalaureate, and associate degrees, and diplomas for the commencement program.

Source Map:
University of Louisiana System Board of Supervisors
Louisiana Board of Regents'

Measure 4.1 (Direct - Knowledge)

Graduation and Degree Audit updates and maintains the tables in the Banner system that upload data into Degree Works. This data is directly linked to program requirements, compliance, and possible substitutions. Since Degree Works is not a Banner product, the assistance of programmers in the IT Department are needed to complete technical updates to the Degree Works software and batching of data. The creation of an in-house technical position in the Registrar's Office will reduce the wait time for technical updates and issues with batching data. Review of the Degree Works training manual by advisors and department heads during the beginning of the fall and spring semesters will enhance their knowledge of how to accurately use this system and submit substitutions when advising students in their academic programs.

Finding: Target Not Met.

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the percentage of Degree Works advisors/deans/department heads knowledge was not met. There was a low number of responses from those surveyed. For the Academic Year 2017/18, there was not a Degree Works training for advisors/deans/department heads. In the 2016/17 Academic Year, there was some training. A total of 488 advisors/department heads/deans were electronically surveyed. Prior to Degree Works training, there were 20 out of the 69 who responded that indicated No Knowledge resulting in a 28.99% rating. A total of 25 responded with Some Knowledge/Very Knowledgeable out of the 69 who responded resulting in a 36.23% rating. A total of 24 indicated that they did not participate resulting

in 34.78%. After the training, only 1 indicated No Knowledge resulting in a 1.45% rating. A total of 35 responded with Some Knowledge/Very Knowledgeable out of the 69 who responded resulting in a 50.72% rating. A total of 33 out of the 69 who responded that they did not participate in the training resulting in 47.83%.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year our plan of action was to develop a tutorial for the advisors/department heads/deans to complete at their convenience at the beginning of each fall and spring semester was not completed due to administrative changes and a delay in the hiring of our technical position. A manual was created that provides the information that would have been in the tutorial. The analysis reflects that the training does meet the needs of the advisors/department heads/deans.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: Based upon the findings and analysis, we plan to have the Degree Works Manual accessible to them on the web. This should be of great assistance to any new advisors/department heads/deans. By having the manual accessible on the web, the percentage of advisors/department heads/dean with No Knowledge should decrease to 25%.

Measure 4.2 (Indirect)

Graduation and Degree Audit ensures that all candidate certifications are received from the deans' offices by the established deadline for each semester. The timely submission of the certifications affects the timely awarding of degrees, the commencement program, and the accuracy of the graduation count. The timeliness of the receipt of the certification of candidates will increase from 80% in fall 2017 to 90% by spring 2018.

Finding: Target Met.

Analysis: For the Academic Year 2016/17, the target was not met. For the fall 2016 semester, there was 50% of timely submissions of candidate certifications. For spring 2017, there were 80% timely submissions. For Academic Year 2017/2018, there was 100% of timely submissions of candidate certifications. In the 2016/17 Academic Year, for fall 2016 candidate certifications were due by December 14, 2016. Of the 10 certifications due for each college and degree type, only 5 were submitted on time and 5 after the deadline resulting in a 50% timely submission. For the spring 2017 semester, the submission totals improved. Candidate certifications for spring 2017 were due by May 10, 2017. A total of 8 certifications for each college and degree type were submitted on time and 2 after the deadline resulting in 80% timely submissions. By the end of spring 2017, our plan of action was to continue to stress the importance of and send reminders to the certifying officials of the candidate certification deadline date.

In comparison, this year's 2017/18 Academic Year having implemented the plan of action from Academic Year 2016/17 to continually stress the importance of and send reminders to the certifying officials of the candidate certification deadline date resulted in 100% of timely submissions. The Academic Calendar and Graduation/End-of-

AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

Semester Calendar both contain the deadline dates for the submissions so that candidates can be accurately identified, and the commencement program completed as accurately as possible even though the program on the day of commencement is unofficial. For fall 2017, candidate certifications were due by December 13, 2017. All five colleges submitted their certifications by the deadline date resulting in 100% timely submissions. For spring 2018, the candidate certifications were due by May 10, 2018. All five colleges submitted their certifications by the deadline date resulting in 100% timely submissions. The analysis reflects that we are successfully receiving the certifications in a timely manner to award degrees in time for commencement.

Action – Decision or Recommendation: The 100% timely submissions of candidate certifications by the deans for Academic Year 2017/18 is evidence that we are providing a beneficial service to our candidates. We will continue to stress the importance of and send reminders to the certifying deans of the candidate certifications deadline date to ensure that the candidates' degrees are awarded in time for commencement.

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Improvements Based on Analysis of Results:

- Because of the decision to change the surveying of VA recipients from the entire student population 9,269 in 2016/17 to only those receiving VA benefits in 2017/18, we were able to determine a more accurate satisfaction rating of 63% for the service provided in 2017/18.

- From our comparison of fall 2017 and spring 2018 VA surveys, we saw evidence that the spring rating was lower than expected which could be attributed to most of them possibly having completed the survey during the fall semester.

- We were late in the hiring of a Computer Support Specialist which caused a delay in some tutorials and training manuals being completed as planned.

- The training booklet for registering courses through eNSU was not developed. After research and discussions with ECE staff, it was discovered that an instruction manual already existed on the Electronic and Continuing Education web site and is not needed. We also determined that there aren't sufficient resources to assess the registration of the courses through eNSU.

