COLLABORATIVELY LEADING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS EFFORTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

How can we cohesively build all four legs of the chair to support the strongest institutional effectiveness efforts in education?

Table of Contents

By Dr. Allen Goben, c. 2007, Reprinted by Permission

About the Author

Dr. Allen Goben works as a Senior Executive, Higher Education Development in the Education Practice for SAS, the world's largest privately held software company (**www.sas.com/education**). Prior to joining SAS in 2006, Goben devoted 20 years to collaborative leadership and learning excellence as a teacher, coach, college recruiter, counselor and administrator. Administrative duties include work as Executive Vice President at AIB College of Business (Iowa) **www.aib.edu**; Dean of Academic Affairs and Workforce Development at Central Arizona Community College (Arizona) **www.centralaz.edu**; and leadership of student services operations for advanced technologies at Indian Hills Community College (Iowa) **www.indianhills.edu**. Goben has served as a master presenter and keynote speaker for colleges, businesses, leadership training programs and faculty/staff development institutes in several states – focusing on leadership, technological implementations, learning styles and communication training. A full electronic career portfolio is available at **www.goben12.net**.

Executive Summary

Institutional effectiveness has become so important to colleges and universities that the language is embedded in accreditation and strategic efforts; institutional cultures are being transformed as human, fiscal and technical resources are aligned to support and promote effectiveness; and senior leadership positions are being created or revised to include a focus on institutional effectiveness. As these efforts grow and adapt, we are left with a major question:

What is institutional effectiveness in education, and how do we fully leverage effectiveness efforts to increase our capacity to serve students and their learning needs?

To understand what institutional effectiveness means in education, we must consider several core ingredients that make up the recipe for a culture of learning success:

- The overall culture of education and how it compares to other industries

- A brief historical overview of institutional effectiveness in education

- Various sectors within education and how each defines institutional effectiveness

- The four legs of the chair needed to support institutional effectiveness:

    o People

    o Culture

    o Technology

    o Processes

- Changing leadership and leadership needs: hierarchical, top-down buy-in versus grass-roots ownership that creates a shared vision

- The Copy and Steal Everything (CASE) method – learning from each other:

    o Education – learning about useful effectiveness measures from other industries

    o Other industries – learning how to focus on learning, collaboration and improvement from education

- Examples of higher education institutional effectiveness efforts in the United States

Each core ingredient has a tremendous impact on the overall success of institutional effectiveness efforts in education. Additionally, other ingredients are usually sprinkled in to meet local, statewide, or regional needs and further define what institutional effectiveness means. There is no universal definition for institutional effectiveness in education. The common core elements are merely a starting point. As a result, it may seem as though institutional effectiveness is something we know when we see it. But, we are often unable to concretely describe it to either internal or external stakeholders.

In order to successfully implement institutional effectiveness, an educational organization must first define, develop and articulate institutional effectiveness internally. Next, the people, culture, technology, and processes must be aligned to support ongoing institutional effectiveness. Finally, the institutional effectiveness message – what it means and how it benefits students - must be communicated to external audiences, as needed.

Educational Culture Compared to Other Industries

Education has its own unique culture. And, it is a culture that has developed and thrived over a considerable period of time. In some contrast to other businesses and industries, education has taken a lot of criticism over the years. However, if we compare 200 to 300 top colleges or universities from the beginning of the 20th century (circa 1900 AD) to 200 to 300 top businesses or corporations from that same point in time, how many of each are still in existence? While businesses come and go, educational institutions remain largely intact. Of course, they do grow and change. But most educational institutions do not just disappear or undergo sweeping transformations from mergers and acquisitions – which happens frequently in the business world. Instead, they tend to move steadily forward while maintaining considerable continuity.

