**Integrated Planning and Advising Services:   
A Benchmarking Study**

**Abstract**

Integrated planning and advisory services (IPAS) is an institutional capacity to create shared ownership for educational progress by providing students, faculty, and staff with holistic information and services that contribute to the completion of a degree or credential. This study, conducted in 2013, examines current and planned IPAS capabilities and technology adoption at a cohort of 36 institutions selected because of their involvement in student success initiatives. The report will be of interest to the many other institutions that are considering addressing the student retention and completion challenge through technological and cultural innovation.

**Data Tables**

The tables in this file are provided as a summary of the data collected from the ECAR IPAS study conducted in 2013. Question text has been abbreviated in this document, but full question text may be found in the survey instrument at <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/PDF/SI/ESI1312.pdf>.

Most survey questions were answered by two officers at the responding institution: the CIO and a “student success officer” (SSO). Questions reported in section B were answered by SSOs only, and those in sections C and D.4 by CIOs only. In some tables, data are disaggregated by role (CIO and SSO) and/or Carnegie Classification (2000). Responses to open-ended questions are not included to preserve respondent anonymity. Note that the number of respondents (n) varies from question to question and that percentages for multiple-choice questions may not sum to 100% due to independent rounding.

Results in these tables may differ from those in the study report for the following reasons:

* Combination of multiple answer categories into aggregate categories, e.g., “strongly agree” and “agree” into “agree.”
* Non-inclusion of some results in the study due to length or because of a low number of responses.
* “Don’t know” or “No opinion” responses are factored out of some study results.
* Some study results refer to a percentage of institutions where either a CIO or SSO (or both) answered in a certain way, while these tables report all respondent answers.
* Results cited in the report text are rounded to the nearest 10%, though report figures and tables report exact results.

For more information, about this study, visit the IPAS research hub at

<http://www.educause.edu/library/resources/integrated-planning-and-advising-services-research>.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent role by institution type** | | | | | |
|  | | Two-year | Four-year | n |
| Respondent Role | |  |  |  |
| CIO | | 70.6% | 29.4% | 34 |
| SSO | | 65.5% | 34.5% | 29 |
| All respondents | | 68.3% | 31.7% | 63 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION A. IPAS and Your Institution [All respondents]** | | | | | | |
| **1. What are the top-three drivers for investing in IPAS services and technologies at your institution?** | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Respondent Role | | | | | |
| CIO | | SSO | | All respondents | |
| Percentage | (n) | Percentage | (n) | Percentage | (n) |
| Strategic priority of student success | 82.4% | (34) | 58.6% | (29) | 71.4% | (63) |
| Strategic priority of evidence-based decision making | 38.2% | (34) | 37.9% | (29) | 38.1% | (63) |
| Trend toward institutional funding formulas that place greater weight on retention, completion, etc. | 32.4% | (34) | 17.2% | (29) | 25.4% | (63) |
| Need to use limited human advising/counseling/support resources more efficiently | 11.8% | (34) | 31.0% | (29) | 20.6% | (63) |
| Need to better coordinate different advisement, counseling, and student-support services | 17.6% | (34) | 24.1% | (29) | 20.6% | (63) |
| Need to better identify at-risk students and appropriate interventions | 50.0% | (34) | 44.8% | (29) | 47.6% | (63) |
| Need to improve student engagement and institutional loyalty | 5.9% | (34) | 13.8% | (29) | 9.5% | (63) |
| Need to improve institutional planning capabilities (course demand, staffing, etc.) | 5.9% | (34) | 6.9% | (29) | 6.3% | (63) |
| Reorienting institution from access/enrollment culture to completion culture | 55.9% | (34) | 48.3% | (29) | 52.4% | (63) |
| Reorienting curricula toward more structured, progress-oriented programs (pathways) | 0.0% | (34) | 17.2% | (29) | 7.9% | (63) |
| Other, please specify | 0.0% | (34) | 0.0% | (29) | 0.0% | (63) |
|  |
|  | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Institution Type | | | | | |
| Two-year | | Four-year | | All respondents | |
| Percentage | (n) | Percentage | (n) | Percentage | (n) |
| Strategic priority of student success | 67.4% | (43) | 80.0% | (20) | 71.4% | (63) |
| Strategic priority of evidence-based decision making | 41.9% | (43) | 30.0% | (20) | 38.1% | (63) |
| Trend toward institutional funding formulas that place greater weight on retention, completion, etc. | 32.6% | (43) | 10.0% | (20) | 25.4% | (63) |
| Need to use limited human advising/counseling/support resources more efficiently | 20.9% | (43) | 20.0% | (20) | 20.6% | (63) |
| Need to better coordinate different advisement, counseling, and student-support services | 14.0% | (43) | 35.0% | (20) | 20.6% | (63) |
| Need to better identify at-risk students and appropriate interventions | 39.5% | (43) | 65.0% | (20) | 47.6% | (63) |
| Need to improve student engagement and institutional loyalty | 9.3% | (43) | 10.0% | (20) | 9.5% | (63) |
| Need to improve institutional planning capabilities (course demand, staffing, etc.) | 7.0% | (43) | 5.0% | (20) | 6.3% | (63) |
| Reorienting institution from access/enrollment culture to completion culture | 60.5% | (43) | 35.0% | (20) | 52.4% | (63) |
| Reorienting curricula toward more structured, progress-oriented programs (pathways) | 7.0% | (43) | 10.0% | (20) | 7.9% | (63) |
| Other, please specify | 0.0% | (43) | 0.0% | (20) | 0.0% | (63) |
|  |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Indicate your agreement with the following statements** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Don’t know | n |
| a My institution's leadership places a high priority on improving student success. performance | | 1.6% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 15.9% | 81.0% | 0.0% | 63 |
