

Recognition Report

BLACK HAWK COLLEGE

May 23, 2012
ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Illinois Community College Board
RECOGNITION REPORT and RESPONSE
FOR
BLACK HAWK COLLEGE
MAY 23, 2012

INTRODUCTION

During fiscal year 2012, the Illinois Community College Board conducted a recognition evaluation for Black Hawk College. Recognition is a statutory term describing the status of a district which meets instructional, administrative, financial, facility and equipment standards as established by the Illinois Community College Board. All community colleges must be officially recognized to be eligible for state funding. Based on a five-year cycle, recognition evaluations are conducted to assure that colleges are in compliance with these standards. All colleges are evaluated on a select number of standards during the same five-year cycle. The standards selected for review during the current five-year cycle are classified into five categories - Instruction, Student Services/Academic Support, Finance/Facilities, and Accountability. This report is organized by those categories and focuses on the findings and recommendations for each standard.

The report contains two types of recommendations. Compliance recommendations are those for which the college was found to be out of compliance with a given state statute or administrative rule. Advisory recommendations are made in instances where the review team identified areas that it believes would be beneficial for the college to examine or pursue. The latter are suggestions only.

The staff of the Illinois Community College Board wishes to thank the college for its assistance and efforts in conducting this review and its attempts to meet the standards examined in the review. The Board acknowledges that the college is involved in numerous positive activities, processes and initiatives that are not reflected in the report and commends the institution for its many efforts on behalf of students.

EVALUATIONS RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. INSTRUCTION

1a. Degrees and Certificates

A comparison between the college catalog and the curriculum master file indicates that all degree and certificate programs have been approved by ICCB. Further review of their offerings indicates that all degree and certificate programs meet the credit hour ranges and the general education requirements as defined in the ICCB Administrative Rules. Staff found the following discrepancies between the catalog and the curriculum master file beyond what the college identified in their self study Evaluation for existing programs.

The following programs appear as active on the College's Curriculum Master File, but do not appear in the college catalog:

- 0515/5061 Technical Communications AAS
- 0516/5771 Warehouse & Distribution Specialist Certificate
- ACCT/5060 Accounting AAS

Compliance Recommendation:

The college has indicated these programs are planned for inactivation/withdrawal from their offerings and the appropriate paperwork for the Curriculum Master File to be updated will be submitted this spring.

Black Hawk College Response: *During the Program Review process, faculty evaluate programs and make recommendations regarding the programs status to the Dean and Vice President of Instruction. Recommendations for “inactive or withdrawal” status are forwarded to the Curriculum Committee for final processing. The Vice President for Instruction reviewed the status of the above mentioned programs and determined that the programs identified should be deleted with an effective date of 6/1/2012. The deletion of the programs and also appended courses if applicable were processed through the Curriculum Committee. (April 27, 2012) The forms to complete the deletion transactions were completed by the office of the Vice President for Instruction with “Recognition” noted and faxed to Tricia Broughton, ICCB as requested. (May 7, 2012)*

1b. Articulation

The college offers an Associate in Arts and an Associate in Science. The specific degree requirements parallel the recommendations of IAI in most regards. The college also offers the Associate in Arts in Teaching (AAT) in three areas: Early Childhood Education, Secondary Math, and Special Education. All AAT degree descriptions listed in the graduation requirements section of the 2011 catalog appear to include accurate information regarding all components of the degree.

A comparison of general education courses listed on the college's IAI GECC Planning Worksheet (available on their website) with those that have been approved for the Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) General Education Core Curriculum (GECC) shows that all courses are IAI GECC approved.

A review of articulation exhibits from a random selection of 24 PCS 1.1 courses showed that all courses are being articulated per ICCB Rules.

Advisory (Quality) Recommendation: The GECC Degree Planning Worksheet accurately reflects the college's IAI approved courses; the AA/AS Degree Planning Worksheet lists some non-IAI approved courses as options to fulfill the GECC requirements of the degree. It is recommended that the college indicate that the following courses are not IAI approved on the AA/AS Degree Planning Worksheet for the benefit of the students: CS 100, CS 101, CS 210, AG 288, ECON 270, SBS 200, SPEC 175.

As reported in the self-study, the college indicated that the AAT curriculum guides have been removed from the college website in response to ICCB's directive of not admitting new students to the AAT degree programs; however it should be noted that the AAT – Special Education Degree Planning Worksheet is still available on the website. The degree requirements are also included in the 2011 catalog. The college shall continue to monitor statewide changes regarding teacher preparation and the AAT degrees, then make changes as necessary in their catalog and on the website.

Black Hawk College Response: Revised degree planning worksheets now clearly identify courses which do not meet IAI requirements, although they may meet Black Hawk College's graduation requirements (CS100, CS101, CS210, AG288, Econ270, SBS200 and SPEC175). These worksheets are now available to students and appear on the website at:

<http://www.bhc.edu/academics/degree-requirements/transferring/> and
<http://www.bhc.edu/academics/transfer-information/successful-transfer/>

All references to the ATT Special Education Degree Planning Worksheets have been removed from the website as well as the 2012-2013 catalog.

1c. Dual Credit

As part of the April, 2012 Recognition review, information was examined from the self study report regarding Black Hawk College dual credit programs. Data and materials were then requested from the college in order to determine if institutional policies and practices were in compliance with ICCB Administrative Rules 1501.507-11 A-G. As part of this process, 50 dual credit faculty files, 50 dual credit class rosters and 100 individual dual credit student transcripts were reviewed.

Part A: State Laws and Regulations and Accreditation Standards.

Based on the review, staff concluded that all state laws, ICCB regulations, accreditation standards specified by the North Central Association and local college policies that apply to courses, instructional procedures and academic standards at the college apply as well to students; faculty and staff associated with dual credit courses at Black Hawk College.

Part B: Instructors.

The ICCB Recognition Team provided the college with a sample of 30 faculty names in order to perform a file transcript review. The transcript review confirmed that the college had requisite transcripts for all 30 faculty members, and all possess the appropriate degrees/credentials to teach the classes in question.

Part C: Qualification of Students.

The ICCB Recognition Team selected 50 dual credit courses for examination. From that, the ICCB provided the college with a sample of 100 student names in order to perform a transcript review. All students fulfilled the appropriate course placement requirement, and were in the 11th or 12th grade at the time of enrollment.

Part D: Placement Testing and Prerequisites.

Based on a review of 100 dual credit student transcripts, there were no issues found.

Part E: Course Offerings.

A review of the list of dual credit courses offered during fiscal year 2011 provided evidence that courses are selected from articulated transfer courses or from first-year courses in ICCB approved career and technical curricula.

Part F: Course Requirements.