A Different Kind of Bottom Line

Another important aspect of educational culture that differentiates it from other industries is the focus on a different bottom line. While other industries focus on profit as their bottom line, education's bottom line is learning. In fact, many educators find for-profit language offensive. There are notable exceptions to this culture as for-profit colleges and universities have risen in prominence throughout the late 20th and early 21st centuries. However, the mainstream of education is still a nonprofit enterprise. The for-profit schools have developed a two-stage bottom line. Their first bottom line is still not money and profit. It is learning – just the same as their nonprofit counterparts. Without demonstrated success in learning, for-profit schools could not possibly compete with less expensive nonprofit options. The second bottom line of money and profit (or money and sustainability for nonprofit schools) can never be achieved without initial success in learning. Thus, we have established one baseline of measurable effectiveness that fits the culture of education: learning. This baseline led to learning outcomes measurements and acronyms like OBE (Outcomes-Based Education) in the late 20th century.

A Different Kind of Renewal

Education also experiences a different culture of "renewal" compared to other industries. While other industries thrive on quarterly financial statements and budgets throughout the fiscal year, education renews annually. Industries experience renewal by moving from one fiscal year to the next and focus largely on profitability as a measure of success. By contrast, education has a different and more sweeping sense of renewal each year. Education's academic year is somewhat tied to an annual fiscal year budget renewal each summer. But more importantly, education also has a renewal of people. New students are everywhere! Expanding this renewal, much of education operates with annual contracts for faculty, administrators and sometimes staff members. As such, there are often several new faces among the employee base (seemingly all at once) in education as the contract year changes in mid- to late summer. This renewal affects the organizational culture because, rather than gradually integrating new employees throughout the year, education integrates many in a short time frame. This cultural difference affects how the entire institution operates because the new employee integration occurs simultaneously as new students enter the institution. As a result, institutional effectiveness efforts are sometimes slowed because the "People" leg of the chair can change quite dramatically each year during a short period of time.

A Different Kind of Funding

In general, the funding structure in education is also quite different from other industries. In a typical industry, when the number of constituents served goes up, profits also go up – making it easier to serve more constituents. While this may be true in the small for-profit sector of education, it does not hold true in the much larger public, nonprofit sector. When the overall local, state, regional and/or national economy is riding high, more funds are usually available for education. However, there are usually fewer students because many are taking advantage of well-paying jobs. When the economy dips lower and unemployment rises, fewer funds are available for education. Limited funding problems occur for both state-supported funding as well as would-be students who now have less disposable income. However, when the economy dips, student numbers tend to grow considerably, which leaves educational institutions between a rock and a hard place. Under these ever-changing conditions, the tangible things that define institutional effectiveness might shift inside the culture of education. The shift in tangible factors causes the "rules of the game" to change when considering the availability of funds versus the number of constituents to be served. In addition, the rules regarding the relative importance of fiscal matters to the overall measurement of institutional effectiveness also changes. Although it is vital to be aware of this condition, its mere existence is not what is important here. Instead, the relevant factor is that this condition is the exact opposite of the scenario that we intuitively expect in other industries.

Academic Freedom

Tenure and academic freedom are concepts unique to education, and they are both important in helping define the culture. Tenure means "safe passage" and was derived during the Middle Ages. During the Middle Ages, few people had access to learning and education, so those few who did were given tenure (safe passage) to allow them to educate and enlighten others. This concept likely expanded during the Renaissance, when free-flowing thoughts and ideas were admired. As a result, the idea of a safe culture where educators can freely explore new ideas with academic freedom is deeply embedded in education. Having such freedom makes the job fun, although the pay and benefits are often less than in other industries. Academic freedom is also one of the main reasons individuals become educators. Therefore, any institutional effectiveness effort that is seen as something that will support this aspect of life in education is likely to be well-received. Any effort that is perceived as potentially destructive to academic freedom will be undermined. For example, many educators dislike the term "performance management" but will likely warm up to institutional effectiveness efforts when those efforts offer tools to help them promote learning.

Education has maintained for decades that it is different, and it is. It is not something apart from the "real world" or any other similar and derogatory cliché. Education is firmly entrenched in the real world. However, it is unique when compared to other industries that base success on financial profit.