| b Our faculty acknowledge a responsibility to help at-risk students improve basic skills. | | 1.6% | 4.8% | 28.6% | 55.6% | 9.5% | 0.0% | 63 |
| c IPAS services play a major role in our overall student success strategy. | | 1.6% | 0.0% | 12.7% | 49.2% | 31.7% | 4.8% | 63 |
| d We have the technology systems needed to deliver IPAS services effectively. | | 0.0% | 14.3% | 15.9% | 50.8% | 15.9% | 3.2% | 63 |
| e The effectiveness of our IPAS services suffers from lack of integration (stovepiping) between different systems and/or data. repositories | | 1.6% | 25.4% | 12.7% | 46.0% | 9.5% | 4.8% | 63 |
| f The effectiveness of our IPAS services suffers from a lack of coordination between different parties who support students (instructors, advisors, student affairs, etc.). | | 4.8% | 22.2% | 12.7% | 41.3% | 12.7% | 6.3% | 63 |
| g The different campus units involved in using technology to support IPAS services collaborate effectively. | | 0.0% | 23.8% | 27.0% | 36.5% | 9.5% | 3.2% | 63 |
| h We anticipate making significant investments in IPAS technologies over the next two years. | | 0.0% | 1.6% | 12.7% | 55.6% | 25.4% | 4.8% | 63 |
| i We can meet our needs with IPAS solutions that are available in the marketplace today. | | 0.0% | 9.5% | 27.0% | 42.9% | 9.5% | 11.1% | 63 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Does your institution have one or more governance structures that oversee the selection and use of IPAS technologies (e.g., academic affairs/student affairs committees, deans' council, student success team, IT steering committee)?** | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Yes | In development | No | n |
| Respondent Role | |  |  |  |  |
| CIO | | 64.7% | 11.8% | 23.5% | 34 |
| SSO | | 71.4% | 10.7% | 17.9% | 28 |
| All respondents | | 67.7% | 11.3% | 21.0% | 62 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Yes | In development | No | n |
| Institution Type | |  |  |  |  |
| Two-year | | 81.0% | 9.5% | 9.5% | 42 |
| Four-year | | 40.0% | 15.0% | 45.0% | 20 |
| All respondents | | 67.7% | 11.3% | 21.0% | 62 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. In five years, our use of technology to support and deliver IPAS services will:** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Decrease a lot | Decrease a little | Stay about the same | Increase a little | Increase a lot | Don’t know | n |
| Respondent Role | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CIO | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.7% | 76.5% | 8.8% | 34 |
| SSO | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.3% | 79.3% | 10.3% | 29 |
| All respondents | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12.7% | 77.8% | 9.5% | 63 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Decrease a lot | Decrease a little | Stay about the same | Increase a little | Increase a lot | Don’t know | n |
| Institution Type | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two-year | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14.0% | 79.1% | 7.0% | 43 |
| Four-year | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 10.0% | 75.0% | 15.0% | 20 |
| All respondents | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 12.7% | 77.8% | 9.5% | 63 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5 What are your concerns, if any, about the growing use of technology to support and deliver IPAS services?** | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Not a concern | Minor concern | Moderate concern | Major concern | No opinion | n |
| a Data will be misused wrong conclusions will be drawn. | 23.8% | 46.0% | 25.4% | 3.2% | 1.6% | 63 |
| b Overloaded faculty will resist learning/using new IPAS systems. | 3.2% | 17.5% | 47.6% | 28.6% | 3.2% | 63 |
| c Overloaded staff will resist learning/using new IPAS systems. | 9.5% | 47.6% | 28.6% | 11.1% | 3.2% | 63 |
| d IPAS systems may trigger demand for in-person advising, counseling, etc., that we can't meet. | 14.3% | 38.1% | 31.7% | 12.7% | 3.2% | 63 |
| e Students crave a personal touch that IPAS technology can't deliver. | 31.7% | 44.4% | 17.5% | 3.2% | 3.2% | 63 |
| f Students won't see value in IPAS systems and will not use them very much. | 36.5% | 39.7% | 19.0% | 1.6% | 3.2% | 63 |
| g Faculty won't see value in IPAS systems and will not use them very much. | 6.3% | 31.7% | 49.2% | 11.1% | 1.6% | 63 |
| h IPAS technology investments drain resources from faculty and staff advisement, counseling, etc. | 39.7% | 46.0% | 9.5% | 0.0% | 4.8% | 63 |
| i Courses of study may become too rule-bound, discouraging exploration. | 38.1% | 28.6% | 15.9% | 3.2% | 14.3% | 63 |
| j Individuals' privacy rights will be breached. | 50.8% | 31.7% | 9.5% | 1.6% | 6.3% | 63 |
| k New IPAS systems and data sources will create integration challenges and add complexity. | 14.5% | 30.6% | 35.5% | 16.1% | 3.2% | 62 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **7. Have you been personally involved in the selection or deployment of IPAS technologies?** | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Yes | No | n |
| Respondent Role | |  |  |  |
| CIO | | 79.4% | 20.6% | 34 |
| SSO | | 75.9% | 24.1% | 29 |
| All respondents | | 77.8% | 22.2% | 63 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Yes | No | n |
| Institution Type | |  |  |  |
| Two-year | | 81.4% | 18.6% | 43 |
| Four-year | | 70.0% | 30.0% | 20 |
| All respondents | | 77.8% | 22.2% | 63 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION B. IPAS Capabilities [Student Success Officer Only]** | | | | |
| **1. Please indicate which of the following IPAS-related capabilities your institution has.** | | | | |
|  |
|  | We do not have this capability and have no plans to develop it. | We do not have this capability but plan to develop it. | We have this capability at least to some extent. | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | 3.4% | 41.4% | 55.2% | 29 |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | 17.2% | 27.6% | 55.2% | 29 |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | 17.2% | 44.8% | 37.9% | 29 |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | 6.9% | 48.3% | 44.8% | 29 |
| e Track overall student progress toward a degree or certificate, and identify deviations and corrective actions | 0.0% | 37.9% | 62.1% | 29 |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | 13.8% | 24.1% | 62.1% | 29 |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | 10.3% | 44.8% | 44.8% | 29 |