Dual credit courses and on-campus courses at Black Hawk College share the same college-level curriculum, competencies, and methods for evaluating student achievement of learning outcomes.

Part G: Concurrent Credit.

The award of high school credit for the course is the responsibility of the high school according to its established policies and practices at Black Hawk College.

Recommendations: None.

1d. Assessment Plans.

Black Hawk College has an assessment plan that clearly indicates that the quality of teaching and learning is valued. The college regularly utilizes data from the assessment of student learning for the improvement of curriculum, teaching and student learning. The college's self study demonstrates that there has been thinking in advance about how the information will be used, and by whom. It also demonstrates that the process of assessment has been integrated into the college as

a whole.

Recommendation: None.

1e. Faculty Qualifications/Polices.

This analysis is based on a review of the Black Hawk College self study report, along with supplemental data supplied by the college. The ICCB Recognition Team provided the college with a sample of 50 faculty names in order to perform a file transcript review. Of those, the college had requisite transcripts for 31 faculty members. Thirty faculty possess a Masters or a Ph.D. degree. One is listed as a “BA of Ministry-Secretarial Science.”

As a result of this review, it is apparent that Black Hawk College policies regarding faculty qualifications are aligned with ICCB Administrative Rule.

Advisory Quality Recommendation: Black Hawk College should ensure that all faculty files contain required transcripts.

***Black Hawk College Response:** The application for employment procedures at Black Hawk College (BHC) have been improved through the implementation of a new Human Resource online application process. As a result, any applicant who meets the criteria and becomes a candidate for a position will have to provide, via online, their cover letter, references and transcripts and will have completed the BHC application form. Transcripts are evaluated by the hiring committee, by the Dean and Vice President for Instruction, prior to a hiring recommendation. The office of Human Resources requests official transcript be provided prior to a faculty member's employment start date. Faculty who have been employed from several to many years, may not have transcripts in their files. The administration has worked with the Faculty Senates to request and encourage faculty to provide transcript copies, but that process has not been completely successful. However, the recent online process mandates that transcripts be provided in the application packet.*

2. STUDENT SERVICES/ACADEMIC SUPPORT

2a. Student Services/Academic Support.

Part A: Advising and Counseling.

Black Hawk College has a comprehensive and organized program of academic advising and career counseling. Increased collaboration between Advising and Career Services staff has been the focus recently in an effort to provide more comprehensive career assessment for their students. Advisor training is offered continually through an online, interactive course utilizing WebCT. The course objectives align with Council for Advancement of Standards (CAS), National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) Core Values and the Black Hawk

College Strategic Plan. The college has also recognized the need for increased confidentiality for students during advising and counseling sessions and is in the process of creating a new space for these areas.

Advisory Quality Recommendation: Continue to focus on Advising and Career Services to provide a comprehensive career assessment for students.

Black Hawk College Response: *Using the College's institutional model for unit planning and assessment, the Advising Center and Career Services Center will continue to develop advising and career services to meet the needs of all students. A recent improvement is the establishment of a student planning tool for students to store and record relevant information including a section dedicated specifically to career planning information. This section of the student planning tool includes websites for self-guided assessments, contact information for the Career Services Center where various assessments may be recommended and administered, and a section to record assessment results. Two advisors are now dedicated to working with students, assisting them with their interpretation of assessment results and in their development of further plans. The Advising Center and Career Services will jointly evaluate the career decision-making section of this new student planning tool annually and make recommended improvements.*

In addition, all new deciding students will have the opportunity to participate in a workshop that will introduce them to various resources aimed at assisting them in making career decisions. At the completion of the workshop, students will be encouraged to explore their options for exploration and then meet individually with identified advisors to discuss the results of their exploration and make further recommendations if needed. Based upon feedback from students, revisions may be made in order to continue improving the content of the workshop.

Part B: Financial Aid.

The Financial Aid Office at Black Hawk College provides students with information and access to financial support by telephone, appointments, and through the college website. The Financial Aid Office also recently remodeled to add an interactive computer area for students to complete their online FAFSAs, loan applications, entrance counseling, and scholarship applications. This area is helpful for students who may not have internet access at home and for those who have questions and would like staff assistance while completing the forms. Black Hawk's Financial Aid Office has also been evaluating their processes and as a result has reduced the number of "required" forms to speed up the file completion time and will begin in fiscal year 2013 emailing award letters to speed the notification process.

Recommendation: None.

Part C: Placement.

The staff of the Career Planning and Placement office serves the needs of students, alumni, community residents, staff, faculty and employers via individual appointments, online job placement site, web, email and phone requests/questions and through an annual job fair. Indicators of quality include 95 percent satisfaction level from survey results. The college also hosts over 70 employers and 1,000 students and community members annually at the job fair.

Recommendation: None.

Part D: Access

Black Hawk College's Office of Disability Services requested an independent evaluation of their website by a local disabilities organization. They were found to primarily be accessible to persons with disabilities with the exception of a few videos that were not captioned. The college is working to update those areas and making every effort to be fully accessible through their website.

Recommendation: None.

3. FINANCE/FACILITIES**3a. Credit Hour Claim Verification.**

ICCB staff conducted a day and a half visit at the college beginning on Tuesday March 6th, 2012 and concluding on Wednesday March 7th, 2012. During this visit ICCB staff reviewed a sample of credit hours reported in the college's SU and SR instructional credit hour submissions and certified as correct by the CEO and CFO. The credit hours were used in the Illinois Community College System funding calculations. ICCB staff selected approximately 150 course sections in the Summer 2010, Fall 2010, and Spring 2011 semesters for fiscal year 2013 funding calculations. The college uses Banner software application and the sample selected utilized an electronic midterm signature process. However, the midterm certification documentation provided for us to verify credit hour claims did not readily do so and additional information had to be requested thereby slowing the review process considerably. As part of the review, ICCB staff reviewed specific midterm class lists and final grade sheets, student demographic and transcript information to support residency status and final grade postings, supporting documentation for classification between the SU and SR records, and supporting documentation for chargeback and cooperative agreement claims. College systems, residency verification, and claiming of students who repeat classes were evaluated.

Systems**Claims processing issues**

The college's self study, as well as a ICCB review of the college's external audits, identified instances where midterm class list information was not available to

external auditors to test the reliability of the college's processes affecting the accuracy of credit hour claim submissions. The self-study reports that a position in Enrollment Services was redesigned and filled in fiscal year 2009 to correct this deficiency. Based on the ICCB review, the printed midterm class lists provided do not contain the relevant information that is needed to properly evaluate the course sections and eligibility of hours for funding as illustrated on page III-24 of the MIS Manual. Information contained in the college's printed midterm class list should be modeled after the ICCB illustrated midterm class list in the ICCB MIS Manual.