A Brief History of Institutional Effectiveness in Education

Institutional effectiveness in education was historically defined by each individual institution. While other external agencies might have sought to compare colleges and universities, the real working definition of an institution's effectiveness was defined locally within the college or university. Magazines or other rating pundits have put their criteria together to rank educational institutions, but true (more objective) benchmarks are still being developed. There is even an old joke that if you get eight educators in a room, you'll have 10 or 12 different opinions. No wonder there is a challenge creating a consistent model!

During the earlier part of the 20th century, higher education in the United States expanded a self-accreditation process managed within regional accreditation agencies. The purpose included defining some agreed-upon criteria for what would commonly occur in a college or university, streamlining acceptable transfer from one institution to another, engaging faculty, staff and administration in a regular review process, and so forth. Although the various regional accrediting bodies morphed into similar-yet-unique agencies, they are still a recognized common ground for maintaining a coherent definition of institutional effectiveness. In the latter 20th and early 21st centuries, most of the regional accrediting agencies revised accreditation criteria to include more purposeful and concise language about institutional effectiveness. Some, such as the Higher Learning Commission (aka North Central Association or HLC/NCA) went so far as to develop a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) model of acceptable accreditation renewal. The HLC developed a CQI model called the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) to complement its traditional once-every-10-years accreditation option. The traditional model was renamed the Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality (PEAQ). Revised Criteria for Accreditation implemented around 2004 include strong emphasis on institutional effectiveness in both models. Although the overall practice is still a "self-accreditation" process with the HLC/NCA coordinating and supporting, it is quite clear that external pressure from legislators, taxpayers and other officials has combined with internal desires to coordinate efforts and achieve excellence. The emerging result is that there is now a more data-driven climate developing to better define and demonstrate institutional effectiveness. National standards and benchmarks are in the development stage for higher education institutions across the United States.

Historically, K-12 education has remained more tightly owned and coordinated by state governments. However, recent trends demonstrate a move toward a national effort backed by data. The No Child Left Behind legislation is one example of this trend. Higher education seems to be mirroring this trend to some degree. There are political efforts under way to revamp the regional accreditation model in favor of a national structure – with considerable political capital on both sides of the argument.

Our lesson from the brief historical overview of institutional effectiveness in higher education, then, is that accreditation has become a major driver of data-intensive efforts to demonstrate effectiveness. The accreditation criteria and frameworks all over the country have become more sophisticated and useful to help align people, culture, technology and processes to support institutional effectiveness. These mechanisms work only when they are properly leveraged through good leadership. However, leaders face a daunting task. The technology systems to support these efforts are not standardized across all technologies, and there is also no standard definition of what constitutes a modern "effective" educational institution.

Various Sectors in Education and How Each Defines Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional effectiveness, at its core, is a combination of efficiency and success. All sectors of education have some common indicators of success, such as learning outcomes, student retention and persistence to graduation, institutional financial viability, etc. There is at least some possibility of determining institutional effectiveness measurements that are likely to fit with any type of educational institution. However, various sectors within education have unique attributes and needs.

K-12 School Districts

US K-12 school districts typically serve students ages 5-18 and comprise elementary schools, middle (or junior high) schools and high schools. This sector of education is likely to focus on learning outcomes, graduation rates and financial viability for common institutional effectiveness metrics. Student engagement is growing in importance, and placement of graduates in higher education is also increasingly important as more and more people go to college. A particular pain point that has been identified is whether students need remediation after high school. Though tied to learning outcomes, this particular measurement of institutional effectiveness is under growing scrutiny from taxpayers and legislators who don't want to have to pay for a student's education twice.

Higher Education

Higher education is made up primarily of community colleges, technical colleges and junior colleges; four-year colleges and universities; and major research universities. There are further, aforementioned delineations between nonprofit and for-profit schools within these categories. As well, some noteworthy differences exist between public and private institutions.

Higher Education Interest Groups

Various interest groups within any given educational institution (particularly so in higher education) may view institutional effectiveness through their own unique lenses. For example, a vice president for enrollment or student services might prioritize enrollment management (such as student recruitment and retention) as one of the prime indicators of institutional effectiveness; a chief academic officer might prioritize measurement of learning outcomes and faculty effectiveness as the prime indicator of institutional effectiveness; the chief financial officer might view fiscal responsibility and efficient use of available funds as the top indicator of effectiveness; the vice president or executive director of advancement (fundraising) might prioritize growth in endowments; and so forth. The president or chancellor and board of trustees or board of regents are likely to view "all of the above and more" as how to define institutional effectiveness.

