



Evaluating The IR Office

AIR 2000 Forum

Frank Doherty

James Madison University



The Need

- SACS Criteria
- Accountability
- JMU Institutional Effectiveness
 - Proactive
 - First in line



JMU OIR Evaluation

- 1992 SACS Visiting Team Report
 - “Although OPA (now OIR) has occasionally evaluated the usefulness of some of its products and services, evaluation has not been established as a routine matter. Thus, *the Committee recommends that the University establish regular and ongoing evaluation mechanisms for the institutional research function.*”

User-Oriented



-
-
- Objective is program improvement
 - Seek information that will improve office
 - Control of evaluation is very important

Program Design



-
- You cannot evaluate that which you cannot describe.
 - Several ways to describe
 - Discrepancy Evaluation Model
 - Systems approach
 - | Inputs
 - | Processes
 - | Outputs
 - Compare performance with standard
 - OIR Program Design
 - Network
 - IPO

Evaluation Design



- Control
- Concerns
 - Program-specific
 - Common
- Questions
- Information sources/methodology
- OIR Evaluation Design

Program Review Team



-
- Consists of 8-10 JMU staff recommended by OIR
 - Chair not from OIR--appointed by VP
 - Collect data
 - Write report and recommendations
 - Recommendations discussed with VP
 - Annual objectives developed to address recommendations

Ongoing Program Review



-
-
- OIR program review is conducted every three years
 - Annual online survey
 - Accountability and use of results
 - Annual objectives based on recommendations



Summary

- IR evaluation should be:
 - Thorough
 - User-oriented
 - On-going and accountable
- OIR evaluation report
 - <http://www.jmu.edu/instresrch/present/air99/oireval.pdf>
- Questions?