The college recently migrated to an electronic midterm signature process but the reports provided during our review failed to provide pertinent information to substantiate its ICCB credit hour claim on the midterm certification document. The online Faculty Web Step by Step Tutorial instructs faculty to electronically identify students who are not actively pursuing completion of the course at the midterm by entering date of last attendance rather than a "V" for Verified (actively pursuing course completion) in the grade column when certifying online at the midpoint of the class but the administration should not rely on faculty to revisit that tutorial every semester. While evidence of other regular methods of communication with faculty was not provided during the visit, the Registrar's office does indicate MS outlook reminders, e-mails, and web portal announcements are sent directly to faculty each semester. All of these informational communications are very important to maintain reliability of the process.

The complexity of the coding system utilized by the college in its programming logic for state reporting requires a thorough understanding of the meaning of the codes, the appropriate use of the codes, and the impact of the codes on state reporting. The complexity seems to unintentionally undermine the intent of the midterm certification process. Instances were found where improper codes were input to student records and the hours were reported as reimbursable and claimed for state funding that should have been reported as non reimbursable and not claimed for state funding. As an example, students who never attended class were given a D1 code and should not have been claimed for state funding, however, later in the semester students originally coded with a D1 petitioned the college for a tuition refund and a Q8 code (75 percent refund attended past midterm) was entered in the system rather than a Q6 code (75 percent refund never attended). Improper use of the Q8 code and other later activity codes such as S4 (student withdraw) when initiated after the midterm are allowed to override a student's previous status (D1) as not claimable and subsequently be improperly claimed for state funding. Further, the programming logic allows withdraw dates that are greater than or equal to the midterm date to be reported as reimbursable for state funding. The programming logic should only allow withdraw dates that are greater than the midterm date to be reported as reimbursable as long as the withdrawal does not override a previous Last Date of Attendance (LDA) or student withdraw before the midterm of the class. It was our impression during the site visit the various departmental personnel involved in the process did not thoroughly understand the

meaning and use of codes individually or in conjunction with other codes and their impact on the accuracy of the credit hour claim process. Numerous instances of human error in generally classifying students for state funding were found impacting residency status and the overall reimbursable credit hour claim. These were found in a relatively small sampling of course sections reviewed which if extrapolated to the entire submission could result in a significant impact.

Compliance Recommendation: In order to be in compliance, the college needs to 1) evaluate its processes and procedures, and modify where necessary, to ensure codes entered on a student record after the midterm date do not subsequently override a Last Date of Attendance (LDA) entered by the instructor to indicate the student was not actively pursuing course completion, and 2) change program logic in the credit hour claiming program to ensure students who withdraw on the midterm term date are classified as non reimbursable on the ICCB credit hour claim submission.

Black Hawk College Response: *BHC does allow currently for any student to be reinstated in classes if the instructor authorizes. This includes those dropped previously for non-attendance (D1). BHC also currently allows for those students who were dropped for non-attendance or anyone else dropped with anything less than 100% refund, to submit a refund appeal. Although a complex set of codes are used, Enrollment Services staff have been trained in a coordinated effort by the office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness and the Registrar. Last date of attendance has been confirmed to be captured and entered into the student system. The ICCB credit hour claim submission programming logic will be modified to ensure this field will not be overridden with the exception of when students meet the requirements defined in the Administrative Rules Section 1501.507-C Student Requirements #2. The Registrar's office has undergone significant staff and leadership turnover in the past 12 months and the current Registrar has resigned for employment in another higher education institution. Additionally the MIS Coordinator will be retiring effective June 30th. The College, once new staff are hired and trained, will reevaluate this process and the credit hour claim program logic early in the fall FY2013 term to ensure compliance with ICCB.*

Advisory (Quality) Recommendations: It is suggested the college 1) examine its programming logic and use of numerous codes for various reasons and, where possible, consider streamlining, simplifying, and modifying the process to ensure more accurate credit claim reporting. As one suggestion, the administration could instruct faculty to utilize a "NAP" code to specifically identify students "Not Actively Pursuing" course completion on the midterm class certification. NAP would never be overridden by the credit hour claim program unless the student received a passing grade of A, B, C, or D and 2) ensure its certified midterm class list contains the information illustrated in the sample midterm class list referenced in the ICCB MIS Manual which reflects the students status at the midpoint of the class.

Black Hawk College Response:

During FY2011, Black Hawk College did conduct several meetings to evaluate, question and streamline its use of registration status codes. While several codes were streamline there still are numerous codes, not all however, are accessible during a semester. Codes are used according to three time frames that correspond to ICCB key dates:

- Codes that will identify that a student was not in attendance on or after the refund period (official enrollment/10th day)*
- Codes that will identify that a student was in attendance up to mid-term date (to include Mid-term)*
- Codes that will identify that a student was in attendance after mid-term*

Students who are not actively pursuing course completion are identified on the midterm compliance roster by the last date of attendance and a null grade field. The current midterm compliance process does not allow for a three letter code such as "NAP". The need for an "NAP" code will not be necessary as students not actively pursuing a course will be identified on the Midterm Compliance Roster with a null midterm grade and a last date of attendance. A Missing midterm grade report is scheduled to run the business day after rosters are closed. This report produces any situation where there is no grade and no last date of attendance. These instances are researched by the Registrar's office for compliance.

The credit hour claim programming logic will be modified to include the use of the last date of attendance and will not be overridden unless a student is reinstated and completes the course with a passing grade.

A review comparing the ICCB MIS Manual sample Midterm Class list to both the Black Hawk College paper Midterm Roster and the Electronic Midterm Roster was completed 05/23/2012. The following changes are currently being processed.

Paper Rosters will be modified to include funding category, residency code, repeat auditor, and a summery number of the students attending at midterm.

The electronic website used to document midterm compliance contains the necessary information to accurately certify students actively pursuing course completion. However the current query that runs to print a mirror copy of the electronic Midterm Compliance Roster does not contain all the fields as identified on the MIS Manual Midterm Roster sample. The query will be modified to produce a true mirror image of the Midterm Compliance roster.

Record classification process

According to the college, identifying a course that is to be classified as an SR is decentralized and done by the instructional departments. This is done by changing a code in the Banner software system for that specific course section. Three reports are then processed and used to ensure courses funded with more than 50 percent restricted funds are coded with an R and are properly classified on the ICCB credit hour claim. A majority of the course sections impacted are Adult Education courses. Nothing came to our attention that indicated this process is not working properly.

Advisory (Quality) Recommendation: It is suggested that business office staff (or other appropriate staff) highlight and identify any non-recurring college revenue from restricted grant funds that pays more than 50 percent of course costs to ensure such course sections are properly classified as SR on the ICCB credit hour claim before fiscal year end.