So, again, we face the question: *What is institutional effectiveness in education, and how do we fully leverage effectiveness efforts to increase our capacity to serve students and their learning needs?* The answer is really a both/and scenario rather than an either/or scenario. Institutional effectiveness in education is all of the above and more. Each institution may use common core indicators of effectiveness. But, ultimately, each will continue to follow some of the traditional educational culture of defining effectiveness in a very local way. The currently emerging dynamic is the use of frameworks to help define institutional effectiveness such as accreditation by regional or state agencies and federal mandates. National benchmarking efforts are becoming more sophisticated and more useful. Out of the chaos some semblance of order is emerging, though there is still much debate. Institutional effectiveness efforts are best leveraged by using these developing constructs that support effectiveness and by connecting the dots to blend strategic efforts, such as accreditation, strategic planning, operational planning, and measures of achievement. Technical systems can then be fully developed and leveraged to support people, organizational culture, and process improvements.

A Modern Definition of Institutional Effectiveness

The newer accreditation criteria, for instance, often include language acknowledging the unique nature of any given college or university. The newer criteria encourage each institution to tie its mission and vision to specific needs, goals and barriers while developing a shared vision of institutional effectiveness. Leaders are encouraged to work with staff members to define needs, goals and barriers to success. Afterward, leaders must follow through to ensure that needs are met, goals are supported and barriers to success are removed. Thus, the modern definition of institutional effectiveness:

- **Combines broadly held core concepts of effectiveness with local input** that further defines needs, goals and barriers.

- **Maps documented solutions back to the defined needs, goals and barriers** in an ongoing demonstration of responsiveness and progress.

This modern definition of institutional effectiveness is what the "learning college" movement is all about. It is an overall effort to increase institutional effectiveness to the point where the college or university becomes a true "learning" organization that grows and adapts through ongoing innovation tuned to current, emerging and future needs. It is a culture of "wonder" instead of a culture of "blame" – one where data-supported intelligence can be agreed upon so people can focus on being successful rather than arguing about who is right.

Other things are growing in importance as this climate of institutional effectiveness and ongoing learning develops. Measurement of and increase in student engagement has been proven to strongly fuel successful outcomes for students. Identification of students at risk and expeditious assignment of resources to help those students (that can be documented as improvements) are signs of institutional effectiveness.

As we are discovering, institutional effectiveness is a rather muddy sort of endeavor – at least until common core concepts are interwoven with local needs and strategies. Then, more concrete definitions of institutional effectiveness emerge, regardless of which sector of education is being considered.

Four Legs of the Chair: People, Culture, Technology and Processes

The information evolution model has five stages:

1. Operational

2. Consolidation

3. Integration

4. Effectiveness/Optimization

5. Innovation (continual learning)

(Davis et al., 2006)

An organization can move up through the stages of the information evolution by using only three legs of the chair. However, that's a pretty wobbly climb to true institutional effectiveness and innovation/continual learning. Progress comes much more readily by solidly building all four legs of the chair. Since decision support software has advanced considerably in the past several years, the technology is now available to support higher levels of achievement and faster progress toward institutional effectiveness and innovation. However, many people have led with technology, only to be disappointed in the outcome as the people, culture and processes lagged behind. No one seemed to "get it", and a lot of money was spent on acquiring underused technical capabilities.

So how do we build a solid foundation for all four legs to work in concert? Given the many cultural considerations inherent to education, it is doubly important to pay attention to bringing the culture of the institution along with the people, technology and processes.

People Lead the Culture Forward to Embrace Progress

If you say the word "change" to most people, they're all for it – until it affects them directly. That's probably a bit of human nature common across most or all industries. However, people do want to make progress. Since rapid change has become such a constant in our world, let's rephrase the word and just call it progress. Really, a change just for the sake of change is rarely helpful, so all change should be progressive anyway. Now that we are focused on leading for progress, we are faced with the question "How do we make this happen?"

