

St. Petersburg College

Outcomes Assessment Review Report

Report Completion Date: January 2010

Introduction

The Institutional effectiveness and planning process is a continuous endeavor; operationally the process begins with a series of meetings by four oversight groups (Student Services, Educational Support Services, Administrative Services and Educational)

The four oversight groups are charged with the following key tasks:

- (i) Evaluate whether the institution successfully achieved its desired outcomes from the previous institutional effectiveness and planning cycle,
- (ii) Identify key areas requiring improvement that were identified in the assessment analysis, and
- (iii) Develop strategies and recommendations to formulate quality improvement initiatives for the next institutional effectiveness and planning cycle

Check the Appropriate Oversight Group:

	Student Services Oversight Group
	Educational Support Services Oversight Group
x	Administrative Services Oversight Group
	Educational Oversight Group

The Administrative Services Oversight Group:

This is an ad hoc working group. Its focus is on reviewing student survey data information and information concerning the effectiveness of administrative services and the effectiveness of using technology at the College. The group leader/chairperson is the Vice President of Administrative and Business Services.

Status of each item identified in this report from last year:

The Administrative Oversight Group identified six areas under “Area that need improvement”, I through VI, in the Administrative Services Oversight Group Report for the 2009-2010 operating year. Each will be addressed below.

Area I –Parking

Summary- Overall there has been an increase in student satisfaction with Parking. The information is captured through the analysis of the 2009-2010 Enrolled Student Survey and utilizes the 2007-2008 Enrolled Student Survey as baseline data.

	Sat 07/08	Imp 07/08	Gap 07/08	Sat 08/09	Imp 08/09	Gap 08/09	Sat 09/10	Imp 09/10	Gap 09/10
Parking	4.60	6.41	-1.82	4.75	6.46	-1.71	5.09	6.50	-1.41
Basis of Objectives:	2007-2008 Basis			Measure 2007-2008 Results Against			Measure 2007-2008 Results Against		

Table 2–Status of Objectives from 2008-2009

	2007-2008 Performance Gap	2009-2010 Performance Gap	Results	Change %
SP Gibbs	-2.38	-1.90	More Satisfied	20%
Clearwater	-1.97	-1.04	More Satisfied	47%
Tarpon	-1.66	-1.91	Less satisfied	-15%
Seminole	-0.99	-.68	More Satisfied	31%
Health	-1.92	-1.15	More Satisfied	40%
Allstate	-1.05	NA	NA	NA
eCampus	-1.46	-1.11	More Satisfied	24%
EpiCenter	-0.54	-2.0	Less Satisfied	-270%
Downtown	-1.97	-2.27	Less Satisfied	-15%
Midtown	-1.13	NA	Few Responses	Few Responses

Table 3 – Status of Objectives from Year: 2009-2010

Objective	Status	Comments
Increase student satisfaction with food services by 5%, as measured for each campus on the 2009-2010 Enrolled Student Survey satisfaction rating and performance gap using 2007-2008 as a baseline.	Ongoing	1. St. Pete/Gibbs Campus: Fund and construct additional parking spaces once the portables are relocated and space is available for additional parking.
	Complete & Ongoing	2. Health Education Center: Additional parking was constructed as part of the Orthotics and Prosthetics project. Additional parking spaces will be available after demolishing the Veterinary Technology Building by the end of 2010-2011
	Complete	3. Clearwater: Additional parking was added with the demolishment of the old Social Sciences Building.
	Ongoing	4. Enrolled Survey: Change the Enrolled Student Survey to incorporate a question similar to “Were you able to find a parking space?” Institutional Effectiveness is working to develop a specific question/line of questions that will obtain the information we desire to gain.

Area II –Food Services

Summary- Overall total food service performance has increased resulting in more satisfaction of students. There was decreased satisfaction at the Epi-Center, e-campus and Tarpon Springs campuses. However, at SP Gibbs, Clearwater and Seminole, the food services areas increased their performance by an average of 42%. This is a measure of student importance versus student satisfaction with the food vendors. The information is captured through the analysis of the 2009-2010 Enrolled Student Survey and utilizes the 2007-2008 Enrolled Student Survey as baseline data.

Table 4 Food Service

	Baseline 2007-2008 Performance Gap	2009-2010 Performance Gap	Results	Change %
SP Gibbs	-0.80	-.55	More Satisfied	31%
Clearwater	-1.23	.73	More Satisfied	41%
Tarpon	-0.43	-.46	Less Satisfied	-7%
Seminole	-0.34	-.15	More Satisfied	56%
Health	-1.03	-1.04	No Significant Change	-1%
Allstate*	-.54	NA	NA	NA
e-Campus**	.11	-.23	Less Satisfied	-209%
EpiCenter	-0.58	-1.0	Less Satisfied	-72%
Downtown*	-0.79	-.55	More Satisfied	70%
Midtown*	.15	NA	NA Few Responses	NA

*These campuses currently do not have contracted manual food service vendors at their sites.