| h Manage advising or counseling-center activities (…) | 6.9% | 13.8% | 79.3% | 29 |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | 3.4% | 44.8% | 51.7% | 29 |
| j Enable instructors to manually flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they are at risk of a poor academic outcome | 0.0% | 44.8% | 55.2% | 29 |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | 13.8% | 37.9% | 48.3% | 29 |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | 6.9% | 37.9% | 55.2% | 29 |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | 6.9% | 44.8% | 48.3% | 29 |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | 17.2% | 62.1% | 20.7% | 29 |
|  |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. You reported that you have no plans to develop the following capabilities. Please select the reason for each capability below.** | | | | | |
|  |
|  | We don’t need it | It is under consideration, but no decision to develop has been reached. | We recognize a need for it, but we lack the necessary resources. | Other (Please describe below ) | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | 0.0% | 60.0% | 40.0% | 0.0% | 5 |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | 20.0% | 0.0% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 5 |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | 0.0% | 33.3% | 66.7% | 0.0% | 3 |
| h Manage advising or counseling center activities (…) | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 2 |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 1 |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | 0.0% | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | 0.0% | 60.0% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 5 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3a. To what extent do you expect this capability to be available in two years?** | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Not available | Very limited availability | Limited availability | Widespread availability | Don’t know | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | 0.0% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 50.0% | 8.3% | 12 |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | 0.0% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 12.5% | 8 |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | 7.7% | 46.2% | 0.0% | 30.8% | 15.4% | 13 |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | 14.3% | 21.4% | 14.3% | 42.9% | 7.1% | 14 |
| e Track overall student progress toward a degree or certificate, and identify deviations and corrective actions | 9.1% | 9.1% | 18.2% | 63.6% | 0.0% | 11 |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | 0.0% | 42.9% | 0.0% | 28.6% | 28.6% | 7 |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | 0.0% | 16.7% | 41.7% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 12 |
| h Manage advising or counseling-center activities (…) | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | 0.0% | 7.7% | 30.8% | 61.5% | 0.0% | 13 |
| j Enable instructors to manually flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they are at risk of a poor academic outcome | 7.7% | 0.0% | 46.2% | 38.5% | 7.7% | 13 |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | 0.0% | 18.2% | 36.4% | 36.4% | 9.1% | 11 |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | 0.0% | 45.5% | 9.1% | 27.3% | 18.2% | 11 |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | 0.0% | 46.2% | 7.7% | 38.5% | 7.7% | 13 |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | 5.6% | 5.6% | 27.8% | 50.0% | 11.1% | 18 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3b. Two years from now, in what ways do you expect your institution to deliver this capability? (1 of 2)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | | 25.0% | 8.3% | 41.7% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 41.7% | 16.7% | 12 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | | 12.5% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 8 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | | 50.0% | 16.7% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 16.7% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 12 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | | 25.0% | 0.0% | 41.7% | 16.7% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 12 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| e Track overall student progress toward a degree or certificate, and identify deviations and corrective actions | | 20.0% | 0.0% | 40.0% | 0.0% | 10.0% | 40.0% | 20.0% | 10 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | | 14.3% | 14.3% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 14.3% | 14.3% | 7 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | | 58.3% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 8.3% | 8.3% | 16.7% | 8.3% | 12 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| h Manage advising or counseling-center activities (…) | | 0.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3b. Two years from now, in what ways do you expect your institution to deliver this capability? (2 of 2)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | | 38.5% | 30.8% | 30.8% | 15.4% | 30.8% | 38.5% | 38.5% | 13 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| j Enable instructors to manually flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they are at risk of a poor academic outcome | | 25.0% | 16.7% | 33.3% | 16.7% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 41.7% | 12 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | | 27.3% | 18.2% | 18.2% | 18.2% | 9.1% | 27.3% | 27.3% | 11 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | | 18.2% | 18.2% | 27.3% | 9.1% | 0.0% | 18.2% | 27.3% | 11 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | | 23.1% | 7.7% | 7.7% | 7.7% | 7.7% | 30.8% | 30.8% | 13 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | | 5.9% | 5.9% | 17.6% | 35.3% | 17.6% | 35.3% | 17.6% | 17 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4a. To what extent is this capability available today?** | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Very limited availability | Limited availability | Widespread availability | Don’t know | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | 25.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 16 |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | 20.0% | 46.7% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 15 |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | 18.2% | 81.8% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11 |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | 15.4% | 30.8% | 53.8% | 0.0% | 13 |