Black Hawk College Response: *The Finance and Planning and Institutional Effectiveness offices collaborated on a new sub process to validate sections being identified as restricted (R) for SU purposes. On a semester basis the Finance Office will evaluate instructor contracts by fund and their associated course load. This information will then be matched to those sections identified as 'R's and those that are unrestricted in the SU/SR process. The office of Planning and Institutional Effectives will process the SU/SR report upon confirmation by the Finance office the data are consistent with payroll and expenditures. For the remaining of FY2012, a prototype process was used to evaluate restricted course activity. The Information Technology department is currently working on the computer programming logic to automate the process for FY2013.*

Residency

Based on a review of residency records, it was found that the student's residency status was generally accurately submitted on credit hour claims. One instance was found in the sample reviewed where a student was improperly classified as in-district while their student demographic information reported them as a Fulton, Illinois resident. College staff at East Campus indicated this was human error. Of the sample examined no other instances occurred. Further, it was found that the college reported only 40 of the eligible 57 chargeback credit hours in its fiscal year 2011 external audit and to the ICCB. College officials report this was due to a staff resignation which resulted in a specific internal verification step not being performed. Fortunately, the college does not issue many chargeback authorizations and the amount in question is immaterial as it impacts equalization funding. College staff indicates they are reviewing these processing and will make changes to prevent staff changes from causing future reoccurrences due to staff vacancies and turnover.

Advisory (Quality) Recommendation: It is suggested, that once completed, the

college provide the ICCB with an update to summarize changes made to its processes and procedures that would help ensure that gathering and reporting of chargeback and cooperative agreement hours are done consistently from year to year and will be verified for accuracy and completeness before the data is submitted to the ICCB and used in the college's external audit.

Black Hawk College Response: *The College convened a team of front line staff involved in one or more steps of the current chargeback process and using the College's process improvement methodology created an "as is" flow chart of the process. During the first meeting the staff from the offices of the Vice President of Instruction, Bursar, Finance and the office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness reviewed the current process beginning with the student request to take courses at other colleges and ending with the submission of the state report claiming the student. The team identified efficiency improvements and recommended process changes ("can be" flow chart) that better align the student request, approval, recording, budget reconciliation and reporting process steps. The current process has five offices responsible for various steps of the process while the improved and approved process now places the responsibility for the student request and approval, recording and budget reconciliation with the office of the Vice President for Instruction and the state reporting and audit reconciliation processes are now the responsibility of Accounting Services.*

Repeats

The selected sample of course sections was reviewed to determine the college's compliance with repeatability rules. The repeat check process is automated. Programming logic is built into the SU/SR claims submission program with specific number of times a course may be repeated. Any student that meets the repeat ineligibility rules according to ICCB administrative rules is placed as non-reimbursable in the credit hour claim. From reviewing a small sampling of actual student transcript information, Black Hawk's process generally appears to be working as intended when classifying students' hours on the ICCB credit hour claim according to their repeat status. Repeat programming logic is intertwined with general coding and in at least one example provided by the college resulted in a non reimbursable code being assigned to the student record because of the combination of other codes. See comments in the system claims processing section of this standard.

3b. Financial Planning.

The college indicates in its self-study that its Board of Trustees periodically (twice in the last five years) reviews a three year financial plan which includes trend history, sources and uses of funds, and capital project information. The financial planning process includes comparative information for the college's ICCB identified peer group. The college has not permanently spent any of the working

cash fund and in some years has not even transferred the earned interest from the working cash fund. Further, the Board, in fiscal year 2010, adopted an operating fund balance policy requiring a 17 - 25 percent of operating expenditures fund balance policy. As fund operating fund balances had been extremely low and no policy had been in place prior to fiscal year 2010. This policy creation in addition to credit hour assumptions and financial restatements helps to explain the large percentage increase identified below.

Revenues, expenditures, and operating fund balances for 2007-2011 were also examined as part of the desk audit. On average, the college receives 26 percent of its revenues from ICCB grants compared to 17 percent on a statewide basis. Student tuition and local property taxes provide 41 percent and 28.5 percent, respectively, compared to 36 percent and 41 percent on a statewide basis. The five-year average of salaries and benefits represent 76 percent of expenditures compared to 74 percent on a statewide basis. Operating fund balances (education, operations and maintenance funds) have an average balance of \$7.1 million over the last five years compared to the statewide average of \$12.4 million. The college's fund balances are below the statewide average but have increased approximately 3700 percent from \$270,000 to \$10,500,000 during the five-year period, while statewide growth in fund balances during the same period was 62 percent. While the increase occurred in both the Education and the Operations and Maintenance Funds, the majority of the increase was in the Education Fund. The increase, as mentioned above, is primarily attributable to a targeted operating fund balance policy adopted by the Board in fiscal year 2010, restatement of financial statements, and district credit hour assumptions. The college's operating fund balance to expenditures ratio over the five years are 22.4 percent compared to the statewide ratio of 37.6 percent. This ratio represents the amount of fund balance in reserve to pay operating expenditures. The higher the ratio, the more in reserve; the lower the ratio, the less in reserve. The college's fund balance to revenue ratio over the five years was 21 percent compared to the statewide ratio of 28 percent. The higher the ratio the more fund balance available to compensate for revenue reductions. The college's expenditures to revenue ratio over the five years were .96 compared to the statewide ratio of .94. Ratios over one indicate expenditures in excess of revenues and more of a reliance on fund balance whereas a ratio of less than one indicates revenues in excess of expenditures and less of a reliance on fund balance.

Recommendation: None.

3c. Financial Compliance.

Part A: Annual External Audit.

The annual external audits for fiscal years 2007 through 2011 were reviewed. For the years reviewed, the audits were submitted by the requested due. All fiscal years had the required information and the college was given unqualified opinions.

The Government Finance Officers Association's (GFOA) Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting (CAFR) Program is designed to recognize and encourage excellence in financial reporting by state and local governments. A college's effort and dedication to achieve such a distinction is an indicator of quality in financial reporting. The college has applied for and received the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) financial statement award for the years reviewed.

Recommendation: None.

Part B: College Budget.

The college budgets for fiscal years 2008 through 2012 were reviewed. For each year reviewed, the budgets were submitted before the due date and published in the prescribed format. The budget hearings were appropriately advertised for each year reviewed. Each year's budget was adopted by the September 30 due date.

The Government Finance Officers Association's (GFOA) Distinguished Budget Presentation Award is designed to encourage governments to prepare budget documents of the highest quality to meet the needs of decision makers and citizens. A college's effort and dedication to achieve such a distinction is an indicator of quality in budgetary reporting. The college has applied for and received the Government Finance Officers Association budget award for the years reviewed.

