2024 AIR National Survey of Institutional Research Offices

Survey Data Report by Region



air | ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Response Rates

The 2024 AIR National Survey targeted leaders of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IR/IE) offices at 1,676 U.S. postsecondary, degree-granting institutions across all sectors, control types, and sizes. A total of 633 institutions submitted responses. To ensure comparability and data quality, this report excludes incomplete responses as well as those from for-profit institutions, administrative units, international institutions, private not-for-profit 2-year institutions, and institutions located in U.S. territories due to low response rates in these categories.

The findings presented in this report are based on 552 complete or semi-complete responses from U.S. degree-granting institutions, including 183 public 4-year institutions, 118 public 2-year institutions, and 251 private not-for-profit 4-year institutions.

Report Structure

This report has five sections:
Section 1: Data and Analytics Offices
Section 2: Office Structure and Leadership
Section 3: Staffing the Office
Section 4: Work Output and Stakeholders
Section 5: Data Environment

Regional Definitions

Midwest: IA, IL, IN, MI, MN, OH, WI, KS, MO, ND, NE, SD
Northeast: CT, MA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT
South: AL, AR, DC, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, SC, TN, TX, VA, WV
West: AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NM, NV, OR,, UT WA, WY

Note: To protect the confidentiality of institutional responses, results will not be reported for any question with fewer than five responding institutions.

To learn more about the AIR National Survey of IR Offices, please visit www.airweb.org/NationalSurvey

Section 1: Data and Analytics Offices

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Which best describes the IR/IE function at your institution?				
Number of respondents	*163*	*126*	*161*	*102*
There is a single office at my institution that provides IR/IE work.	85%	83%	78%	83%
There are multiple offices at my institution that provide IR and IE work.	7%	12%	19%	12%
IR/IE function resides within another unit(s).	8%	5%	3%	5%
At your institution, are there data and analytics professionals within some/all administrative units?				
Number of respondents	*163*	*126*	*159*	*102*
Yes	50%	51%	48%	42%
No	48%	46%	49%	55%
I don't know	2%	3%	3%	3%
Which best represents the relationship between those analysts and the IR/IE Office?				
Number of respondents	*81*	*64*	*77*	*43*
Analysts report directly to the IR/IE Office (direct-report relationship).	2%	5%	0%	2%
Analysts report to administrative units, but IR/IE helps supervise work (dotted-line).	6%	3%	5%	7%
Collaborative relationship with IR/IE Office only; no reporting relationship.	72%	70%	65%	72%
There is no relationship between analysts and the IR/IE Office.	9%	2%	8%	5%
The relationship depends on the administrative unit.	11%	19%	21%	14%
Other	0%	2%	1%	0%
What is the approximate staff FTE of these analysts working within administrative units?				
Number of respondents	*73*	*52*	*62*	*39*
1 FTE or less	23%	21%	21%	28%
2 to 5 FTE	62%	52%	44%	49%
6 to 10 FTE	4%	13%	21%	21%
11 to 15 FTE	1%	4%	8%	0%
16 to 20 FTE	1%	0%	3%	0%
21 to 30 FTE	4%	2%	2%	0%
More than 30 FTE	4%	8%	2%	3%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
At your institution, are there data and analytics professionals within some/all academic colleges/schools?				
Number of respondents	*163*	*124*	*161*	*102*
Yes	21%	19%	27%	23%
No	73%	77%	65%	68%
I don't know	6%	4%	9%	10%

Which best represents the relationship between those analysts and the IR/IE Office?				
Number of respondents	*34*	*24*	*43*	*23*
Analysts report directly to the IR/IE Office (direct-report relationship).	0%	8%	2%	4%
Analysts report to academic schools, but IR/IE helps supervise (dotted-line relationship).	3%	4%	2%	0%
Collaborative relationship with IR/IE Office only; no reporting relationship.	76%	67%	70%	61%
There is no relationship between analysts and the IR/IE Office.	6%	8%	9%	13%
The relationship depends on the academic college/school.	15%	13%	14%	17%
Other	0%	0%	2%	4%