| e Track overall student progress toward a degree or certificate, and identify deviations and corrective actions | 16.7% | 27.8% | 55.6% | 0.0% | 18 |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | 11.1% | 44.4% | 44.4% | 0.0% | 18 |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | 15.4% | 46.2% | 38.5% | 0.0% | 13 |
| h Manage advising or counseling-center activities (…) | 13.6% | 50.0% | 36.4% | 0.0% | 22 |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | 26.7% | 26.7% | 46.7% | 0.0% | 15 |
| j Enable instructors to manually flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they are at risk of a poor academic outcome | 12.5% | 31.3% | 56.3% | 0.0% | 16 |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | 28.6% | 42.9% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 14 |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | 31.3% | 50.0% | 18.8% | 0.0% | 16 |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | 42.9% | 42.9% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 14 |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | 16.7% | 66.7% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 6 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4a. How available do you expect this capability to be in two years?** | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Very limited availability | Limited availability | Widespread availability | Don’t know | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | 0.0% | 6.7% | 93.3% | 0.0% | 15 |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | 0.0% | 35.7% | 57.1% | 7.1% | 14 |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | 10.0% | 30.0% | 50.0% | 10.0% | 10 |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | 0.0% | 16.7% | 83.3% | 0.0% | 12 |
| e Track overall student progress toward a degree or certificate, and identify deviations and corrective actions | 0.0% | 18.8% | 81.3% | 0.0% | 16 |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | 0.0% | 29.4% | 70.6% | 0.0% | 17 |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | 0.0% | 15.4% | 84.6% | 0.0% | 13 |
| h Manage advising or counseling-center activities (…) | 0.0% | 20.0% | 75.0% | 5.0% | 20 |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | 0.0% | 20.0% | 73.3% | 6.7% | 15 |
| j Enable instructors to manually flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they are at risk of a poor academic outcome | 0.0% | 18.8% | 81.3% | 0.0% | 16 |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | 7.7% | 23.1% | 69.2% | 0.0% | 13 |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | 0.0% | 26.7% | 73.3% | 0.0% | 15 |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | 7.7% | 38.5% | 46.2% | 7.7% | 13 |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | 0.0% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 20.0% | 5 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4b. In what ways does your institution deliver this capability today? (1 of 2)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | | 37.5% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 37.5% | 25.0% | 16 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | | 75.0% | 31.3% | 43.8% | 6.3% | 18.8% | 12.5% | 31.3% | 16 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | | 63.6% | 36.4% | 27.3% | 18.2% | 0.0% | 36.4% | 18.2% | 11 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | | 53.8% | 15.4% | 53.8% | 15.4% | 7.7% | 30.8% | 30.8% | 13 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| e Track overall student progress toward a degree or certificate, and identify deviations and corrective actions | | 55.6% | 16.7% | 33.3% | 11.1% | 5.6% | 33.3% | 27.8% | 18 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | | 33.3% | 27.8% | 16.7% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 38.9% | 27.8% | 18 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | | 84.6% | 38.5% | 15.4% | 30.8% | 0.0% | 38.5% | 15.4% | 13 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| h Manage advising or counseling-center activities (…) | | 52.2% | 34.8% | 30.4% | 8.7% | 17.4% | 39.1% | 4.3% | 23 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4b. In what ways does your institution deliver this capability today? (2 of 2)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | | 46.7% | 26.7% | 13.3% | 13.3% | 0.0% | 60.0% | 13.3% | 15 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| j Enable instructors to manually flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they are at risk of a poor academic outcome | | 56.3% | 43.8% | 25.0% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 62.5% | 6.3% | 16 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | | 50.0% | 50.0% | 42.9% | 7.1% | 14.3% | 50.0% | 7.1% | 14 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | | 50.0% | 43.8% | 25.0% | 6.3% | 12.5% | 43.8% | 18.8% | 16 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | | 78.6% | 42.9% | 14.3% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 35.7% | 7.1% | 14 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | | 50.0% | 83.3% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 6 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4c. Two years from now, how do you expect your institution to deliver this capability?** | | | |
|  |
|  | In about the same ways as today | In different ways than today | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | 62.5% | 37.5% | 16 |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | 62.5% | 37.5% | 16 |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | 27.3% | 72.7% | 11 |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | 76.9% | 23.1% | 13 |
| e Track overall student progress toward a degree or certificate, and identify deviations and corrective actions | 56.3% | 43.8% | 16 |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | 66.7% | 33.3% | 18 |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | 69.2% | 30.8% | 13 |
