



Co-curricular Assessment Report

Program/Department Name: Advancement & Strategic Grants

Year of CAR Completion: 2018

CAR Cycle: 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18

Co-curricular Assessment Report

Organization of Program Review Materials:

- ◆ Component I: Response to Previous Co-curricular Assessment Report
- ◆ Component II: Review of Assessment Data
- ◆ Component III: Criteria for Co-curricular Assessment Report
- ◆ Component IV: Recommendations and Executive Summary
- ◆ Appendix A: Co-curricular Program/Department Summary Work Plan

NOTE: Please spell out any acronym the first time it is used.

NOTE: Whenever possible, link answers to supplemental documentation that you are providing.

Component I

Response to Previous Co-curricular Assessment Report

Based on your previous CAR review, identify strengths, areas of improvement, opportunities, threats, and progress to date. (Please enter NA in these areas if this is your first CAR.) **If you are referring to supplemental documentation that you are including in this CAR, please identify that documentation clearly in your answers below.****

Program/Department: NA: First Assessment Report

Strengths:

NA

Areas of improvement:

NA

Opportunities:

NA

Threats:

NA

Progress to Date:

NA

Component II

Review of Previous Assessment Data

***If you are referring to supplemental documentation that you are including in this CAR, please identify that documentation clearly in your answers below.*

1. What changes have been recommended that have had a positive effect on your program's outcomes? (Please be specific.)

NA

2. What changes to your program/department were made based on findings from the previous CAR?

NA

Component III

Criteria for Co-curricular Assessment Report

Criterion 1.0 Mission, Values and Goals*

Mission:

The mission of the Division of Advancement and External Relations is to strategically manage relationships in order to secure support which promotes access, academic success, stewardship, and community partnerships for Stark State College, its programs and its students.

Alumni

The Alumni Office/Association works to support and foster a mutually beneficial relationship between SSC alumni and the college; it serves as a valuable resource by the College, its Board of Trustees and Foundation Board of Directors.

SSC Foundation

The Stark State College Foundation seeks, receives and distributes funds, equipment, property and other contributions for the benefit of the students and programs of Stark State College.

Strategic Grants

The Strategic Grants Office researches and develops proposals for government funding in order to secure major funds for programs, buildings and innovative initiatives.

Values: We value our donors, funders, and relationships and set high stewardship standards which include an accurate and timely gift processing, acknowledgment and recognition for donors, and alumni.

Vision: Impactful financial resources are available to support the college's strategic goals and objectives.

Goals:

Strategic Grants

To research, identify and secure funding which aligns to the college's mission of access with success and workforce delivery.

Foundation

To secure philanthropic funding which benefits the students and programs at SSC.

Alumni

To foster a mutual beneficial relationship between alumni and the college that will lead to life-long loyalty and financial support through philanthropic giving to SSC.

Advancement Division

To provide high quality support services to students, faculty and staff.

*Goals should align with current SSC Strategic Plan. **Note if any changes have been made to the mission, values, and/or goals since the last CAR.**

Criterion 2.0 Baseline Data

1.) What baseline data has your Program/Department collected during this CAR term?

The baseline data used by Advancement and Strategic Grants during this CAR term is the annual internal campaign data, annual external campaign data, alumni giving, grants awarded, and the support services effectiveness survey trend data, and the Voluntary Support of Education (VSE), which is the authoritative source of information on private giving to higher education and private K-12 institutions in the United States.

2.) How is that data used to evaluate the Program/Department?

The data is used for longitudinal tracking of the above metrics and the evaluation of goals and customer service.

Criterion 2.0 Program/ Departmental Assessment Procedure and Action Plan

Program/Department Name: Advancement & Strategic Grants
Individual Completing Report: Marisa Rohn
Individual(s) Reviewing Report: Dr. Para Jones
Date: 5/31/18

Program/ Departmental Assessment Procedure and Action Plan

Purpose:

To self-identify the status of Program/Department in the outcomes assessment process as well as the action-steps and timetable for the development of assessment processes.

Assessment Criteria

Goals:

Does the Department have specific student learning or academic/ student service goals which reflect the discipline or service area professional standards?

Yes No

Outcome Measures:

Are direct and indirect outcome measures identified for each goal?

Yes No

Research:

Is research systematically conducted to evaluate success or failure in achieving outcomes?

Yes No

Findings:

Are research results analyzed and interpreted and findings determined?

Yes No

Review Process:

Are findings discussed and reviewed by appropriate groups and individuals and recommendations made for action?

Yes No

Proposed Actions:

Are recommendations acted upon?