- The decision for 2017/18 to survey only the actual graduates instead of all of the enrolled students was a great idea. We were able to determine the candidates' satisfaction rating for the entire commencement ceremony. We received a satisfaction rating that exceeded our target of 90% by receiving a 98.38% satisfaction rating for fall 2017 and a 97% rating for spring 2018.

AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

- Our decision to survey students, faculty, and staff when services are rendered in our office was also a great idea instead of surveying all students and faculty/staff members. All students, faculty, and staff do not contact or visit our office. By surveying those who did, we were able to get more accurate data and determined that they are satisfied with the service we are providing.

- Transcript evaluation is a very essential function in our office and impacts the students' admission eligibility, pre-requisites for registration, financial aid eligibility, academic standing, and degree completion. The 84.24% satisfaction rating of students with transfer credits for 2017/18 is an indication that we are providing essential services to them and is greatly needed.

- Our satisfaction rating of 94.11% for fall 2017 and 100% for spring 2018 is a very good indication of the students' satisfaction with the maintenance and updating of their academic records. The Banner system does not allow an audit trail of some of the specific forms that are updated when working with the students' records. Because of this, some students are not identified for surveying. We did survey those students who could be identified even though our responses were low.

- By encouraging and making students/former students aware of the on-line enrollment and degree verifications self-service, our volume of on-line self-service increased to 4,160 which was above our target (104%). By providing accurate enrollment and degree data in a timely manner every 30 days, students and employers/prospective employers can retrieve this valuable information.

- We did not receive a high response from survey to students who had used our on-line transcript service. The rating was good for those who did respond. Based upon the analysis of the data, we were able to see the percentage of the volumes of transcripts generated. Using those volumes (97.25% fall & 97.55% spring), the indicating is that the students are satisfied with this essential service we provide.

- Our digitizing student records is a crucial part of the service we provide to our students. We had a high turn over of employees responsible for the scanning of the students' records which resulted in our low number of images scanned. We did have a high volume scanned during fall (20,909), but we did not meet our target to increase to 25,000 by the end of spring.

- It is crucial that all faculty and staff are aware of the FERPA regulations. Violations of these regulations can result in federal funding being cut from our institution. Due to a delay in hiring our technical person to update and set up the FERPA Tutorial, we did not meet our target. FERPA book marks were created by the Registrar and distributed to academic departments. Our analysis of this important service is something that we need stress and make readily available the most current version of FERPA information on our Registrar's web site.

- Degree Works is a very beneficial tool for our students, their advisors, and their deans. A Degree works Manual was created but not the tutorial as planned due to administrative changes and a delay in the hiring of our technical person. The knowledge of advisors/department heads/dean is important in assisting their students with accurate degree completions.

- For this academic year, the timely submission of the certification of candidates was at 100%. This is the best it has ever been. We include the deadline dates on the University Calendar and End-of-Semester Calendar. Our persistence was well worth the effort.

Plan of Action Moving Forward:

Based upon this Academic Year 2017/18's results, we will change the spring 2019 VA survey to include an initial question of inquiry of whether or not the student has already completed a survey during fall 2018. The Director of Academic Services, who supervises the VA Office, will attend VA training this summer 2018 to gain knowledge to help assist the VA recipients who come into our office for service. The final plan for our VA area is to assess the academic year instead of comparing fall semester to spring semester to determine the satisfactory rating.

We decided to eliminate the plan for a training booklet for registering courses through eNSU since one already exists to assist faculty. Since this measure is not one that we can assess, it is no longer needed.

Since we exceeded our target rating for 2017/18, we plan to continue to provide exemplary service to our graduates to increase their satisfaction rating to 100% by the end of spring 2019.

For 2018/19, we changed our plan to focus on the service we provide to the students instead of advisors/faculty/staff since everything processed within our office is centered around the students. The transcript evaluation mainly affects the students. The continued timely entry and accuracy of their credits should result in an increase in their satisfaction rating regarding this essential service.

Our plan for academic records for 2018/19 will be to focus on the students who specifically have major changes and grade changes. Students with these two type updates can be identified in the Banner system. Our expectation is a 65% satisfaction rating.

The enrollment and degree verifications are an essential service provided for our students and employers/prospective employers. We plan to notify all of the currently enrolled students after the enrollment reporting that this on-line service is available to them at all times.

AY 2017 – 2018 Assessment

After analysis of the surveys and volumes report of transcript production, we changed our plan to focus primarily on the volume of transcripts produced through the on-line service. By doing so, we should be able to determine their satisfaction level from the volume of transcripts successfully produced.

Because of the volume of documents, we are able to scan as seen in our fall numbers, we are capable of meeting our target. Our plan is to hire another employee who will primarily work with records and scan documents. This should increase our volume of scanned images and help us meet our target.

FERPA is a crucial set of regulations that must be governed. Our goal is to continue to provide this beneficial information and by updating the FERPA Tutorial for faculty and staff to access. The plan is to increase the understanding of the FERPA regulations to avoid violations that could be detrimental to the University.

Based upon our findings and analysis, we plan to have the Degree Works Manual accessible on the web for the advisors/department heads/deans. This should assist in increasing their knowledge of Degree Works.

The 100% timely submission of candidate certifications for this current academic year was outstanding. We plan to continue to stress the importance of and send reminders to the certifying deans of the candidate certifications deadline date to ensure the continued 100% timely submissions.