| h Manage advising or counseling-center activities (…) | 69.6% | 30.4% | 23 |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | 86.7% | 13.3% | 15 |
| j Enable instructors to manually flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they are at risk of a poor academic outcome | 75.0% | 25.0% | 16 |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | 71.4% | 28.6% | 14 |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | 60.0% | 40.0% | 15 |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | 71.4% | 28.6% | 14 |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | 83.3% | 16.7% | 6 |
|  |
|  | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4d. Two years from now, in what ways do you expect your institution to deliver this capability? (1 of 2)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| a Enable students to create a formal education plan that identifies educational objectives and a roadmap for achieving them | | 16.7% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 6 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| b Help students identify an appropriate career objective | | 50.0% | 16.7% | 50.0% | 33.3% | 16.7% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 6 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| c Help students assess their chances of successfully completing a course or program of study | | 12.5% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 37.5% | 25.0% | 8 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| d Determine at registration time whether a course will contribute to a student's progress toward degree or certificate, and flag it if it does not | | 33.3% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 3 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| e Track overall student progress toward a degree or certificate, and identify deviations and corrective actions | | 28.6% | 0.0% | 42.9% | 14.3% | 28.6% | 42.9% | 28.6% | 7 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| f Assess whether a course will be accepted for credit upon transfer to another institution or program | | 33.3% | 16.7% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 66.7% | 16.7% | 6 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| g Match specific student needs with institutional or external services that help overcome obstacles to success (…) | | 50.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 75.0% | 50.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| h Manage advising or counseling-center activities (…) | | 28.6% | 0.0% | 28.6% | 28.6% | 28.6% | 57.1% | 0.0% | 7 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4d. Two years from now, in what ways do you expect your institution to deliver this capability? (2 of 2)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| i Enable advisors to access a unified, comprehensive view of a student's interactions with advising and other support services, integrated with relevant information (…) | | 0.0% | 50.0% | 100% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 100% | 0.0% | 2 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| j Enable instructors to manually flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they are at risk of a poor academic outcome | | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| k Define and deploy automated triggers that flag students whose behavior or performance suggests they may be at risk of a poor academic outcome | | 25.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| l Notify appropriate support staff (counselors, student affairs staff, etc.) when a student's at-risk indicators meet certain criteria | | 33.3% | 33.3% | 33.3% | 16.7% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 6 |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| m Recommend appropriate interventions to at-risk students based on characteristics of the individual and his/her program of study | | 50.0% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 75.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | Through direct personal interaction | Using paper-based processes or general-purpose office technology tools | Through a web or mobile self-service tool that delivers information personalized for the individual user | Using information from assorted systems not specifically designed to deliver this capability | Through dedicated technology solutions managed at the departmental or academic-unit level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the campus or institutional level | Through a dedicated technology solution managed at the district or system-wide level | n |
| n Assemble a view of upcoming demand for courses and programs, accessible to appropriate executives, academic leaders, and administrators | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100% | 0.0% | 100% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION C. IPAS Systems [CIO Only]** | | | | | | |
| **1. Please indicate the status of the following IPAS technology systems and solutions at your institution** | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Deployed | In planning | Experimenting/considering | Considered, not pursued | No discussion to date | n |
| a Academic early-alert system | 52.9% | 23.5% | 20.6% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 34 |
| b Advising center management system (appointments, check in/out, etc.) | 73.5% | 14.7% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 8.8% | 34 |
| c Career assessment and development portal/system | 33.3% | 12.1% | 21.2% | 6.1% | 27.3% | 33 |
| d Advising or case management system tracking student advising/counseling interactions | 50.0% | 20.6% | 23.5% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 34 |
| e Credit transfer/articulation system | 53.1% | 25.0% | 9.4% | 6.3% | 6.3% | 32 |
| f Course or program recommendation engine | 22.6% | 25.8% | 25.8% | 9.7% | 16.1% | 31 |
| g Customer relationship management system with IPAS-related functionality | 6.1% | 36.4% | 15.2% | 12.1% | 30.3% | 33 |
| h Degree audit/progress tracking system | 73.5% | 20.6% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 34 |
| i Education plan creation/tracking tool or system | 44.1% | 29.4% | 5.9% | 8.8% | 11.8% | 34 |