Recommendation: None.

Part C: Published Financial Statements.

The published financial statements for fiscal years 2007 through 2011 were reviewed. All fiscal years reviewed were submitted before the December due date. All years reviewed were published by the required November 15 publication date and in the required format.

Recommendation: None.

Part D: Tax Levy

The tax levies from 2008 through 2012 were reviewed. All years reviewed contained the proper filings and were all done by the required dates. For the years reviewed the Certificate of Tax Levy was submitted to the ICCB by the due date.

Recommendation: None.

Part E: Bidding and Awarding of Contracts.

During ICCB's March 6th -7th visit on campus, Board minutes from the previous two years and vendor registers and payments were examined to determine the college's compliance with state level and local bidding and awarding of contract

requirements and policies. No exceptions were noted during the period reviewed and for the vendor information reviewed.

Recommendation: None.

3d. Facilities.

Part A: Approval of Construction Projects.

ICCB Rule 1501.602 “Approval of Capital Projects” requires prior ICCB approval of any project (regardless of funding source) resulting in a room use change (i.e., but not limited to, classroom to office, office to storage, storage to study space, etc.) or creation of additional gross square feet with estimated costs to complete of \$250,000 or more and not meeting the definition of a maintenance project. The college’s self-study did not identify any remodeling, renovation, or new construction requiring ICCB approval under ICCB Rule 1501.602, which had not been submitted for ICCB approval during the period of time evaluated in its self-evaluation. The college’s self-study failed to identify five project exceptions noted below in the ICCB review but may not have been included in their review since these projects were initially approved before 2006. An ICCB review of projects over the last 10 years identified several locally funded project approvals requested, other than protection, health, and safety projects which are discussed in the next section, by the college for new construction, remodeling or acquisition of property. This seems to indicate the college does know which projects require ICCB approval and submits the appropriate application submission.

ICCB rules require the college to complete statements of final costs on each approved project (regardless of funding source). There were 32 projects reported as completed since fiscal year 2007 and statements of final costs have been submitted for each of those completed projects. ICCB rule 1501.607 requires the college to seek ICCB approval of a revised budget if revised budget estimates to complete the project will exceed the original approved budget by five percent or more. Five (all protection, health and safety funded projects) of the thirty two projects’ final costs exceeded the original approved budget by more than five percent. One was over budget more than 100 percent, two 10 percent over budget, and the other two less than 8 percent over budget. In calendar year 2006 during the last recognition review, two completed projects exceeded the approved budget. All five were reported as completed in 2009, 2008, or 2007, subsequent to the last recognition visit, when this was first identified as a problem. It is likely all five may have been past the point of correcting since they likely had already exceeded the approved budget when this was found as a problem in the prior recognition visit.

ICCB rule 1501.602c requires an updated Facilities Master Plan (FMP) be filed with future ICCB recognition self-study reports. This rule is in place to ensure an updated Facilities Master Plan is prepared and available for district use and to be submitted to the ICCB once each five years. The last plan was submitted in January

2007. The college did not mention the status of an updated FMP in its self-study but discussions with staff indicated they had deferred updating the FMP due to turnover in the office of the President. Staff wanted to allow the new President to be involved in the process and is just beginning the development of the RFP process to update the plan. The facilities master plan provides an intermediate to long-term road map (depending upon the length of the plan) for construction and remodeling needs on campus and to the extent no unexpected projects arise it can serve as a reminder of projects that require ICCB approval.

Compliance Recommendation: In order to be in compliance the district should: 1) develop a process to review and update the FMP once every five years, 2) provide an estimated completion date for the current FMP update in its response to this recommendation, and 3) submit the updated FMP to the ICCB as soon as it is done.

Black Hawk College Response: *Black Hawk College is currently utilizing the qualification based selection process to choose an architectural team that will assist the College in developing a new Facilities Master Plan. The College is planning to submit the new plan to the ICCB following the June 2013 Board of Trustees meeting. The office of the Vice President for Administration will review the Black Hawk College facilities master plan on an annual basis updating the plan as needed.*

Advisory (Quality) Recommendation: It is strongly suggested the college continue to monitor projects' projected costs to complete as they progress through various stages to completion and immediately seek ICCB approval for projects whose costs and/or scope of work are going to exceed the original ICCB approved budget/scope.

Black Hawk College Response: *The office of the Vice President for Administration will continue to submit Board reports and project capital applications to the ICCB for approval. If after bidding the costs and/or scope exceed five percent of the ICCB approved budget the College will submit an amended capital application. During construction the office of the Vice President for Administration maintains estimate to actual spreadsheets tracking all invoices and change orders. The Black Hawk College Finance Department also monitors projects as a check and balance system to ensure budget accuracy. The College will continue to notify the ICCB if project costs and/or scope exceed the ICCB approved budget by five percent or more.*

Part B: Protection, Health, or Safety Projects.

The college has completed various Protection, Health and Safety (PHS) projects with tax levy funds. The college has requested approval of PHS projects in a timely and accurate fashion and submitted progress reports to the ICCB on current/active projects. The college has also submitted final completion reports as

PHS projects are finished. See the additional comments on PHS projects in Part A of standard 3d) Facilities above.

Recommendation: None.

4. ACCOUNTABILITY

- 4a. General Reporting Requirements.** (Focused finance items are covered in Section 4a Part C.) The latest five years of Illinois Community College Board (ICCB) data submissions by Black Hawk College were reviewed - generally this includes fiscal years 2008-2012 unless otherwise stated. Submissions were evaluated on consistency, accuracy, completeness, and timeliness. Timeliness is based on the date on which a submission is finalized, not the date the original submission is received. A detailed analysis of individual data submissions is in Appendix A.

ICCB data timeliness and accuracy are becoming increasingly important as these submissions are used extensively by ICCB staff to fulfill external reporting requirements on behalf of the colleges. As a value added service to the colleges ICCB staff reconfigure and combine information collected through routine ICCB submissions into a format that meets the needs of external entities. This approach minimizes duplicate reporting and serves to further strengthen data submission quality and comprehensiveness. For example, ICCB uses information from college submissions to provide multiple federal Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS) reports. It is particularly important to meet federal IPEDS collection deadlines because federal officials have the authority to fine colleges for failure to furnish timely data. The potential for IPEDS federal fines totals \$225,000 per institution in the event that Fall, Winter and Spring submissions are not locked by colleges by their respective due dates. ICCB data also are used in federal Perkins Postsecondary and Adult Education and Family Literacy (WIA Title II) performance reporting. Failure to meet these federal reporting deadlines could delay the availability of funds and would remove the state from eligibility for incentive dollars.

