

Part I – Update on Goals

Goal 1

Ensure the timely and accurate updating of the academic sections of the college catalog, including those sections that rely on faculty input.

Goal 1 assessment:

1. Information for all academic sections of the catalog is submitted to Janet Mapstone, graphic designer, **on or before** her stated deadlines throughout the catalog update cycle. (This may mean frequent reminders to faculty about reviewing their sections and/or follow up phone calls or visits.)
2. The printed catalog will contain no more than three errors in content that can be directly attributed to the Registrar

Results:

1. For the first time since I have been doing the catalog update, I did have to ask Janet's indulgence for a slight extension of one of the preliminary deadlines; she assured me this didn't negatively affect her work with the catalog at that stage, as she was also busy with other projects. The final deadline for revisions was met.
2. So far, I have found one catalog content error for which I am solely responsible. Several sociology courses were deleted from the curriculum since they are no longer being taught and I "caught" that these would need to be deleted from where they appeared in the Anthropology minor, but I failed to remove the reference to students having to take "three of the following, at least one of which must be in sociology" when, in fact, there are no longer any sociology courses listed.

Goal 2

To provide high quality, efficient and courteous academic-related services to students and faculty.

Goal 2 assessment:

1. Again, I think the nature of what we do will change in the near future, but once we have new procedures and systems in place, *I would like assistance in developing a survey instrument to measure "satisfaction" with the services the offices provides.* I would strive for a 90% or better

satisfaction rate, with “satisfaction” being determined by students and faculty being “satisfied” or “highly satisfied” with our services.

Results:

I have to admit that I have not had any brainstorming regarding developing the satisfaction survey. We’ve been so focused on getting the new systems (Jenzabar EX itself, along with the functions of the Globe, and now an interface with the National Student Clearinghouse) up and running that I haven’t yet spent the time to formulate a survey that gets at satisfaction with the services of our office, both technological and non technological. Also, of course, we haven’t yet rolled out all of the Globe services, so a survey that gets at satisfaction with these aspects of our work might be premature in any case.

Goal 3:

Transfer credit evaluations for prospective transfer students are completed within three business days of receipt from the Admissions Office, except at “peak” times for my office, such as graduation week.

Goal 3 assessment:

1. Admissions files are date stamped upon receipt and the date compared with the date of completion as noted on the transfer evaluation.

Results: I have met this goal, as the director of transfer admission would attest, even at peak times. The only time this goal was not met was when I was on vacation, which was inevitable and, fortunately, was well timed in that the volume of transfer evaluations was not especially high at that time (first part of July).

Goal 4:

Requests for official transcripts are processed within three business days of receipt, except at “peak” times, such as during each semester’s grade entry (again, this may change with software conversion once faculty enter their own grades).

Goal 4 assessment:

1. Transcript requests are date stamped upon receipt and dates can be compared with the processing date recorded when the transcript is sent.
2. The office should receive not more than one complaint per month regarding lack of timeliness in receipt of transcripts that can be attributed to the Registrar’s Office.

Results:

This goal has been met. Most of the complaints about timeliness with regard to transcript requests are the result of the requestor's not making a timely request and then expecting same-day service. When possible, we try to accommodate these urgent requests, but this isn't always feasible at times such as the first week of classes each semester or during graduation week.

Goal 5:

1. For prospective F-1 students, I-20s are issued within three business days of receipt of completed admissions file and certifications of finances showing sufficient funds. Updates to the SEVIS system are made in timely fashion, according to ICE rules, so as to avoid student or institutional citations for non-compliance.
2. For students receiving VA benefits, timely enrollment verifications (timely = by the beginning of the upcoming semester) and updates (within 30 days of an enrollment change) are submitted via the VA-ONCE system.

Goal 5 assessment:

1. Prospective students will not experience F-1 visa delays due to untimely completion of I-20 on the part of the Registrar, nor will students or Wells College be faulted for non compliance with regard to reporting changes to SEVIS.
2. VA audits will not show citations for non-compliance.

Results:

Goals one and two have both been met. I issued I-20s during the past year in fewer than three days, and generally on the same day I received the completed file, to which the associate director of admissions and the director of off campus study can attest. In fact, two students who themselves were very late in submitting their financial documentation were able to get visas and are here now partly because there was no delay on my part in getting them their I-20s.

Neither Wells College nor any students have been faulted for non compliance in reporting changes to SEVIS.

The three year V.A. review was completed in June and everything was found to be in order.

Goal 6:

All required IPEDS, NYSED and other assorted reports are completed accurately on or before the established deadlines. In some cases, this requires follow-up with others on campus who supply information for these reports.

Goal 6 assessment:

1. The college will not receive notice of or citations for untimely submission of reports.

Results:

This goal was met. All state and federal reports, as well as various others, were completed on time.

Part II – Where We Hope to Go

I would like to continue assessing the goals we've laid out so far, including Goal 2, which to date we have not assessed. This, of course, is the goal for which assessment requires the satisfaction survey. I propose delaying this until we have fully implemented services on the Globe, so that we can formulate the survey in such a way as to gauge satisfaction with the whole range of services the office provides, including ones that are primarily delivered through the Globe. As I've mentioned in my assessment plan, I think I'll need some assistance developing the survey, since that is not my area of expertise.

Part III – How Jenzabar EX Affects How the Work Gets Done

Goal 1:

The conversion to Jenzabar EX has had little impact on goal one so far. However, it is the case that the EX software allows input of a course description when we build a course into the EX catalog. For new courses and those with description changes, we have begun entering this information, but we have not had the time or the staff power to go back and load descriptions for existing and unchanged courses. At some point, we'd like to get this information entered because it would make looking up courses on the Globe much more useful for students. If this gets done, it's possible that it would also make the catalog course update process easier and less paper based; however, I'm not sure what the mechanism for this would be at present. The EX software doesn't seem to be designed for this use, and also, the course descriptions we input for the Globe are in a slightly different format than what's needed for the catalog.

Goal 2:

As I have already noted, EX has already changed some of the ways we provide service to our constituencies and this will continue to evolve. When we get to a (more or less) status quo state, we'll assess satisfaction with these services as well as the non technological ones we provide, via the survey.

Goal 3:

Conversion to EX has not changed the part of the transfer evaluation process that involves notification to students about their transfer credit and how it fulfills general education requirements.

What has changed, however, with the advent of the Advising Module, is the time it takes the assistant registrar and me to process the work of those who choose to attend. I have to assign advising requirements codes (ARCs) to all transfer work in order for the advising module to recognize that transfer courses meet specific Wells requirements, meaning that I have to spend time on the files of those who enroll twice, once when I do the initial evaluation and again after the student has actually enrolled. To assign ARCs to students who don't end up attending would waste time.

In addition, it takes the assistant registrar longer to enter transfer work into the system than it used to because of having to attach the ARCs.

Goal 4:

Use of the EX software has not significantly altered transcript processing time.

Goal 5:

Use of the EX software has not significantly altered the time it takes to issue I-20s or to provide V.A. enrollment certifications.

Goal 6:

The EX conversion has, so far, made the submission of state and federal reports more time-consuming, as the assistant registrar and I go through the process of writing in Infomaker all the reports needed for me to get the data I need for the state and federal reports.

It is true that there are interfaces included with EX for three of the required federal reports, though none for the state or "other" reports. So far, we have not been able to use the interface for the federal reports, either, due to problems with converted data. At some point, I do expect to be able to use the system for the

three federal reports for which an interface is available. This should save considerable time eventually.

Respectfully submitted,

Karla Leybold-Taylor
Registrar