There are many possible leadership models to use, but one of the best is to develop an understanding of how various *people* within the institution view progress and then lead strategically. The institutional *culture* is created collaboratively by *people. People* are also the ones who use the *technology* and develop/maintain the *processes* that sustain the organization. How readily does one person accept progressive initiatives compared to others? As Everett Rogers outlined many years ago in *Diffusion of Innovations*, there are five groups that most people fall into when it comes to embracing progressive initiatives:

- **Innovators**: About 10 percent to 15 percent of all employees. They quickly integrate progress into their consciences and actions, and usually seek to augment any initiative with additional ideas to continually improve it.

- **Early Majority**: Approximately 30 percent of all employees. They tend to go along with initiatives fairly quickly, though they may also change directions more easily later if the wind blows in a different direction.

- **Late Majority**: Approximately 30 percent of all employees. They are often skeptical of any initiative, viewing changes as "flavor of the month" ideas that might go away if they ignore them. Late Majority individuals are slow to adapt to change and view it as disruptive and time-consuming rather than as a normal part of their jobs/lives.

- **Resistors**: Approximately 5 percent to 15 percent of all employees. They are also known as "CAVE people" (Citizens Against Virtually Everything) and resist for the sake of resisting. They will undermine progressive initiatives that they do not instigate and will resist behind the scenes, even while publicly supporting the effort.

- **Leaders**: Approximately 15 percent of all employees. They have risen to leadership from one of the other four groups. Leadership is not defined by titles or hierarchy. Instead, leaders are the thoughtful, objective and/or inspiring people others choose to follow.

<p align="right">* Adaptation of Diffusion of Innovations model by Everett Rogers</p>

Why the Late Majority Rules

Because *people* fall into one of these categories regarding how they view and handle progress, institutional leadership teams need to realize who is in which category and then focus their time strategically to move the *culture* forward. When this is done successfully, *technology* can be best leveraged and *processes* can be improved continually to promote institutional effectiveness. Although leaders need to focus time and communications on all employees, *cultural* progress can be achieved most effectively when focusing on the **Late Majority**.

Innovators will jump on board quickly because they have an inner need to create and improve things. In fact, they will move most quickly to ownership of progress and results. **Early Majority** will follow more easily. They tend to handle buy-in or ownership, try to do a good job and adapt as needed. **Leaders** may move slowly or fast to own and implement progress; but, if the idea is sound, they will embrace it. **Resistors** are simply an energy drain. They will continually detract from progress because their only power comes from being able to resist and to influence others to resist. As such, the more time devoted to them, the longer it takes the initiative and culture to move forward to progress. The **Late Majority** members are different, though. They may be slow to move, but that is because they have seen progressive changes come and go. They have adapted only to be told to adapt again, so they are somewhat skeptical. They must be thoroughly convinced that the "progress" is worth the pain it might take to get there. This is the group that should receive the most attention, as slow and painful as that may seem for many leaders who want an initiative to move quickly. When the **Late Majority** is on board, though, the progressive initiative will have approximately 80 percent to 85 percent of the people behind it – with few left to drag down the *culture* with resistance. And **Resistors** usually join the effort fully (if at all) only when the **Late Majority** convinces them that the progressive initiative is worthwhile and will stick.

Technology and Processes Depend on People and Culture

Once the *people* and *culture* are ready, technology can be fully leveraged to fuel institutional effectiveness. Processes will begin to streamline into more efficient ways of working and helping students learn. It is possible to lead with technology and with *process improvement* initiatives. However, there are challenges in getting these too far ahead of *people* and *institutional culture*. In a perfect world, any organization would be able to perfectly plan and implement this sort of leadership. In reality, it almost never works that smoothly because people, culture, technology and processes are interwoven into a complex matrix of interconnected relationships. Truly effective institutions not only define and measure institutional effectiveness performance indicators, but they also surface that intelligence at the right time to the right people so that decisions supporting tangible improvement can be made.