Black Hawk College officials have been successful in meeting federal submission time lines over the past five fiscal years. Over the last couple of years, Black Hawk College officials have met ICCB deadlines for most submissions. Overall, Black Hawk College's final data submissions have been accurate and complete. An Appendix Table contains additional details on actual submission dates.

Part A: Student Data Reporting

The **Annual Enrollment and Completion Data (A1)** submission is the most complex and lengthy of the state data submissions. Accuracy of final submissions has been very good over the timeframe of the study. Final A1 submissions have not contained any critical errors. The timeliness of Black Hawk College's A1

submission has met the deadline in each of the last five fiscal years. The submissions took two to three submissions to finalize. Coverage of high school rank is an area for further improvement in future submissions. Consistency between the Annual Enrollment and Completion submission and the **Annual Student Identification (ID)** submission was excellent during the past five fiscal years. There were no headcount discrepancies. Annual Student Identification (ID) data have been finalized on-time in each of the last five fiscal years.

The **Fall Enrollment (E1)** data submission's timeliness met the reporting deadline in four of the past five years. The fiscal year 2008 submission was finalized 26 days past the deadline. The number of submissions needed to finalize the data ranged from two to three during the five fiscal years reviewed. Timeliness for the **Fall Enrollment Survey** has been excellent with all five submissions meeting the reporting deadline. There has been consistency between the Fall Enrollment Survey and the E1 submission each year.

Noncredit Course Enrollment (N1) data collection began in fiscal year 2000. Black Hawk College data submissions met the reporting deadline in each of the last five fiscal years. The final submissions had no critical errors in each of last five fiscal years.

IPEDS Summer Graduate Reporting data collection began in fiscal year 2000. The final submission met the reporting deadline in each of the past five fiscal years. **Summer Graduate Reporting for the IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey (GRS)** provides colleges with an opportunity to raise their graduation rates by including those students who complete programs one summer beyond the end of the fiscal year in rate calculations.

The **Underrepresented Groups Report** was submitted on time in three of the past five fiscal years, ranging just one or two days late. This report is becoming more important as national and state attention is being increasingly focused on improving the depth and breadth of services provided to members of underrepresented groups.

The **Winter Quarter/Spring Semester Term Enrollment Survey** has been submitted on time in each of the past five fiscal years.

The final **Career and Technical Education Follow-up Study (FS)** submission has not met the reporting deadline in one of the last five fiscal years, five days late in fiscal year 2008. The response rate was above the ICCB minimum standard in four of the last five years: 2007 (51.61 percent), 2009 (51.41 percent), 2010 (51.28 percent), and 2011 (51.92 percent).

Part B: Faculty/Staff Data Submission.

The **Faculty, Staff and Salary (C1/C2)** electronic data submissions met the

reporting deadline in four of the past five fiscal years, 24 days late in fiscal year 2011. The number of submissions required to finalize these data ranged from two to four. Data items in these submissions are very important in generating the annual “Salary Report for Illinois Community Colleges” and related Illinois Board of Higher Education and federal (IPEDS) reports.

The **Faculty, Staff and Salary Supplementary Information (C2)** paper survey data submissions were finalized on time in three of the past five fiscal years, ranging from three to six weeks late.

Advisory (Quality) Recommendation: Most data submissions have been timely, accurate, and complete.

Black Hawk College Response: *In the quest to continue to provide data and information to accurately support decision making, the College has purchased and is currently implementing a data warehouse (ZogoTech). A major focus will be placed on the quality of the data. It is intended that the focus on data quality will eventually lead to more accurate data submissions. The office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness will be reviewing and revising all state reports once the data warehouse is operable.*

Part C: Financial Data Submissions.

The following are financial submissions the college is required to send the ICCB.

Audit/Unit Cost Reconciliation

The fiscal year 2007 to 2011 reconciliations were reviewed and all were submitted accurately and on or before the due date.

Audit/UFRS Reconciliation

The fiscal year 2007 to 2011 reconciliations were reviewed. All submissions reviewed were submitted before the October 15th due dates. The college’s balance sheet data for each year reviewed was in balance which, while not the only indicator of quality, is a good indication that the data is accurate and final.

Certificate of Chargeback

The fiscal year 2007 to 2011 certificates were reviewed. The college published their certificate in the college’s annual audit and it was submitted in a timely and accurate manner.

SU/SR submissions

The fiscal year 2008 to 2011 submissions were reviewed. The college has generally made its credit hour claims submissions in a timely manner. ICCB Rule 1501.507(a) requires the colleges to submit the credit hour claims within 30days after the end of each term.

Uniform Financial Statements

The fiscal year 2007 to 2011 statements were reviewed. The college published the Uniform Financial Statements in the college's annual audit and they were submitted in a timely and accurate manner.

Unit Cost

The fiscal year 2007 to 2011 submissions were reviewed. The college has submitted their Unit Cost in a timely and accurate manner.

UFRS

The fiscal year 2007 to 2011 submissions were reviewed. The college has submitted substantially all of their Uniform Financial Reporting Submissions very near or by the due date and in a timely and accurate manner. ICCB's review of the college's UFRS balance sheet information each year shows that it is in balance.

Tax Revenue and Budget Survey

The fiscal year 2008 to 2012 submissions were reviewed. The college has submitted the survey in a timely and accurate manner.

Recommendation: None.

Part D: Facilities Data Submissions.

F3, F6, B3, R3 records

The college's self-study does not identify any data reporting issues that require corrective action. During ICCB's review of the most recent facility data (F3, F6, B3, & R3 records submitted and processed on 8/31/11) submissions there were no fatal errors identified in the edit report. In examining facility reports from the ICCB system, no major shifts in reporting of gross square footage or assignable square footage or discrepancies were identified during the years examined. There appears to be a correlation between the facility identifier codes being reported in the S6/S7 data and in the facility data (F3, F6, B3, & R3 records) submissions as the district's C14 report does reflect facility usage percentages.

Square footage of planned construction and owned land

The fiscal year 2007 to 2011 submissions were reviewed. At July 1, 2007 the acreage information (owned acreage report) was decreased and then it was increased the next year with the July 1, 2008 reporting. During the five year period the only new construction reported in that time period was at July 1, 2007. This was inconsistent and did not accurately reflect information that should have been reported and according to college staff was primarily due to staffing turnover.

Advisory (Quality) Recommendation: It is strongly suggested the college review processes and procedures for reporting planned or current (but not yet completed) new construction on campus and changes in owned acreage from year to year to ensure consistent and accurate reporting since this information

is published annually in the ICCB Data and Characteristics Manual. As a suggestion, written procedures could be developed for use by new and existing staff to help achieve a higher level of consistency and accuracy in reporting.