What is the approximate staff FTE of these analysts working within academic colleges/schools?				
Number of respondents	*28*	*20*	*33*	*19*
1 FTE or less	25%	20%	21%	42%
2 to 5 FTE	50%	50%	45%	53%
6 to 10 FTE	11%	10%	27%	5%
11 to 15 FTE	11%	5%	6%	0%
16 to 20 FTE	0%	0%	0%	0%
21 to 30 FTE	4%	0%	0%	0%
More than 30 FTE	0%	15%	0%	0%

Section 2: Office Structure and Leadership

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Which best describes the organizational structure of your Office?				
Number of respondents	*137*	*104*	*125*	*82*
One person/team under the leadership of a person with a Director-level position, or higher.	89%	90%	78%	93%
Multiple teams/units, each led by a Director-level (or higher), operating within the Office.	11%	10%	21%	7%
Other	0%	0%	2%	0%
Average Hours Worked/Week: Office Leader				
Number of respondents	*135*	*98*	*120*	*90*
Average Hours Worked/Week	42.9	43.2	44.2	44.2
Average Annual Salary/Wage: Office Leader				
Number of respondents	*128*	*79*	*112*	*82*
Average Salary/Wage	$ 100,481	$ 123,672	$ 117,443	$ 119,841
Salary/Wage Aligned with Experience, Education, Work Effort: Office Leader				
Number of respondents	*149*	*109*	*130*	*92*
Yes	69%	73%	68%	68%
No	31%	27%	32%	32%
Salary/Wage Aligned with Experience, Education, Work Effort: Office Leader				
Number of respondents	*150*	*112*	*133*	*95*
Number of Years: Working in higher education	18.2	20.8	22.1	19.5
Number of Years: Working in the field of IR/IE (either at your current institution or not)	12.1	14.9	15.2	13.2
Number of Years: Working at your current institution (either in your current position or not)	11.8	10.4	12.4	12.0
Number of Years: Leading the Office at your current institution	6.9	5.9	7.1	6.8
Highest Degree Earned: Office Leader				
Number of respondents	*150*	*113*	*133*	*96*
Baccalaureate degree or lower	9%	5%	2%	7%
Master's degree/Specialist (M.A., M.S., Ed.S.)	48%	44%	47%	50%
Doctoral degree, including professional practice doctorates (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., J.D.)	43%	50%	50%	43%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Age: Officer Leader				
Number of respondents	*149*	*112*	*133*	*95*
Less than 30 years old	1%	3%	1%	1%
30 to 39 years old	15%	12%	14%	17%
40 to 49 years old	38%	31%	26%	27%
50 to 59 years old	34%	41%	41%	46%
60 to 69 years old	11%	13%	18%	8%
70 years old or older	1%	1%	2%	0%
Office Leader: Gender identity				
Number of respondents	*148*	*112*	*133*	*95*
Woman	58%	58%	65%	69%
Man	39%	40%	34%	29%
Another gender				
Gender option is not provided	1%	0%	0%	0%
Prefer not to answer	2%	2%	1%	1%
Office Leader: Race/ethnicity				
Number of respondents	*149*	*113*	*132*	*96*
Race/ethnicity: American Indian or Alaska Native	1%	0%	2%	3%
Race/ethnicity: Asian	1%	5%	6%	8%
Race/ethnicity: Black or African American	1%	5%	11%	6%
Race/ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino/a	3%	2%	5%	10%
Race/ethnicity: Middle Eastern or North African	1%	1%	0%	1%
Race/ethnicity: Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	0%
Race/ethnicity: White	92%	85%	75%	75%
Race/ethnicity: Option not provided	0%	0%	0%	0%