Changing Leadership and Leadership Needs

Many organizations are arranged in a hierarchy of one sort or another. There are other ways to structure an organization, such as a matrix, but hierarchical arrangements are most common. However, traditional top-down hierarchical methods of developing and moving strategies, information and decisions are falling out of touch with the modern work force. In the current US work force, Generation Xers (ages 25 to 40) have reached a plurality in many organizations. The Xers, along with a growing number of Millennials (under age 25 but now entering the work force), do not respond favorably to top-down hierarchical directives – if they respond at all. Baby Boomers (ages 41 to 60) have become the establishment – rather than overturning it as many set out to do upon entering the work force 20 to 40 years ago. As a result, the leadership mixture in most organizations is made up primarily of Boomers and Xers, with a much smaller number of Traditionalists (above age 61) and a few Millennials. This four-generation leadership mix creates considerable advantages for organizations that know and learn how to collaborate effectively by leveraging capabilities common among any given generational cohort. However, it also creates an atmosphere where intergenerational communication mishaps are quite common and can impede institutional effectiveness efforts. *Collaboration Power* can grow through improved communication among and between all constituent groups:

> *What early 21st century organizations need to succeed in institutional effectiveness efforts is a **culture** made up of **people** who are collaboratively using **technology** to improve **processes**. That is how we can fully leverage effectiveness efforts to increase our capacity to serve students and their learning needs in all educational organizations.*

Leadership teams must recognize and leverage the diversity inherent in all generational groups to improve their capacity for effectiveness. In order to achieve this climate, leaders must recognize the growing importance of ownership and creating a shared vision rather than always attempting to get employees to buy in to top-down directives. Ownership is different – it takes more time than just passing down a directive. It is a vital need of the bulk of our modern work force, though, and cannot be stressed enough as the key to engaging the people and moving the organization's culture toward progress. Without ownership, technology implementations and process improvements will be doomed to failure or limited success. To create ownership rather than buy-in, employees must be engaged in a collaborative problem-solving effort rather than being given a fully baked "right" answer. They must be allowed the time to co-create the solutions that they are expected to implement. Strategy, communication and decision making must involve more people in a meaningful way. That's how the culture of an organization grows, adapts and learns how to learn.

The CASE Method: <u>C</u>opy <u>A</u>nd <u>S</u>teal <u>E</u>verything

The old saying goes "There's no sense in reinventing the wheel." This is good logic when considering institutional effectiveness efforts. Education and other industries have much to offer one another when it comes to facilitating successful efforts for continually improving institutional effectiveness.

What Education Can Learn from Other Industries

Although education has historically shied away from borrowing too many ideas from the corporate and industrial world, it can gain a great deal in the arena of institutional effectiveness. In particular, sophisticated performance measures have been developed in many industries to increase efficiency and reduce overhead costs of operation. While this method was developed with a bottom-line profit motive somewhat foreign to much of education, it is tremendously useful. Educational institutions may focus on learning, but they also need to manage finances. In fact, it could be argued that with shoestring nonprofit budgets in particular, educational institutions need to be even better at financial management than their corporate counterparts. Aside from finances, performance metrics might be different across industries, but the way these metrics are constructed is useful knowledge for educators. Educators can use such information to help them find ways to repurpose those metrics for education.

Educators can gain valuable lessons from other industries by looking at examples of their successes and failures when it comes to cultural progress and process improvements. Although education is unique, people are people. We all have to use technology to do our jobs, and leadership examples can help create successful blueprints for educational leaders, regardless of which industry those examples come from.

What Other Industries Can Learn from Education

Education may be ahead of the curve in leveraging the power of collaboration. Because education is focused on learning, it has many "been there, done that" lessons to offer other industries regarding how to learn. When the learning is directed toward the organization at large, rather than just around students in classrooms, education is perhaps the emerging leader in institutional effectiveness capabilities. While corporations have adapted more readily to technologies, education has adapted better to people. Learning communities have been created to take advantage of collaborative strengths and help students succeed. Other industries can learn a lot from education about effective collaboration that can further their own ability to compete.