Black Hawk College Response: *The office of the Vice President for Administration will review square footage and owned acreage data with the office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness on an annual basis. During project planning the office of the Vice President for Administration will alert the office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness of potential square footage and owned acreage changes. Upon ICCB approval and project completion the office of the Vice President for Administration will confirm ending square footage and owned acreage. All changes will be forwarded to the office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness for report updates.*

Project status reports

The fiscal year 2008 to 2012 submissions were reviewed. This report was submitted each year to show the relative progress toward completion on each ICCB approved project. All reports were submitted in a timely and accurate manner.

RAMP

The submissions due in fiscal years 2008 to 2012 were reviewed. For the period examined the college has submitted their state funded RAMP submissions in a timely manner. On occasion submission errors have occurred but college staff has been responsive and attentive to making modifications and resubmitting documents when necessary. For instance, projects are limited to a specific inflationary increase from year to year and the college has had to resubmit its RAMP forms when the inflationary limits were not applied to the first submission in a couple of years. Ensuring checks and balances are in place before the calculations are finalized will help minimize the duplication of effort required to make revised a submission.

S6/S7

The submissions due in fiscal years 2008 to 2012 were reviewed. While the submissions have been made on or before the due date, there are fatal error messages in each year's submissions which have never been corrected and resubmitted. College staff does review the data and edits but it seems, in speaking with college staff, that historical reporting practices result in including records that are not even included on the SU/SR records such as Kids for College classes and zero enrollment classes. This practice results in a longer than normal listing of fatal and warning error messages which makes it more difficult to identify the errors potentially impacting the C14 utilization report. It does appear that some of those errors could impact the accuracy of the C14 utilization report and college staff are reevaluating the latest submission to determine if a re-submission of data is necessary. The S6/S7 data is used in conjunction with the facilities data to generate the C14 classroom utilization report. For these reasons we are making a compliance recommendation rather than an advisory recommendation.

Compliance Recommendation: In order to be in compliance the district should 1) review its processes and procedures and make changes, where needed, to ensure the S6/S7 submission instructions are followed and all college staff involved in supplying data that impact the accuracy of the S6/S7 submission are familiar with the appropriate codes to identify the classes and methods of instruction and delivery of instruction, meeting times, locations, etc. that would minimize the clutter in the edit report and improve the accuracy of data impacting the C14 utilization report, and 2) resubmit the most recent S6/S7 submission which was due January 31, 2012 if it is found that some errors occurred that had not been corrected in the college's two prior submissions.

Black Hawk College Response: *The Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) reviewed the Fall 2011 S6 submission and the Fall 2011 SUSR report. Data from these two reports are used together to generate the ICCB's C14 utilization report, which identifies the space utilization for Black Hawk College's buildings and respective classrooms. To check for completeness, PIE downloaded the College's Fall 2011 SU/SR file from the ICCB VPN site and placed it into an ACCESS database. Next, PIE copied the College's Fall 2011 S6 flat file into ACCESS and joined to two files using CRN (the unique course section identifier). This join produced 3,223 records, which is the exact number of records the ICCB added to their S6 database. In addition, PIE reviewed the program that generates the S6 file and determined that the program was including all sections that generated a CRN rather than only those that met the ICCB's S6 criteria of only SU/SR records that use an actual seat space in a college-owned or -leased facility. Based on these findings, PIE is confident that the College did not miss any records that would have been added to the ICCB's database. At the same time, this process was sending data and information that was not required by the ICCB. (PCS.13 sections and sections not taught at a College-owned or -leased facility). In order to eliminate this data from the S6/S7 report, PIE has identified a short-term and long-term solution. The short-term solution is to use Access to eliminate the data not required by the ICCB. The long-term solution is to revise the computer program logic to do this task.*

To further check for accuracy, PIE ran queries to determine if any missing data could be fixed and/or updated. In this process, PIE discovered there were sections that were missing or had inaccurate data and information that were not listed on the ICCB's Master Course Resource Edit. For example, old building location codes were still being used and some sections had missing data fields. The correct data was identified and those sections were updated.

Finally, in order to provide the ICCB with only those S6 records that use an actual seat space in a college-owned or -leased facility, PIE used queries to remove

locations not owned or leased by the College. This step reduced the number of records from 3,223 to 1,958.

4b. Program Review/Results.

Based on a review of the college's self study and program review submissions over the last five years, staff found that all instructional programs have been reviewed utilizing a systemic, college-wide process. The college goes beyond the minimum requirements of need, cost and quality for evaluating their career and technical programs.

The college's Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (PIE) coordinates the program review process. Program Review Guidelines are established by a joint task force including the most appropriate academic and career and technical faculty, department chairs and deans. The Guidelines require all programs be evaluated according to a common set of questions, using a common data set specific to their curriculum. Quality indicators beyond the minimum used for evaluating a program's relevance, strengths and weaknesses include occupational skill standards, work-based learning assessments, passage rates on industry credentialing exams, and cohort data. The college has a process in place for identifying program weaknesses, establishing improvement plans and the necessary follow-up accordingly. The college includes not only academic and career and technical programs, but also administrative and public services functions in their program review.

The college indicates review of their Program Review Guidelines occurs annually. Because the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness is also responsible for other college accountability functions, program review assessment is linked to the college's strategic planning and continuous improvement process.

No discrepancies between the college's program review schedule and the published ICCB five-year program review schedule were identified beyond what the college identified in its self study report or for what the college had received an approved extension.

Recommendation: None.

Black Hawk (503) – Recognition Policy Studies Report Due Dates Attachment A

Noncredit Course Enrollment Data (N1)

Fiscal Year Collected	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Final Submission – (07/15)*	07/12/11	06/18/10	06/04/09	05/28/08	06/13/07
Timeliness	on time	on time	on time	on time	on time
Duplicated Head Count	7073	6753	7301	8028	6841
Unduplicated Head Count	3855	3525	3793	4584	3590
# Error Codes in Final Submission	2	2	3	2	2
# Critical Errors in Final Submission	0	0	0	0	0
% Records with Errors in Final Sub.	2.95 percent	2.52 percent	3.18 percent	4.04 percent	3.27 percent
% Unknown Age in Final Submission no value or .	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
% Unknown Age in Final Submission unknown	2.57 percent	2.27 percent	2.89 percent	3.96 percent	2.82 percent
% Unknown Ethnicity in Final no value or .	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
% Unknown Ethnicity in Final unknown	9.06 percent	8.40 percent	5.68 percent	5.95 percent	3.84 percent
% Unknown Highest Degree in Final no value or .	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
% Unknown Highest Degree in Final unknown	50.63 percent	47.02 percent	47.24 percent	46.29 percent	43.11 percent