| j Student co-curricular activities management system | 12.5% | 18.8% | 21.9% | 15.6% | 31.3% | 32 |
| k Student extracurricular activities management system | 21.9% | 12.5% | 9.4% | 9.4% | 46.9% | 32 |
| l System for student self-service referral to social services or community resources | 12.5% | 9.4% | 15.6% | 9.4% | 53.1% | 32 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2a. To what extent is this system available at your institution today? If more than one such system is deployed, respond with respect to the one most widely available.** | | | | |
|  |
|  | Very limited availability | Limited availability | Widespread availability | n |
| a Academic early-alert system | 0.0% | 22.2% | 77.8% | 18 |
| b Advising center management system (appointments, check in/out, etc.) | 8.0% | 20.0% | 72.0% | 25 |
| c Career assessment and development portal/system | 9.1% | 9.1% | 81.8% | 11 |
| d Advising or case management system tracking student advising/counseling interactions | 5.9% | 11.8% | 82.4% | 17 |
| e Credit transfer/articulation system | 5.9% | 11.8% | 82.4% | 17 |
| f Course or program recommendation engine | 14.3% | 14.3% | 71.4% | 7 |
| g Customer relationship management system with IPAS-related functionality | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 2 |
| h Degree audit/progress tracking system | 0.0% | 8.3% | 91.7% | 24 |
| i Education plan creation/tracking tool or system | 0.0% | 20.0% | 80.0% | 15 |
| j Student co-curricular activities management system | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 4 |
| k Student extracurricular activities management system | 0.0% | 28.6% | 71.4% | 7 |
| l System for student self-service referral to social services or community resources | 0.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2b. Where does primary responsibility for the technical management of this system reside?** | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Department or academic unit | Campus or institutional IT unit | District or system-wide IT unit | Other, please specify: | n |
| a Academic early-alert system | 11.1% | 55.6% | 27.8% | 5.6% | 18 |
| b Advising center management system (appointments, check in/out, etc.) | 20.0% | 32.0% | 32.0% | 16.0% | 25 |
| c Career assessment and development portal/system | 18.2% | 9.1% | 54.5% | 18.2% | 11 |
| d Advising or case management system tracking student advising/counseling interactions | 17.6% | 41.2% | 23.5% | 17.6% | 17 |
| e Credit transfer/articulation system | 11.8% | 35.3% | 47.1% | 5.9% | 17 |
| f Course or program recommendation engine | 0.0% | 42.9% | 42.9% | 14.3% | 7 |
| g Customer relationship management system with IPAS-related functionality | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| h Degree audit/progress tracking system | 8.0% | 44.0% | 44.0% | 4.0% | 25 |
| i Education plan creation/tracking tool or system | 20.0% | 40.0% | 33.3% | 6.7% | 15 |
| j Student co-curricular activities management system | 25.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 4 |
| k Student extracurricular activities management system | 28.6% | 42.9% | 0.0% | 28.6% | 7 |
| l System for student self-service referral to social services or community resources | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2c. Where does primary responsibility for the functional management of this system reside?** | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Department or academic unit, please specify: | Campus or institutional level, please specify office: | District or system-wide level, please specify office: | Other, please specify: | n |
| a Academic early-alert system | 55.6% | 33.3% | 5.6% | 5.6% | 18 |
| b Advising center management system (appointments, check in/out, etc.) | 72.0% | 20.0% | 4.0% | 4.0% | 25 |
| c Career assessment and development portal/system | 45.5% | 36.4% | 18.2% | 0.0% | 11 |
| d Advising or case management system tracking student advising/counseling interactions | 70.6% | 17.6% | 5.9% | 5.9% | 17 |
| e Credit transfer/articulation system | 29.4% | 35.3% | 29.4% | 5.9% | 17 |
| f Course or program recommendation engine | 28.6% | 28.6% | 28.6% | 14.3% | 7 |
| g Customer relationship management system with IPAS-related functionality | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| h Degree audit/progress tracking system | 44.0% | 36.0% | 16.0% | 4.0% | 25 |
| i Education plan creation/tracking tool or system | 53.3% | 13.3% | 26.7% | 6.7% | 15 |
| j Student co-curricular activities management system | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
| k Student extracurricular activities management system | 85.7% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 7 |
| l System for student self-service referral to social services or community resources | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2e. Which of the following best describes your expectations about this system over the next two years?** | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | We will maintain it, but don’t anticipate more than minor | We will maintain it and perform significant enhancements | We will replace it with something else Please describe: | We will decommission it without replacing it | Other, please describe: | n |
| a Academic early-alert system | 33.3% | 22.2% | 33.3% | 0.0% | 11.1% | 18 |
| b Advising center management system (appointments, check in/out, etc.) | 45.8% | 33.3% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 8.3% | 24 |
| c Career assessment and development portal/system | 54.5% | 36.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 11 |
| d Advising or case management system tracking student advising/counseling interactions | 58.8% | 29.4% | 5.9% | 0.0% | 5.9% | 17 |
| e Credit transfer/articulation system | 52.9% | 47.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 17 |
| f Course or program recommendation engine | 16.7% | 83.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 6 |
| g Customer relationship management system with IPAS-related functionality | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| h Degree audit/progress tracking system | 40.0% | 32.0% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 8.0% | 25 |
| i Education plan creation/tracking tool or system | 28.6% | 57.1% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 14 |