Race/ethnicity: Prefer not to answer	3%	4%	3%	2%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Office Leader: Time on Task				
Number of respondents	*138*	*105*	*126*	*90*
Percentage of Time Spent: Brainstorming	6%	6%	7%	6%
Percentage of Time Spent: Data collection and management	18%	16%	16%	13%
Percentage of Time Spent: Conducting analyses/reporting	14%	15%	17%	16%
Percentage of Time Spent: Institutional effectiveness activities	9%	7%	7%	8%
Percentage of Time Spent: Assessment activities	7%	5%	6%	6%
Percentage of Time Spent: Accreditation activities	7%	8%	9%	9%
Percentage of Time Spent: Strategic planning activities	6%	7%	6%	8%
Percentage of Time Spent: Improving stakeholder data literacy	3%	4%	4%	4%
Percentage of Time Spent: Data governance/policy	4%	4%	4%	4%
Percentage of Time Spent: Technology	4%	4%	4%	4%
Percentage of Time Spent: Professional development	4%	4%	4%	4%
Percentage of Time Spent: Administrative activities	14%	17%	15%	16%
Percentage of Time Spent: Other	4%	3%	1%	2%
Relationship with senior-leader cabinet: President/CEO cabinet				
Number of respondents	*146*	*107*	*130*	*93*
I am a member of the cabinet	14%	13%	9%	29%
I am not a member but attend as needed	34%	37%	35%	32%
I am not a member and do not attend	51%	49%	55%	37%
The cabinet does not exist	1%	1%	2%	2%
Relationship with senior-leader cabinet: Provost/CAO cabinet				
Number of respondents	*145*	*107*	*128*	*87*
I am a member of the cabinet	28%	28%	30%	26%
I am not a member but attend as needed	21%	26%	22%	20%
I am not a member and do not attend	23%	29%	27%	20%
The cabinet does not exist	27%	17%	20%	34%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
What is the division does your office currently report to?				
Number of respondents	*153*	*118*	*152*	*96*
President/Chief Executive Officer/Chancellor (or equivalent)	21%	23%	14%	28%
Provost/Chief Academic Officer/VP of Academic Affairs (or equivalent)	55%	56%	62%	46%
IR / IE / Strategic Planning / Strategic Initiatives	5%	4%	7%	13%
Administration Services	1%	0%	1%	2%
Finance/Operations/Business	6%	7%	5%	7%
Communications and Marketing	1%	0%	0%	0%
Institutional Advancement / Development or similar office	0%	2%	3%	1%
Enrollment Management / Admissions	2%	3%	3%	1%
Human Resources	2%	0%	1%	0%
Information Technology (IT)	7%	4%	3%	1%
Student Life/Student Affairs	0%	0%	1%	1%
Other	1%	1%	1%	0%
Ideally, what division would your office report to?				
Number of respondents	*135*	*102*	*131*	*83*
President/Chief Executive Officer/Chancellor (or equivalent)	47%	41%	44%	55%
Provost/Chief Academic Officer/VP of Academic Affairs (or equivalent)	39%	46%	42%	30%
IR / IE / Strategic Planning / Strategic Initiatives	9%	7%	8%	8%
Administration Services	0%	0%	1%	1%
Finance/Operations/Business	1%	3%	2%	1%
Communications and Marketing	0%	0%	0%	0%
Institutional Advancement / Development or similar office	0%	1%	1%	0%
Enrollment Management / Admissions	1%	0%	1%	2%
Human Resources	0%	0%	0%	0%
Information Technology (IT)	3%	2%	2%	1%
Student Life/Student Affairs	0%	0%	1%	0%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%