Yes No

Improvements:

Have actions resulted in documented improvements in student learning or academic/ student services?

Yes No

Assessment Measures Inventory

***The matrix should contain all goals as they pertain to the CAR.**

Assessment Measures for Goals (Outcome measures from assessment report)	Is trend data available for the measure? (Yes, No, NA)	Has a performance benchmark(s) been identified for the measure? (Yes, No, NA)	Type of performance benchmark - SSC (internal), State-level (OACC, OBR, Etc.), National (Professional Org., accrediting group, etc.) List all that apply
Goal 1: \$/grants staff FTE (Annual SSC benchmark)	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 1: Grant Success Rate (Annual SSC benchmark) ratio written: funded	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 2: VSE, market value \$ YOY change	Yes	Yes	National and SSC
Goal 2: VSE, Ratio Total expenditures (2b. 5F): Official Grand Total by source or purpose	Yes	n/a	National
Goal 2: VSE: Total Alumni Donors YOY change	Yes	Yes	National and SSC
Goal 2: Total scholarship \$	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 2: Pct. Employee giving, Annual campaign	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 2: Employee giving Total \$, YOY change/ FTE	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 2: Total # new donors YOY	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 2: Total # external donors YOY	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 3: Alumni giving YOY change	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 3: Alumni Task Force Recommendations	NA	NA	NA
Goal 4: Support Services Effectiveness Survey*	Yes	Yes	SSC
Goal 4: Foundation Board Focus Group	n/a	n/a	n/a
Goal 4: Student Testimonials (Letters)	Yes	Yes	SSC

* rotates between Advancement and Strategic Grants annually

Criterion 3.0: Assessment Results Report

Purpose:

The report is a summary compilation of key assessment methods, findings, review processes, actions, and improvements related to the academic/student service or learning goals of the Program/Department on an annual basis. As an historical record of assessment activities, the report provides for and supports the *systematic* assessment of academic support outcomes.

Instructions:

Enter the outcome measure in the space provided. Please note that for each goal it is expected that a mix of quantitative and qualitative as well as direct and indirect measures are employed.

Provide a brief summary of baseline data collected by the Program/Department and how that data has been used during the current CAR cycle.

Provide a brief summary of *key findings*, either as bulleted points or in short paragraph form.

Provide a brief summary on the review committee/review process (for example, Findings are reviewed by the Director and staff on a per term basis and recommendations are forward to the VP for further review).

Provide a brief summary of any proposed actions for the next term/CAR cycle. Please note that not all findings result in actions.

Provide a brief summary of any improvements from the previous CAR cycle (this does not apply to new measures the first year).

Goal 1: Grants: Research/Secure Funding

Outcome Measure 1: \$/staff FTE (Annual SSC benchmark)

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018
Stark State College			
# of Grants Submitted	41	27	Not complete as of yet
\$ of Grants Submitted	\$9,503,663	\$4,681,316	NA
# of Grants Received	22	19	NA
\$ of Grants Received	\$5,269,168	\$1,964,527	NA
FTE Staff	1.28	0.97	NA
\$ of Grants Received per FTE Staff	\$4,116,538	\$2,025,286	NA

Our grants team is very new as of halfway through 2016-2017 so there has been a learning curve. Additionally, Federal grant opportunities have yet to open up, since the new administration has

been in place. We believe we are now positioned to apply for large Federal grants, should the opportunities that align with our mission arise. In the meantime, the grants team has been reaching out to the various areas of the College through regular emails with potential grant opportunities, follow up calls and meetings to ensure we are pursuing other opportunities.

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed with Institutional Research, Executive Committee Members and the College Board of Trustees.

Improvements: N/A

Outcome Measure 2: Grant Success Rate (Annual SSC benchmark) ratio written: funded

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

Again, our grants officers are fairly new, and the Federal opportunities have not opened up as of yet under the new administration.

	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018
Stark State College			
# of Grants Submitted	41	27	Not complete as of yet
\$ of Grants Submitted	\$9,503,663	\$4,681,316	NA
# of Grants Received	22	19	NA
\$ of Grants Received	\$5,269,168	\$1,964,527	NA
FTE Staff	1.28	0.97	NA
\$ of Grants Received per FTE Staff	\$4,116,538	\$2,025,286	NA
% of Grants Applied for Received	54%	70%	NA

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed with Institutional Research, Executive Committee Members and the College Board of Trustees.

Improvements: Our percentage of grants applied for and received did increase by 16%.