| j Student co-curricular activities management system | 75.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 4 |
| k Student extracurricular activities management system | 42.9% | 14.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 42.9% | 7 |
| l System for student self-service referral to social services or community resources | 75.0% | 0.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3a. When do you expect this system to be deployed?** | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Not yet decided | Within one year | One to two years | More than two years | n |
| a Academic early-alert system | 13.3% | 46.7% | 40.0% | 0.0% | 15 |
| b Advising center management system (appointments, check in/out, etc.) | 16.7% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 16.7% | 6 |
| c Career assessment and development portal/system | 54.5% | 36.4% | 9.1% | 0.0% | 11 |
| d Advising or case management system tracking student advising/counseling interactions | 40.0% | 46.7% | 6.7% | 6.7% | 15 |
| e Credit transfer/articulation system | 36.4% | 54.5% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 11 |
| f Course or program recommendation engine | 25.0% | 37.5% | 31.3% | 6.3% | 16 |
| g Customer relationship management system with IPAS-related functionality | 11.8% | 41.2% | 41.2% | 5.9% | 17 |
| h Degree audit/progress tracking system | 12.5% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 8 |
| i Education plan creation/tracking tool or system | 8.3% | 41.7% | 33.3% | 16.7% | 12 |
| j Student co-curricular activities management system | 46.2% | 23.1% | 23.1% | 7.7% | 13 |
| k Student extracurricular activities management system | 28.6% | 42.9% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 7 |
| l System for student self-service referral to social services or community resources | 62.5% | 25.0% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 8 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3b. To what extent do you expect this system to be available at your institution when fully deployed?** | | | | | |
|  |
|  | Not yet decided | Very limited availability | Limited availability | Widespread availability | n |
| a Academic early-alert system | 20.0% | 0.0% | 13.3% | 66.7% | 15 |
| b Advising center management system (appointments, check in/out, etc.) | 16.7% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 66.7% | 6 |
| c Career assessment and development portal/system | 54.5% | 0.0% | 9.1% | 36.4% | 11 |
| d Advising or case management system tracking student advising/counseling interactions | 28.6% | 0.0% | 7.1% | 64.3% | 14 |
| e Credit transfer/articulation system | 45.5% | 0.0% | 18.2% | 36.4% | 11 |
| f Course or program recommendation engine | 37.5% | 0.0% | 6.3% | 56.3% | 16 |
| g Customer relationship management system with IPAS-related functionality | 17.6% | 5.9% | 5.9% | 70.6% | 17 |
| h Degree audit/progress tracking system | 12.5% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 75.0% | 8 |
| i Education plan creation/tracking tool or system | 16.7% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 66.7% | 12 |
| j Student co-curricular activities management system | 38.5% | 0.0% | 15.4% | 46.2% | 13 |
| k Student extracurricular activities management system | 28.6% | 0.0% | 14.3% | 57.1% | 7 |
| l System for student self-service referral to social services or community resources | 62.5% | 0.0% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 8 |
|  |
|  | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Why did your institution decide not to pursue these systems?** | | | | |
|  |
|  | We don’t need it | We recognize a need for it, but we lack the necessary resources. | Other | n |
| c Career assessment and development portal/system | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| d Advising or case management system tracking student advising/counseling interactions | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 1 |
| e Credit transfer/articulation system | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
| f Course or program recommendation engine | 0.0% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 3 |
| g Customer relationship management system with IPAS-related functionality | 25.0% | 75.0% | 0.0% | 4 |
| i Education plan creation/tracking tool or system | 0.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 3 |
| j Student co-curricular activities management system | 60.0% | 40.0% | 0.0% | 5 |
| k Student institutional engagement assessment tool | 0.0% | 66.7% | 33.3% | 3 |
| l System for student self-service referral to social services or community resources | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 2 |
|  |
|  | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5. Looking forward, which of the following best describes your institution's preferred overall approach to adopting IPAS technologies?** | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | We heavily favor proven solutions ... | We will be selective early adopters of new solutions ... | We will aggressively adopt new solutions ... | Other, please describe: | n |
| Institution Type | |  |  |  |  |  |
| Two-year | | 41.7% | 45.8% | 8.3% | 4.2% | 24 |
| Four-year | | 30.0% | 30.0% | 30.0% | 10.0% | 10 |
| All respondents | | 38.2% | 41.2% | 14.7% | 5.9% | 34 |
|  |
|  |
|  | | We heavily favor proven solutions ... | We will be selective early adopters of new solutions ... | We will aggressively adopt new solutions ... | Other, please describe: | n |
| Institution Size | |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 8,000 | | 45.0% | 40.0% | 5.0% | 10.0% | 20 |
| 8,000+ | | 28.6% | 42.9% | 28.6% | 0.0% | 14 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6. Indicate your agreement with the following statements about your institution** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Don’t know | n |
| a Systems- and data-integration costs will be a major obstacle to effectively using IPAS technologies | | 2.9% | 29.4% | 32.4% | 29.4% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 34 |
| b Academic units involved in the selection and use of IPAS technologies understand the costs of systems and data integration | | 5.9% | 35.3% | 26.5% | 29.4% | 0.0% | 2.9% | 34 |