Section 2: Office Structure and Leadership

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Are you the institution's Chief Data Officer (or equivalent position)?				
Number of respondents	*154*	*113*	*148*	*96*
I am the Director of IR/IE and CDO	7%	5%	6%	13%
I am the Director of IR/IE and the de facto CDO	15%	18%	16%	24%
No, but the institution has this position	13%	12%	14%	3%
No and the institution does not have this position	63%	64%	59%	56%
I am the CDO but not the Director of IR/IE (Supplemental Survey)	2%	1%	2%	3%
I am the de facto CDO but not the Director of IR/IE (Supplemental Survey)	0%	1%	2%	1%
CDO BRANCH: Prior to CDO Role, which roles did you serve in? NOTE: Multiple-response question; column will not add to 100%.				
Number of respondents	*13*	*7*	*10*	*12*
Served as the Director of IR/IE at this institution	62%	86%	50%	50%
Served as the Director of IR/IE at other institutions	38%	43%	40%	67%
Worked in IT/technology at this institution	15%	14%	20%	8%
Worked in IT/technology at other institutions	8%	0%	10%	0%
Worked in IT/technology but not in higher education	0%	0%	0%	0%
Worked in the field of data and analytics within higher education but outside of an Office of IR/IE	23%	43%	40%	33%
Worked in the field of data and analytics but outside of higher education	31%	14%	0%	8%
As CDO, I am expected to: Collaborate with stakeholders to ensure data-informed decision making.				
Number of respondents	*14*	*7*	*12*	*14*
Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	0%	0%	17%	0%
Moderately agree	14%	0%	0%	7%
Strongly agree	79%	100%	83%	93%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
As CDO, I am expected to: Ensure the institution has the necessary resources to meet information demands.				
Number of respondents	*14*	*7*	*11*	*14*
Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	0%	0%	9%	7%
Moderately agree	43%	57%	27%	14%
Strongly agree	50%	43%	64%	79%
As CDO, I am expected to: Coordinate and manage an institution-wide data strategy.				
Number of respondents	*14*	*7*	*12*	*14*
Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately disagree	0%	0%	0%	7%
Neutral	0%	0%	17%	7%
Moderately agree	29%	14%	8%	14%
Strongly agree	64%	86%	75%	71%
As CDO, I am expected to: Coordinate and manage institutional data governance.				
Number of respondents	*14*	*7*	*12*	*14*
Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately disagree	7%	0%	8%	14%
Neutral	0%	0%	0%	7%
Moderately agree	43%	14%	8%	29%
Strongly agree	43%	86%	83%	50%
As CDO, I am expected to: Work to achieve institutional data integrity/quality.				
Number of respondents	*14*	*7*	*12*	*14*
Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	0%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately agree	21%	14%	0%	21%
Strongly agree	71%	86%	100%	79%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
As CDO, I am expected to: Ensure data compliance standards are met.				
Number of respondents	*14*	*7*	*12*	*14*
Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately disagree	7%	0%	8%	0%
Neutral	7%	29%	8%	0%
Moderately agree	14%	14%	8%	36%
Strongly agree	64%	57%	75%	64%
As CDO, I am expected to: Facilitate data sharing/use across the institution.				
Number of respondents	*14*	*7*	*12*	*14*
Strongly disagree	7%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	0%	0%	0%	0%
Moderately agree	21%	29%	17%	21%
Strongly agree	71%	71%	83%	79%
DE FACTO-CDO BRANCH: Do you anticipate the institution will make this position/title official?				
Number of respondents	*19*	*15*	*19*	*20*
Yes, within the next year	0%	0%	11%	0%
Yes, within 1-3 years	5%	7%	21%	10%
Yes, but more than 3 years from now	5%	7%	5%	15%
No	89%	87%	63%	75%
Prior to de facto CDO Role, which roles did you serve in? NOTE: Multiple-response question; column will not add to 100%.				
Number of respondents	*22*	*17*	*26*	*19*
Served as the Director of IR/IE at this institution	91%	71%	69%	89%
Served as the Director of IR/IE at other institutions	18%	41%	31%	42%
Worked in IT/technology at this institution	5%	18%	15%	16%
Worked in IT/technology at other institutions	0%	24%	23%	5%
Worked in IT/technology but not in higher education	5%	0%	12%	5%
Worked in the field of data and analytics within higher education but outside of an Office of IR/IE	23%	18%	23%	26%
Worked in the field of data and analytics but outside of higher education	5%	18%	15%	21%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