Goal 2: Foundation: Philanthropic giving

Outcome Measure 1: VSE, market value \$ YOY change

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

Market Value (VSE) YOY Change	14-15	15-16	16-17	% change
*Stark State College Foundation.	\$4,947,555	\$5,180,485	\$6,181,036	25% increase

*The reporting fiscal year contains data for prior fiscal year performance.

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed with the President of the College and the Foundation Board of Directors.

Improvements: The market value increased year-over-year during the three year period by 25%.

Outcome Measure 2: VSE, Ratio Total expenditures (2b. 5F): Official Grand Total by source or purpose

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual N/A

Findings: The VSE reported expenditures include the Stark State College annual expenditures so this measurement does not apply. Employees of the college manage the Foundation day-to-day operations, but are not employees of the Foundation.

Review Committee/Review Process:

Improvements: Identify a different way to measure intended outcomes.

Outcome Measure 3: VSE: Total Alumni Donors YOY change

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X _____

Findings:

VSE: Total Alumni Donors YOY change	14-15	15-16	16-17	% change
*Stark State College Foundation	105 donors	89 donors	77 donors	27% decrease

*The reporting fiscal year contains data for prior fiscal year performance.

Findings: The decrease in alumni donors is due to limited staffing and focusing on other fundraising as directed by the Foundation Board of Directors. There is a project in process to identify alumni and the appropriate activities to engage with alumni.

Review Committee/Review Process: This data is reviewed by internal staff.

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 4: Total scholarship \$ available

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

Total Scholarship \$	14-15	15-16	16-17	% of change
Stark State College Foundation	\$262,221	\$250,029	\$630,363	140% increase

Findings: The increase in scholarships is due to the Foundation’s Strategic Plan focus to increase dollars for scholarships.

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed internally with the Office of Financial Aid as well as with the Board of Directors of the Stark State College Foundation.

Improvements: The Foundation experienced a 140% increase over the three-year period in scholarship dollars.

Outcome Measure 5: Pct. Employee giving, Annual campaign

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

% Employee Giving	14-15	15-16	16-17	% of change
Stark State College Foundation	71%	72%	62%	13% decrease

Findings: Due to numerous retirements of employees and fewer employees overall, there was a 13% decrease over the three year period in the number of employees participating.

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Foundation, Executive Council, and the Team Captains (internal volunteers) who help facilitate the internal campaign.

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 6: Employee giving Total \$, YOY change/ FTE

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

% Employee Giving	14-15	15-16	16-17	% of change
-------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------------

Findings:	Stark State College Foundation	\$66,066	\$65,941	\$51,054	23% decrease
------------------	--------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	--------------

Findings: Due to numerous retirements of employees and fewer employees overall, there is a 23% decrease in the dollar amount of employee giving.

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed by the Board of Directors of the Foundation, Executive Council, and the Team Captains (internal volunteers) who help facilitate the internal campaign.

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 7: Total # new donors YOY

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

Total new donors YOY	14-15	15-16	16-17	% of change
Stark State College	99 donors	128 donors	71 donors	28 % decrease

Findings: There is a 28% decrease over the three year average, but mid-term 23% increase, indicating this measurement may not be consistent in reflecting growth.

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed internally with Advancement staff and also with the Board of Directors of the Stark State College Foundation.

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 8: Total # external donors YOY

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

Total # external donors	14-15	15-16	16-17	% of change
Stark State College	474 donors	533 donors	435 donors	8 % decrease

Findings: There is an 8% decrease in the total number of external donors over the three-year Period; however, donations have increased in dollar amount due to our focus on increasing the giving of current donors.

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed internally with Advancement staff and also with the Board of Directors of the Stark State College Foundation.

Improvements: NA

Goal 3: Alumni: Build Alumni/College Relationship

Outcome Measure 1: Alumni giving YOY change

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings:

VSE: Alumni giving YOY	14-15	15-16	16-17	% change
Stark State College Foundation	\$27,541	\$21,026	\$28,361	3% increase

Findings: There is a 3% increase over the three-year period, but this percentage is greatly impacted by the annual Foundation Strategic Plan.

Review Committee/Review Process:

Improvements: There is a 3% increase over the three-year period in Alumni Giving.

Outcome Measure 2: Alumni Task Force Recommendations

Terms of Assessment: Fall NA Spring NA Annual NA

Findings: Previous administration decided not to move forward with the Alumni Task Force Recommendations. A new alumni revival plan is in the works as a collaboration between Advancement and Career Services.