In addition, educators work with – and learn how to work with – each succeeding generation of students before they graduate to the workplace. Definitive differences in a new generation often are reflected in their learning and communication needs. Those needs don't simply go away when students enter the work force and begin collecting a paycheck. As such, other industries need to communicate with educators to learn about – and prepare for – their work force before they arrive. This will help new employees be more effective and decrease costly employee churn.

Examples of Institutional Effectiveness Efforts in Higher Education

Several examples are available via the Web links listed in appendix A. One nice list was developed by the Community College Roundtable in 1994 and updated in 1999. It includes the following indicators of effectiveness in the context of American community colleges:

- Student goal attainment.

- Persistence (fall to fall).

- Degree completion rates.

- Placement rate in the work force.

- Employer assessment of students.

- Licensure/certification pass rates.

- Client assessment of programs and services.

- Demonstration of literacy skills.

- Demonstration of citizenship skills.

- Number and rate of those who transfer.

- Performance after transfer.

- Success in subsequent, related course work.

- Participation rate in service area.

- Responsiveness to community needs.

(Roueche et al. 2001)

These are some of the common core indicators of effectiveness that are pertinent to community colleges and can be measured and mapped to sources of data, though the list is certainly not all-inclusive. By contrast, a university might put much more stock into alumni and development as a prime indicator of effectiveness. Thus, it is important to note that differences do exist in the various sectors within higher education.

A Picture That's Becoming Clearer

Like a camera lens being brought into focus, institutional effectiveness efforts in education are becoming clearer, deeper, broader and more useful. Student learning and learning support services are being improved in a myriad of ways. There are now best practices that can be shared and emulated as we continually seek to improve our ability to help students. With new technologies at our disposal to better identify needs, align resources and communicate effectively, we will continue to increase our *Collaboration Power*. We will provide the right intelligence to the right people at the right time to truly make a difference. The people will continually enhance the organizational culture while using technology to improve processes. As a result, the health of the entire system in any given educational institution can thrive for ongoing learning success as we learn, grow and share best practices for institutional effectiveness.

Appendix A: Additional Examples of Institutional Effectiveness Efforts in Higher Education

http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Template.cfm?Section=Browse_by_Subject_
Topic&Template=/Ecommerce/ProductDisplay.cfm&ProductID=207

http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/ccs/edinfos/edinfo9.html

http://www.southern.wvnet.edu/assessment/ccc_indicators.htm

http://www.lee.edu/institutionaleffectiveness/

http://www.madisonville.kctcs.edu/gpe/planning.html

http://www.commission.wcc.edu/Reports_Studies/CI2002.pdf

http://ipr.sc.edu/effectiveness/

http://iea.fau.edu/

http://assessment.clemson.edu/

Appendix B: Bibliography

Davis, J.; Miller, G.J.; & Russell, A (2006). *Information revolution: Using the information evolution model to grow your business*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Drucker, P. F. (1999). *Management challenges for the 21st century*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Howe, N. & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York, NY: Vintage Books, a division of Random House.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1999). *Encouraging the heart: A leader's guide to rewarding and recognizing others*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Lancaster, L. C. & Stillman, D. (2002). *When generations collide*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Minerd, J., "Bringing Out the Best in Generation X." *Futurist*, January 1999, Vol. 33, Issue 1, 6-7.

Mink, O. G., et al. (1993). *Change at work: A comprehensive management process for transforming organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

O'Banion, T. (1997). *A learning college for the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education, Oryx Press.

O'Banion, T. & Milliron, M., "College Conversations on Learning." *Learning Abstracts-League for Innovation in the Community College*, 2001, Vol. 4, Number 5, 1-2.

Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations: Fourth edition*. New York, NY: The Free Press, a division of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

Roueche, J. E. & Baker, G. A. (1986). *Profiling excellence in America's schools*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Roueche, J. E. et al. (1997). *Embracing the tiger: The effectiveness debate and the community college*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Roueche, J. E. et al. (2001). *In pursuit of excellence: The community college of Denver*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Strauss, W. & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future*, 1584 to 2069. New York, NY: Morrow.