*Due 07/17 in FY08 & FY09

Annual Enrollment & Completion Data (A1)

Fiscal Year Collected	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Final Submission – (08/01)*	08/01/11	07/30/10	07/29/09	07/29/08	07/24/07
# Submissions to Final	2	2	2	3	3
Timeliness	on time	on time	on time	on time	on time
Head Count (total incl. 0 hrs enroll.)	13098	13397	12474	12326	11938
Discrepancy between A1 & ID	0	0	0	0	0
# Error Codes in Final Submission	6	8	5	1	2

# Critical Errors in Final Submission	0	0	0	0	0
% Records with Errors in Final Sub.	1.01 percent	1.12 percent	0.20 percent	1.93 percent	1.14 percent
% 0 Cumulative GPA in Final Sub.	35.60 percent	37.47 percent	36.87 percent	35.60 percent	34.91 percent
% 0 Cumulative Hours in Final Sub.	32.17 percent	34.50 percent	34.34 percent	33.79 percent	33.27 percent
% Unknown Entry Intent in Final no value or .	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
% Unknown Entry Intent in Final unknown	30.73 percent	28.60 percent	28.09 percent	27.45 percent	25.59 percent
% Unknown Current Intent in Final no value or .	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
% Unknown Current Intent in Final unknown	20.26 percent	19.15 percent	19.36 percent	19.22 percent	16.47 percent
% Unknown Degree Obj. in Final	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
% Unknown Highest Degree in Final no value or .	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
% Unknown Highest Degree in Final unknown	0.05 percent	0.69 percent	1.68 percent	1.66 percent	0.59 percent
% Unknown HS Rank in Final Sub.	72.22 percent	72.36 percent	71.02 percent	68.83 percent	68.24 percent

*Due 08/15 in FY12; 08/02 in FY11; & 08/03 in FY10

Annual Student ID Submission (ID)

Fiscal Year Collected	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Final Submission (09/01)	08/30/11	08/06/10	08/07/09	08/01/08	08/29/07
# Submissions to Final	1	1	1	1	2
Timeliness – Data Due	on time	on time	on time	on time	on time
Head Count in Final Submission	13098	13397	12474	12326	11938
Discrepancy between A1 & ID	0	0	0	0	0

Fall Term Enrollment Data (E1)

Fiscal Year Collected	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Final Submission – (10/01)*	09/28/11	09/28/10	09/30/09	10/02/08	10/29/07

# Submissions to Final	3	2	3	2	3
Timeliness	on time	on time	on time	on time	26 days late
Head Count in Final Submission	6403	6677	6267	6179	6311
Discrepancy between E1 & Survey	0	0	0	0	0
# Error Codes in Final Submission	3	3	4	6	2
# Critical Errors in Final Submission	0	0	0	0	0
% Records with Errors in Final Sub.	0.28 percent	0.32 percent	0.33 percent	5.71 percent	0.28 percent
Current Intent Coverage in Final Sub % coded as unknown	20.96 percent	20.23 percent	21.53 percent	19.99 percent	17.16 percent
Degree Obj. Coverage in Final % coded with no code	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
Scholarship Coverage in Final Sub. % with no scholarship	98.50 percent	98.61 percent	98.44 percent	99.19 percent	98.45 percent

***Due 10/03 in FY12, FY09 & FY08**

Fall Term Enrollment (Web) Survey

Fiscal Year Collected	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Final Submission – (10/01)*	09/30/11	09/28/10	09/29/09	10/01/08	10/01/07
Timeliness	on time	on time	on time	on time	on time
Head Count**	6403	6677	6267	6179	6311
Discrepancy between E1 & Survey	0	0	0	0	0

***Due 10/03 in FY12, FY09 & FY08**

****2008-2011 count is from E1**

Faculty Staff & Salary Data (C1)

Fiscal Year Collected	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Final Submission – (10/15)*	10/14/11	11/08/10	10/15/09	10/14/08	10/15/07
# Submissions to Final	2	3	4	2	3
Timeliness	on time	24 days late	on time	on time	on time
# Error Codes in Final Submission	2	2	2	3	4
# Critical Errors in Final Submission	2	2	2	2	3
% Records with Errors in Final Sub.	2.40 percent	1.27 percent	0.62 percent	1.26 percent	2.13 percent

% Unknown Employment Class (8)	1.61 percent	2.07 percent	1.56 percent	0.47 percent	1.07 percent
--------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

***Due 10/17 in FY12, FY09 & FY08**

Faculty Staff & Salary Supplementary Information (C2 Paper)

Fiscal Year Collected	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Final Submission – (10/15)*	10/17/11	11/08/10	10/15/09	10/15/08	11/26/07
# Submissions to Final	1	1	1	1	1
Timeliness	on time	24 days late	on time	on time	40 days late

***Due 10/17 in FY12, FY09 & FY08**

Summer Graduate Reporting for IPEDS GRS

Fiscal Year Collected	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Final Submission (12/01)*	11/29/11	10/19/10	10/20/09	10/15/08	10/02/07
Timeliness	on time	on time	on time	on time	on time

***Due 11/01 in FY10 & FY09**

Underrepresented Groups Report

Fiscal Year Collected	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Final Submission Varies See Note	04/15/11	03/30/10	04/15/09	03/19/08	02/05/07
Timeliness	on time	on time	1 day late	2 days late	on time

***Due: 04/18 in FY11; 03/31 in FY10; 04/14 in FY09; 03/17 in FY08; 02/06 in FY07**

Winter Quarter/Spring Semester Term Enrollment Survey

Fiscal Year Collected	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Final Submission (02/15)*	02/08/11	02/05/10	02/11/09	01/30/08	02/01/07
Timeliness	on time	on time	on time	on time	on time

***Due 02/09 in FY11**

Occupational Follow-up Study Data (FS)

Fiscal Year Collected	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007
Fiscal Year <i>of Data</i>	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
Final Submission – (5/30)*	05/31/11	05/26/10	05/11/09	06/04/08	05/23/07
# Submissions to Final	1	2	3	2	1

Timeliness	on time	on time	on time	5 days late	on time
# Error Codes in Final Submission	1	2	3	0	0
# Critical Errors in Final Submission	0	0	0	0	0
% Records with Errors in Final Sub.	1.92 percent	7.69 percent	2.81 percent	0.0 percent	0.0 percent
Response Rate (PBIS)	51.92 percent	51.28 percent	51.41 percent	42.86 percent	51.61 percent
Met Minimum Response Rate**	yes	yes	yes	no	yes

***Due 05/31 in FY11 & FY10**

**** 50% when N>= 30 & 60% when N<30.**

Note: N/A = Not Applicable; N/C = Data Not Collected; = Data Unavailable