Review Committee/Review Process:

Improvements:

Goal 4: To provide high quality support services to students, employees, and the Foundation Board

Outcome Measure 1: Support Services Effectiveness Survey*

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X (rotates)

*** rotates between Advancement and Strategic Grants annually**

Findings: While the Advancement ratings improved in almost every category from 2013 to 2017, Strategic Grants did not. This is reflective of the staff that is no longer with the College and left in 2017. Our new grants officers' service-focus will be reflected in the next survey results.

	Meets personally with you	Speaks by phone with you	Provides help when needed	Exhibits solid understanding of issues	Provides accurate, helpful information	Shows courtesy and respect	Demonstrates appropriate level of confidentiality	Responds in timely manner	
Advancement	2013	2.78	2.80	3.06	2.87	3.13	3.51	3.38	3.19
	2015	2.60	2.63	2.90	2.69	2.85	3.01	3.11	2.97
	2017	2.98	3.10	3.15	3.09	3.19	3.37	3.39	3.28

	Meets personally with you	Speaks by phone with you	Provides help when needed	Exhibits solid understanding of issues	Provides accurate, helpful information	Shows courtesy and respect	Demonstrates appropriate level of confidentiality	Responds in timely manner	
Strategic Grants	2012	3.41	3.38	3.37	3.29	3.29	3.41	3.45	3.24
	2014	3.04	3.11	3.16	3.18	3.10	3.27	3.24	3.16
	2016	3.04	3.04	2.98	2.97	3.05	3.14	3.21	3.20

Review Committee/Review Process: This information is reviewed internally by the Advancement and Strategic Grants Staff.

Improvements: Advancement ratings were up in all categories over the three year period, with the exception of Shows Courtesy and Respect, which dipped in 2015 but rebounded in 2017.

Outcome Measure 2: Foundation Board Focus Group

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual _____

Findings: NA

Review Committee/Review Process: NA

Improvements: NA

Outcome Measure 3: Student Testimonials (Letters)

Terms of Assessment: Fall _____ Spring _____ Annual X

Findings: Several letters are attached for reference.

Review Committee/Review Process: The letters are reviewed annually by the Advancement staff and sent to the appropriate donors to show gratitude for scholarships.

Improvements: N/A

Criterion 4.0 Program/Department members are qualified by professional background, experience, and continuing professional development and meet the needs of the Program/Department.

Yes	No	DNA		
X			4.1	Employee (full-time and part-time) credentials meet the program, college, state, and national accreditation requirements.
X			4.2	Annual Employee Performance Evaluations are on record in Human Resources.
X			4.3	Employees (full-time and part-time) are involved in professional organizations, presentations, and/or other scholarly works.
X			4.4	Employees are involved in the development of program/department initiatives that support the College Mission.

Additional Comments: (Please explain any “No” selections.)

Reflective Narrative Questions:

1. Describe how Performance Evaluations are being used to enhance the Program/Department.

Performance Evaluations are on record for each employee in the Advancement and Strategic Grants Division. The process of evaluating employees allows for the establishment of SMART goals that drive a dialogue focused on employee performance and development. The evaluations allow for employees to express obstacles that are getting in the way of progress and to tout success and where they are growing. In addition, the evaluations allow the supervisor the opportunity to provide positive feedback on great work and comments on areas of potential improvement. The evaluations help enhance the growth and efforts of the division, provide a culminating conversation that sums up the various conversations and efforts throughout the year, and set the stage for the next fiscal year.

2. Describe how professional development benefits the program.

The Advancement and Grants Division is continually seeking professional development in order to stay informed of new opportunities and new strategies in fundraising and grant writing. The division holds a membership with the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). The grants team attends the annual CASE Conference for Grant Writers in November, and the executive director attends the annual CASE Conference for Chief Advancement Officers in the spring. Additional conferences are evaluated for other members based on content and speakers. In addition, the division holds a membership with the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP) and attends various local sessions throughout the year based on topic. When a conference or session is attended, the material is reviewed at a team meeting and key

takeaways are highlighted. New ideas have been implemented to help move the division and its efforts forward after each professional development opportunity has been completed.

3. Describe how employees are involved in the development of program/department initiatives that support the College Mission.

As a fundraising arm for the College, the Advancement and Grants team is integral to the development of initiatives that support the College Mission.

The team

- meets with various departments to discuss current and new program ideas and what funding is needed;
- presents the funding concepts to Executive Council for approval to seek funding;
- and works with various subject matter experts throughout the College to develop grant and funding proposals that support the College Mission.