| c We have the infrastructure to carry out systems and data integration necessary to effectively use IPAS technologies | | 2.9% | 5.9% | 11.8% | 50.0% | 29.4% | 0.0% | 34 |
| d We have the staff skills to carry out systems and data integration necessary to effectively use IPAS technologies | | 2.9% | 14.7% | 14.7% | 44.1% | 20.6% | 2.9% | 34 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SECTION D. IPAS Data and Analytics [All respondents]** | | | | | | | | | |
| **1. Please provide your best estimate of how data are being used in the following areas in order to improve institutional student success performance. Where you make use of data in multiple ways, select the most advanced use (i.e., farthest to the right).** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | We do not collect these data | ... rarely used | ... to monitor operations or programs. | ... to make predictions or projections for programs or groups. | ... that may trigger proactive responses. | Don’t know | n |
| a Academic student success risk factors (grades, study load, attendance, etc.) | | 16.4% | 19.7% | 24.6% | 21.3% | 14.8% | 3.3% | 61 |
| b Nonacademic student success risk factors (demographic, life/work, financial, etc.) | | 19.7% | 32.8% | 21.3% | 8.2% | 9.8% | 8.2% | 61 |
| c Characteristics associated with success in specific courses and programs | | 19.7% | 11.5% | 26.2% | 18.0% | 11.5% | 13.1% | 61 |
| d Student progress and completion measures | | 1.6% | 11.5% | 39.3% | 29.5% | 16.4% | 1.6% | 61 |
| e Instructional management (course and program demand, staffing, etc.) | | 8.2% | 4.9% | 36.1% | 32.8% | 9.8% | 8.2% | 61 |
| f Use of interventions that address specific student risk profiles | | 14.8% | 13.1% | 36.1% | 13.1% | 11.5% | 11.5% | 61 |
| g Enrollment management, admissions, and recruiting | | 1.7% | 3.4% | 42.4% | 33.9% | 13.6% | 5.1% | 59 |
| h Student participation in advisement and other support services | | 6.6% | 14.8% | 47.5% | 18.0% | 4.9% | 8.2% | 61 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Indicate your agreement that the following are in place to enable your institution to make progress through the use of student success“related analytics** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Don’t know | n |
| a We have senior leaders who are interested in/committed to using data to make decisions | | 1.6% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 24.2% | 72.6% | 0.0% | 62 |
| b We have identified the key outcomes we are trying to improve with better use of data (e.g., retention, time to degree, etc.) | | 1.6% | 6.5% | 3.2% | 38.7% | 50.0% | 0.0% | 62 |
| c We have the right kinds of data to analyze student success | | 1.6% | 6.6% | 27.9% | 47.5% | 16.4% | 0.0% | 61 |
| d We have the right tools/software for analytics | | 1.6% | 24.6% | 23.0% | 32.8% | 13.1% | 4.9% | 61 |
| e Our data are standardized to support comparisons across areas within the institution | | 3.2% | 12.9% | 19.4% | 43.5% | 14.5% | 6.5% | 62 |
| f Our student success data, reports, and processes are repeatable we don't have to reinvent the wheel to address questions and problems that come up repeatedly | | 1.7% | 16.7% | 18.3% | 43.3% | 16.7% | 3.3% | 60 |
| g We have an appropriate number of analysts for analytics | | 12.9% | 37.1% | 17.7% | 17.7% | 6.5% | 8.1% | 62 |
| h Our student success data are siloed we have pockets of individuals who protect their data | | 18.0% | 37.7% | 14.8% | 26.2% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 61 |
| i We have IT professionals who know how to support analytics | | 3.2% | 12.9% | 29.0% | 35.5% | 17.7% | 1.6% | 62 |
| j Our advisors, counselors, and faculty members have the access to student success analytics that they need | | 6.6% | 44.3% | 14.8% | 27.9% | 6.6% | 0.0% | 61 |
| k Our advisors, counselors, and faculty members know how to apply analytics to improve student success | | 6.5% | 43.5% | 22.6% | 24.2% | 0.0% | 3.2% | 62 |
| l When it comes to improving student success, we have a process for moving from what the data say to making changes/decisions | | 3.2% | 17.7% | 29.0% | 35.5% | 12.9% | 1.6% | 62 |
| m We have policies that specify rights and privileges regarding access to institutional and individual data | | 0.0% | 8.1% | 24.2% | 50.0% | 16.1% | 1.6% | 62 |
| n We have a culture that accepts the use of data to make decisions regarding student success | | 4.8% | 4.8% | 22.6% | 48.4% | 19.4% | 0.0% | 62 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements** | | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Don’t know | n |
| a Analytics will be increasingly important to our student-success efforts over the next two years | | 1.6% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 25.8% | 71.0% | 0.0% | 62 |
| b We anticipate making significant investments in student success–related analytics capabilities in the next two years | | 0.0% | 0.0% | 11.3% | 37.1% | 46.8% | 4.8% | 62 |
| c We are interested in having access to student-success data from other institutions (e.g., in a consortial or system-wide pooling arrangement) | | 1.6% | 0.0% | 12.9% | 50.0% | 35.5% | 0.0% | 62 |
| d We would be willing to share student-success data with other institutions (e.g., in a consortial or system-wide pooling arrangement) provided there were appropriate safeguards | | 1.6% | 0.0% | 14.5% | 45.2% | 30.6% | 8.1% | 62 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Which of the following does your institution have in place to support analytics related to student success?** | | | | | | |
|  |
|  | In use institution-wide | In use at departmental or academic-unit level | Planned/Implementing | Not in use or not planned | Don’t know | n |
| a Data warehouse | 48.5% | 6.1% | 33.3% | 12.1% | 0.0% | 33 |
| b Operational data store | 57.6% | 15.2% | 15.2% | 6.1% | 6.1% | 33 |
| c Embedded analytics in major student success–related enterprise systems (SIS, LMS, etc.) | 33.3% | 21.2% | 21.2% | 15.2% | 9.1% | 33 |
| d Reporting dashboards for executives | 21.9% | 3.1% | 59.4% | 12.5% | 3.1% | 32 |
| e Reporting dashboards for academic leaders (deans, department chairs, etc.) | 18.2% | 6.1% | 51.5% | 21.2% | 3.0% | 33 |
| f Reporting dashboards for directors/managers | 15.2% | 3.0% | 57.6% | 18.2% | 6.1% | 33 |
| g Reporting dashboards for advisors, instructors, counselors, etc. | 12.1% | 6.1% | 57.6% | 18.2% | 6.1% | 33 |
|  |
|  | | | | | | |