1: Performance Outcome

Providing Department: Performance Outcome Example

PERFORMANCE OUTCOME: An area of focus for improvement efforts

Decrease the average time to degree completion.

MEASURE 1: Specific method used to collect evidence, direct and/or indirect, of the outcome. Attach a copy of instrument(s) used, if applicable.

Average time to degree completion (in number of years).
For graduates during a given academic year (December, May, and July), the percentage of students graduating in 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 years.

Note: For purposes of analyses and reporting, partial years are rounded down (i.e., 4.5 years is rounded down to 4 years).

Measure 1 Data Source: Institutional Data
Is Measure 1 direct or indirect?: Direct

MEASURE 2: Specific method used to collect evidence, direct and/or indirect, of the outcome. Attach a copy of instrument(s) used, if applicable.

List of obstacles to timely degree completion. This qualitative data will be collected through focus groups or interviews with students.

Focus group/interviews questions:

- Please tell me a little about your expectations in attending KSU.
- What were some of your goals academically and professionally?
- What is your timeframe for achieving these goals and for graduation?
- What is your understanding of the role of the advisor?
- What are the obstacles to graduating in 4 years?
- What are some ways you think we can improve the program?

Measure 2 Data Source: Focus Group
Is Measure 2 direct or indirect?: Indirect

Is this outcome related to a federal grant awarded to the department or unit?: No
Grant Source and Title (If Applicable):

Assessment Plan Status: Approved by Supervisor
RESULTS: Aggregated data, summary of the analyses, and interpretations for each measure.

Of the 62 graduates in AY 2016-2017 (December, May, and July), the most frequent time to degree completion was 4 years (37%), with the average being 5.25 years.

![Pie chart showing time to degree completion for Program Graduates in AY 2016-2017]

In order to further investigate the issues with regard to timely degree completion, we held 3 focus groups with students (n=6, n=5, n=8) in Spring 2017.

Summary of themes from focus groups and interviews:

- Students came in thinking they will graduate in 4 years, but find it takes longer because most have to balance with part-time or full-time work.
- There are still a few bottleneck courses with not enough sections or the times offered are not convenient to many working students.
- More online courses are needed.
- Some students felt more advisors or office hours were needed.

IMPROVEMENTS: Improvement(s) verified with data and trends, including information from previous cycles, related to the outcome (for outcomes measured more than once).

Previous Assessment Cycle: For graduates in AY 2015-2016, the most frequent time to degree completion was 5 years (31%), with the average being 5.60 years.
Improvements Implemented: Based on those results, we identified the bottleneck courses and added sections of most of those courses for AY 2016-2017.

Current Assessment Cycle: Of the 51 graduates in AY 2016-2017, the average time to degree completion decreased by .35 year to an average of 5.25 years. Also, higher numbers of students graduated in 4 years, which is a good improvement.

It appears adding sections of some of the bottleneck courses did have a positive effect. However, of the graduates in AY 2016-2017, more than half graduated in 5 or more years and the average time to degree completion is still over 5 years.
BRAINSTORMING: Possible strategies for improvement. This is an area for the collection of ideas (the selected strategy for improvement follows below).

During our August 2017 faculty meeting, we discussed this performance outcome and ways to further decrease the time to degree completion. The following ideas were discussed:

- Review current enrollment figures for each course and section to determine what bottleneck courses still exist.
- Add sections for those bottleneck courses if possible.
- Increase the availability of advisors (office hours) and communicate office hours to a greater decrease (using social media as well).
- Increase the number of advisors.
- Educate advisors about the bottleneck courses and how to most effectively advise students toward the goal of timely graduation.
- Offer more online sections of bottleneck courses.

STRATEGY FOR IMPROVEMENT: The specific strategy for improvement selected for implementation during the next assessment cycle.

At this time, we are not able to offer more sections of bottleneck courses due to resource constraints. However, we will work towards offering more online sections in coming years.

For AY 2017-2018, we will focus on advising and its effectiveness.

- We will ensure advisors are aware of bottleneck courses and how to best advise students with these in mind.
- Each advisor will add 1-2 office hours to their weekly schedule.
- We will encourage students to consult with their advisor as they determine schedules for the next semester. Faculty will discuss this with students during class near the end of each semester, before enrollment begins for the following semester.
- We will send out email reminders with the office hours and contact information for each advisor. This information will also be posted on social media sites and the website for the program.

Improvement Report Progress: Ready for OIE Review

Related Items

University Mission Statement

KSU is a public institution committed to serving our state, the nation, and the world community. We strive to contribute to the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge to these communities through our extensive research, teaching, and service initiatives.

1: Enhance learning and services that improve retention, progression, and graduation (RPG) rates