Recently, one of our grants officers became certified in Compression Planning. Compression planning is a unique way to meet and tackle a large problem or develop a grant-funded program plan within a compressed amount of time. She has been facilitating various sessions across the College to help solve problems and create opportunities that directly support the College Mission.

Criterion 5.0 Program/Department is responsive to changes in current technology and adequate resources.

Yes	No	DNA		
X			5.1	Program/Department changes are consistent with technological and scientific advances, and Program/Department content incorporates new developments in the field.
X			5.2	Employees work with supervisors to ensure adequate and current resources available for the Program/Department.
X			5.3	Employees work with information technology staff to ensure availability of appropriate software and hardware components.

Additional Comments: (Please explain any “No” selections.)

Reflective Narrative Questions:

1. Explain the changing conditions within the field.

In today’s society change is constant and requires continual learning and knowledge in any field. In the world of fundraising, conditions are no different. Individual donor expectations vary with some preferring old-fashioned solicitation and appeal approaches, while others want the flexibility and convenience of online options for both solicitation and donation. Additionally, grant funding organizations vary in submission expectations, with some still requiring multiple

paper copies of requests mailed to a physical location and others setting up online portals where everything is submitted electronically. Even the government grants have recently moved to an online workspace for all submissions that requires staff training to navigate and submit a request.

In addition to donors and funders changing how they want to be contacted, fundraising professionals have created new events and opportunities for fundraising. *Giving Tuesday* is a prime example of an online, one-day donation event that is recognized world-wide. The Tuesday after *Black Friday* has become so popular that standing out among the hundreds of thousands of non-profits participating is a strategy that requires training. Other institutions and non-profits have coined their own *Giving Tuesday* events during different times of the year in order to create an urgency to give within a deadline to their specific causes.

The landscape of fundraising and grants will always be dynamic and require constant research and learning. Professionals will need to remain nimble as we navigate the desires and wishes of our older donors along with the constantly changing technology and desires of our younger donors.

2. How are these changing conditions addressed within the Program/Department?

The Advancement and Grants Division addresses these changing conditions in several ways:

- keeping informed and educated through trade-publication subscriptions;
- attending conferences and seminars that cover new trends in grants and fundraising;
- networking and learning from our peers at other institutions;
- performing online research and following the efforts of the top institutions in the country;
- talking to our current and prospective donors to make sure we are meeting their needs;
- and continually seeking additional resources to stay ahead of the curve.

3. Explain how employees work with information technology staff to ensure availability of appropriate software and hardware components.

The Advancement and Grants Division relies heavily on information technology (IT) staff for upgrades to our donor database (Raisers Edge) and other support services. Recently, we upgraded to Raisers Edge NXT, which provides a cloud-based function that can be accessed from a smart phone. The IT staff members not only helped us migrate our current data to the new system, but also ensured the information was easily accessible through an application on our phones.

The team also relies on the staff members of information technology anytime there is an issue with one of our systems or a new technology we want to explore.

Component IV

Recommendations and Executive Summary

Based on the results of this current CAR, list your strengths, areas of improvement, opportunities, threats, and recommendations.

Program/Department: Advancement and Strategic Grants

Strengths:

We have a dedicated, small staff that will work tirelessly to garner support for the College. Our staff is thirsty for knowledge and willing to learn. The Stark State College Foundation is a great strength to support our Advancement and Grants efforts with a body of volunteers who are ready to open doors and offer support. Leadership believes in the work we do, which allows continued opportunities for professional development and growth for the team.

Areas of improvement:

Staff is very small in numbers and has limited time to devote to a multitude of projects. Our grants team is fairly new and will continue to grow and learn about larger grant opportunities.

Opportunities:

The Stark State College Akron location has opened a door to new fundraising opportunities and a new geography of donors to cultivate and solicit. When the Federal Government begins to open up funding opportunities again, we have an opportunity to leverage our workforce and apprenticeship programs, among others.

Threats:

Time is always a threat, or at least having enough time to accomplish what we need to with a small team. Mission creep is a threat as we compete for funding against other institutions and non-profits that may be creeping into our open-access mission.

Priority Recommendations: *(For each area listed below, please number all recommendations as they will be prioritized on the [Summary Work Plan - Appendix A](#). Sufficient support for the recommendations must be included, either by reference to responses in the components or specific Criterion or by additional information included with this program review.)*

Additional Information. On occasion, some programs may have additional documents that they feel should be included to complete the self-study. Supporting documents may include such things as program self-study reports, case study reports, survey statistics, focus group data, etc. All supporting documentation must be dated within this CAR period. Please list below the additional documents that you will be adding to this CAR in support of your recommendations.