**It is assumed that e-Campus students are coming on Campus for at least one class, however the survey did not capture any further details as to which campus their options were based.

Table 5 – Status of Objectives from Year: 2009-2010

Objective	Status	Comments
Increase student satisfaction with food services by 5%, as measured for each campus on the 2009-2010 Enrolled Student Survey satisfaction rating and performance gap using 2007-2008 as a baseline.	Ongoing	1. SPC has a new Auxiliary Coordinator that is focusing on a number of contracts coming up for renewal this year. For renewals of expiring food services contracts (e.g., SP/Gibbs Orange Blossom), SPC is considering a broader array of prospective food service vendors, such as Subway (now providing pizza, fruit, breakfast) and other similar vendors.
	Ongoing	2. A cross-campus communication and advisory group has been developed and meets to define best practices in food service. This group also advises on and monitors improvements being made based on food survey results.

Area III – Bookstores

Summary- Total bookstore student satisfaction improvement was 4%. Therefore, St Petersburg College came close but did not meet the overall 5% bookstore student satisfaction goal by 1%. However, five of the eight reporting areas of student data all met, or exceeded, the student satisfaction goal. The student satisfaction measure is defined by student importance rating of the Bookstores versus student satisfaction with the bookstores. The information is captured through the analysis of the 2009-2010 Enrolled Student Survey and utilizes the 2007-2008 Enrolled Student Survey as baseline data.

Table 6 Bookstore

	2007-2008 Baseline Performance Gap	2009-2010 Performance Gap	Results	% Change Results
Collegewide	-1.07	-1.03	More Satisfied	4%
SP Gibbs	-1.06	-.93	More Satisfied	12%
Clearwater	-1.31	-1.22	More Satisfied	7%
Tarpon	-0.84	-.95	Less Satisfied	-13%
Seminole	-0.74	-.97	Less Satisfied	-31%
Health	-1.19	-.92	More Satisfied	23%
Allstate	-1.26	NA	NA	NA
eCampus	-1.14	-1.08	More Satisfied	5%
EpiCenter	-1.66	-1.40	More Satisfied	16%
Downtown	-1.24	-1.32	Less Satisfied	-6%
Midtown	-0.24	NA	NA	NA

Table 7– Status of Objectives from 2009-2010

Objective	Status	Comments
Increase student satisfaction with bookstore services collegewide and on campuses by 5% for campuses below satisfaction and performance gap criteria, as measured by the 2009-2010 Enrolled Student Survey, utilizing 2007-2008 as a baseline. - Contain and/or reduce textbook prices.	Complete	1. The College actively supported and lobbied for sales tax exemption legislation. A Bill was developed; however, it did not pass. The College will continue to actively support such legislation.
	On-Going	2. Based on the Bookstore Viability Report, provided recommendations to the College’s Leadership Team and continues to raise awareness and focus on textbook issues
	Complete	3. Worked with the Bookstore vendor in the last contract negotiated that allowed SPC to implement an online venue through which students can trade/sell books
	On-Going	4. Monitor impact of new legislation requiring books to be posted 30 days before classes begin
	Complete	5. Renegotiated Bookstore contract in February that expired in June.

Area IV – Planning & Budgeting Processes

Summary- The final SPOL tracking year (2008-2009) will be completed with final remarks by the end of March 2010. A new planning tool/process has been built and Phase 1 has been implemented called PlanIt SPC. PlanIt SPC links planning units directly to SPC Goals and Institutional Initiatives, as well as employee’s performance objectives. Additionally, PlanIt has been designed to have an easy and intuitive interface.

Table 8 – Status of Objectives from Year: 2009-2010

Objective	Status	Comments
Improve user satisfaction with the college’s strategic planning and budgeting system as measured by (i) the College’s Effectiveness of the Planning, Budgeting, and Technology Resources Satisfaction Survey and (ii) analysis of unit manager comments on the survey.	Complete	1. Continued to simplify the budget submission and approval processes through SPOL and non-SPOL alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Created the PlanIt system- after reviewing SPOL and evaluating a few different models, decided to create our own system that would integrate strategic planning with employee goals and evaluations. • Further automated Excel worksheet system thru which to submit budgets. The FY09-10 budget was built via zero-based budgeting.
	Complete	2. Identified alternatives to SPOL and recommended discontinuing the use of SPOL and created the PlanIt system.

Area V – Breadth, Depth, and Ease of Use of Operational Data

Summary- There has been significant focus over the past year on analysis, research, process development and technological improvement and great strides have been made. Systems were reviewed and applications are being created to give end users the ability to more readily capture, view and analyze data in order to better solve-day-to-day issues. These systems are giving users the tools to access, query and report on College information at any time in an with an intuitive and easy-to-use interface.

