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1) Presenter Information

Dr. Laurie A. Henry

Dr. Henry is Dean of the Seidel School of Education at Salisbury University (SU) in Maryland. Prior to SU, she served as the Associate Dean of Clinical Preparation & Partnerships and Interim Department Chair in Curriculum & Instruction for the College of Education at the University of Kentucky. Dr. Henry served as a member of AACTE’s Clinical Practice Commission and has served in many leadership roles with national organizations. Dr. Henry earned her PhD in Educational Psychology from the University of Connecticut with a focus in Cognition and Instruction.

Dr. Richard Wilkens

Dr. Wilkens is the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs at Salisbury University (SU) in Maryland. He was previously Provost at a small private liberal arts college in New York, where he also served for many years as Chair of Biology. At SU, one of his main projects is to work with Chairs and other campus leaders to incorporate more data informed decision making into normal operations. Currently, Salisbury University is using an analytics dashboard developed by EAB called Academic Performance Solutions; however, the data compiled by this dashboard can typically be drawn from standard student information systems.

2) Title: Constructing an Effective Annual Departmental Report

3) Abstract: Departmental strategic needs are wide-ranging placing increased demands on chairs to broaden their roles. To meet growing strategic demands, chairs must systematize the gathering of pertinent analytics and information. This workshop identifies important items to include in annual departmental reviews and how to leverage data towards positive departmental change.

4) Key words: data analytics, data informed decision making, program planning, annual reporting, program review

5) Presentation Theme: Operating the Department

6) Target Audience: academic chairs and program directors

7) Disciplines: Education; Higher Education Administration

8) Presentation Type: interactive workshop (105 minutes)

9) Presentation Objectives: Participants will further develop their ability to:
   a. Self-evaluate assessment readiness for annual departmental reporting.
   b. Identify key data sets related to annual departmental reporting.
c. Establish realistic timelines to overcome time demands to increase probability of effective departmental planning.

d. Develop a strategy to overcome barriers to the systematic utilization of a departmental annual report and implement change.

e. Analyze examples of analytics from an annual departmental report in order to develop a strategy plan or action for change.

10) Description of the session (300-500 words)

In an environment of declining postsecondary enrollments, it is more important than ever for academic administrators to utilize robust data analytic tools to better inform programmatic decisions within academic departments. The National Student Clearinghouse Research Center (2018) reported a steady decrease in postsecondary enrollments since 2010, reaching nearly 10 percent overall with an average annual decline of about 1.3 percent. Growth in enrollments of new international students has also declined for the first time in ten years (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 2018). Chairs and program directors are challenged now more than ever to better understand the cost efficiency of programs by conducting a Cost Efficiency Analysis (CEA). This is especially true for academic programs that are highly clinical in nature (e.g. health sciences, educator preparation, psychology).

The last two decades has seen renewed attention on the field of knowledge discovery in databases (KDD) amidst an environment of rapid growth in data collection and data accumulation (Fayyad, Piatetsky-Shapiro, & Smyth, 1996). Data mining, data analytics, and data dashboards provide opportunities for data informed decision-making that is much more accessible and readily available than ever before. As more and more institutions of higher education look for data solutions through enterprise systems, the role of department chairs and program directors is shifting toward an increased focus on data use for program planning (Cervino, 2018). Analyses of the relationship between program costs and enrollment trends can help with decision-making regarding the sustainability of programs and to help respond to pressing programmatic needs.

Oftentimes, chairs and directors come to their leadership position with little or no training (Payne, 2016), but the use of analytics requires “staff skilled in understanding and applying analytics for decision-making” (Dziuban, Moskal, Cavanagh, & Watts, 2012, p. 22). Thus, we suggest the best approach for systematic departmental review and annual reporting is to undertake a process in which incremental steps centered on analysis of one data set at a time can build toward a more succinct annual report and comprehensive implementation plan (Buerck & Mudigonda, 2014). Campbell, DeBlois, and Oblinger (2007) recommend using analytics to guide decision-making through a five step process: capture (data), report (trends), predict (with a model), act (intervene), and refine (the model and process), which supports the implementation of analytics within the culture of the department or program.

For this interactive workshop, participants will engage in authentic applications of data-informed decision-making at the department/program level. To frame and contextualize this discussion, the presenters will facilitate the process of development and implementation of departmental annual reporting and pose critical questions related to knowledge discovery in databases. Together, presenters and participants will engage in activities that focus on the annual review process,
including: 1) building annual report components, 2) operationalizing the use of the report, and 3) evaluating specific examples of analytics to include in annual reporting. The session will end with round-table scenario-based conversations focused on critical questions related to cost efficiency, enrollment growth, student outcomes, faculty workload, or other topics identified by the participants.
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Workshop Structure: Presentation + Workshop Groups (105 minutes)

Introductions (5 mins)

National Context for Data Analytics and Knowledge Discovery (10 mins)

Assessment Readiness Self-Evaluation and Table Conversations (10 mins)

Brainstorm List of Key Data Points for Annual Reports (10 mins)
Key Questions: Data retrieval. What existing data is available? How do you get access to the data?

Backwards Mapping to Establish Suitable Timelines for Report Build (10 mins)

Key Questions: What are your institutions expectations? What time periods require a shift in your focus? What’s “doable” in relation to your workload?

Identify Key Challenges and Potential Solutions to Implementation (15 mins)

Key Questions: How do you stay on track when challenges arise? What challenges can you predict at different time points in the semester?

Scenario-based Examples of Analytics (35 mins)

Dossier of information: Data/handouts (data, charts, scenarios); arrange as a process for reviewing: Scenario 1. Stop and discuss. Scenario 2. Stop and discuss. Scenario 3. Stop and discuss. (allow approximately 10 minutes for each scenario)

Key Questions: What are your analyses and what are your next steps as chair? What tangible actions will you focus on?

Communication: How do you share data with different audiences? Deans, faculty, other stakeholders, responders. How do you shift your department from a culture of compliance to a culture of inquiry? (5 mins)

Q&A: (5 minutes)