Table 9 – Status of Objectives from 2008-2009

Objective	Status	Comments
Improve user satisfaction with the breadth, depth, and ease of use in accessing and manipulating the college’s operational data to prepare plans and business decisions.	Complete	1. Completed evaluation of several Business Intelligence (BI) system proposals; however, determined them to be too expensive. Researched other alternatives, including a system at Tallahassee Community College (TCC).
	Complete	2. The College Administrative and Business Services Management team was provided an online demo by TCC to view their system. AIS personnel visited TCC to discuss detailed infrastructure behind their Business Intelligence application. A proposal/recommendation, and timeline was then presented to the College’s senior leadership
	On-Going	3. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are being developed for major SPC business and operational functions and IE/Assessment Outcomes.

Table 10 – Status of Objectives from: 2009-2010

Objective	Status	Comments
Improve breadth, depth, and ease of use of operational data as shown by increasing user satisfaction and manipulating the college’s operational data to prepare plans and make business decisions	On-Going	1. Continued evaluation of TCC Business Intelligence Application for implementation at SPC. AIS has begun creating Business Intelligence Application for implementation.
	On-Going	2. Currently piloting E-Requisitioning, which will automate the Purchase Order approval process
	On-Going	3. Implemented roll-out phase of Webtime, which will automate the time sheet/payroll process
	Complete	4. Assigned Functional Technical Analysts to three major areas (HR/Payroll, Business Services, and Student Services) to assist in user functionality and automation
	On-Going	5. Developed/implemented a reporting database for use by Institutional Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The users of this database are currently being trained

Area VI – Non-Credit Registration Process Improvement

Summary-The majority of the implementation for Lumens is complete. However, interfacing to other systems is currently under development or in the roll-out phase. Lumens is also beginning to be utilized by other non-credit departments such as College for Kids.

Table 11 – Status of Objectives from 2008-2009

Objective	Status	Comments
Strengthen non-credit registration via PeopleSoft SA version 9.0 or via an alternative system such as Lumens.	Complete	1. The Lumens system went live in January.
	On-going	2. Interfaces are complete for Student, HR/Payroll, and CashNet systems; however, not with SPD and PDB at this time.
	On-going	3. Currently looking to expand Lumens to other appropriate areas.

Table 12– Status of Objectives from: 2009-2010

Objective	Status	Comments
Continue to strengthen non-credit registration via expanded utilization of Lumens.	Complete	4. Completed initial implementation of Lumens for Corporate Training.
	Complete	5. Identified and began Phase 1 enhancement after initial implementation.
	On-going	6. Evaluating application in other non-credit arenas and implementing, as appropriate. Started initial implementation into College for Kids.

II. Initiatives:

Once the 2010-2011 Initiatives are determined, they will be transferred to PlanIt via each President's Direct Report's Institutional Initiatives. (The AOG will need to decide area for focus beyond the objectives already submitted)

The following are the current 2009-2010 Initiatives:

1. *Implement a comprehensive IT helpdesk support system to better analyze and coordinate workflow for more efficient and effective customer support.*
2. *Complete the computer lease refresh program for all sites by end of year. Investigate alternatives for fax, printers and copiers that will reduce recurring costs in these areas.*
3. *Complete the selection and begin phase I of business intelligence system technology with the goal of improving access to student success data such as student retention, student graduation rates, as well as the analytical tools to overlay related operational data.*
4. *Initiate one-time funded projects for enterprise (PeopleSoft) systems development and productivity improvement (particularly as it relates to student services and MAP centers).*
5. *Finalize college-wide implementation of the "eRequisition" on-line purchasing system which will also integrate travel and check requests.*
6. *Maintain initiatives for budget stabilization and fiscal health of the college.*
7. *Utilize the Technology Oversight Group (TOG), and the PeopleSoft Steering Cooperative (PSC) to improve management decision making, enhance customer relationships, and maximize the utilization of SPC's enterprise systems and technology investments.*
8. *Complete the selection and begin phase I of business intelligence system technology with the goal of improving access to student success data such as student retention, student graduation rates, as well as the analytical tools to overlay related operational data.*
9. *Investigate alternatives for fax, printers and copiers that will reduce recurring costs in these areas.*
10. *Analyze, streamline Business Services and IT rules, procedures and business processes, with particular emphasis on automation capabilities, functional user training, customer support, and audit compliance.*
11. *Continue to analyze, evaluate and enhance the technology infrastructure and maintenance requirements of IT Systems.*
12. *Complete the computer lease refresh program for all sites by year end.*

Completion and Review Process Information

This Outcomes Assessment Review report was completed by Doug Duncan in January 2010.