As de facto CDO, I am expected to: Collaborate with stakeholders to ensure data-informed decision making.				
Number of respondents	*23*	*21*	*27*	*24*
Strongly disagree	17%	5%	11%	0%
Moderately disagree	0%	5%	0%	0%
Neutral	4%	0%	4%	0%
Moderately agree	35%	14%	26%	17%
Strongly agree	43%	76%	59%	83%
As de facto CDO, I am expected to: Ensure the institution has the necessary resources to meet information demands.				
Number of respondents	*23*	*21*	*27*	*24*
Strongly disagree	22%	5%	11%	0%
Moderately disagree	9%	5%	0%	8%
Neutral	4%	5%	4%	17%
Moderately agree	26%	38%	30%	29%
Strongly agree	39%	48%	56%	46%
As de facto CDO, I am expected to: Coordinate and manage an institution-wide data strategy.				
Number of respondents	*23*	*21*	*27*	*24*
Strongly disagree	13%	5%	11%	0%
Moderately disagree	9%	10%	7%	0%
Neutral	9%	14%	11%	8%
Moderately agree	43%	29%	33%	54%
Strongly agree	26%	43%	37%	38%
As de facto CDO, I am expected to: Coordinate and manage institutional data governance.				
Number of respondents	*23*	*21*	*27*	*24*
Strongly disagree	4%	5%	7%	0%
Moderately disagree	13%	24%	0%	0%
Neutral	9%	5%	15%	8%
Moderately agree	39%	14%	30%	63%
Strongly agree	35%	52%	48%	29%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
As de facto CDO, I am expected to: Work to achieve institutional data integrity/quality.				
Number of respondents	*23*	*21*	*27*	*24*
Strongly disagree	13%	5%	11%	0%
Moderately disagree	9%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	0%	10%	0%	4%
Moderately agree	30%	24%	11%	8%
Strongly agree	48%	62%	78%	88%
As de facto CDO, I am expected to: Ensure data compliance standards are met.				
Number of respondents	*23*	*20*	*27*	*24*
Strongly disagree	13%	5%	11%	0%
Moderately disagree	0%	5%	0%	4%
Neutral	13%	5%	4%	0%
Moderately agree	22%	30%	30%	29%
Strongly agree	52%	55%	56%	67%
As de facto CDO, I am expected to: Facilitate data sharing/use across the institution.				
Number of respondents	*23*	*21*	*27*	*24*
Strongly disagree	17%	5%	11%	0%
Moderately disagree	0%	0%	0%	0%
Neutral	0%	5%	0%	8%
Moderately agree	26%	33%	22%	17%
Strongly agree	57%	57%	67%	75%
BRANCH FOR INSTITUTIONS WITHOUT A CDO: You indicated your institution does not have a CDO. Does your institution have plans to create this role?				
Number of respondents	*97*	*72*	*88*	*54*
Yes, within the next year	2%	1%	5%	4%
Yes, within the next 2-3 years	3%	1%	3%	4%
Yes, within the next 4-5 years	2%	0%	1%	0%
No	49%	53%	43%	46%
I don’t know	43%	44%	48%	46%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Agreement: At our current staffing level, the Office can achieve its goals by never/rarely asking staff to work overtime.				
Number of respondents	*153*	*116*	*149*	*96*
Strongly disagree	20%	21%	19%	14%
Moderately disagree	27%	26%	26%	31%
Neutral	10%	9%	11%	7%
Moderately agree	26%	31%	30%	29%
Strongly agree	16%	13%	14%	19%
Level of Agreement: With additional staff, our Office could better meet institutional expectations for data and information.				
Number of respondents	*152*	*114*	*148*	*96*
Strongly disagree	2%	3%	3%	6%
Moderately disagree	3%	1%	2%	3%
Neutral	8%	10%	9%	10%
Moderately agree	30%	40%	34%	29%
Strongly agree	57%	46%	52%	51%
Level of Agreement: Our Office can recruit talented staff.				
Number of respondents	*146*	*114*	*148*	*95*
Strongly disagree	4%	8%	5%	3%
Moderately disagree	14%	11%	17%	14%
Neutral	32%	27%	21%	23%
Moderately agree	28%	29%	33%	35%
Strongly agree	23%	25%	24%	25%
Level of Agreement: Our Office can retain talented staff.				
Number of respondents	*147*	*113*	*148*	*93*
Strongly disagree	3%	5%	6%	1%
Moderately disagree	9%	11%	13%	8%
Neutral	30%	23%	20%	23%
Moderately agree	33%	37%	34%	34%
Strongly agree	25%	24%	28%	34%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Agreement: Our Office can recruit a diverse staff.				
Number of respondents	*147*	*112*	*147*	*93*
Strongly disagree	5%	7%	5%	0%
Moderately disagree	12%	13%	14%	14%
Neutral	39%	39%	27%	23%
Moderately agree	24%	21%	29%	29%
Strongly agree	20%	21%	25%	34%
Level of Agreement: Our Office can retain a diverse staff.				
Number of respondents	*146*	*112*	*147*	*93*
Strongly disagree	4%	4%	6%	1%
Moderately disagree	12%	10%	10%	10%
Neutral	43%	42%	34%	27%
Moderately agree	22%	23%	26%	32%
Strongly agree	19%	21%	24%	30%
Level of Agreement: Our Office's hiring practices align with institutional expectations.				
Number of respondents	*146*	*114*	*147*	*93*
Strongly disagree	1%	4%	2%	0%
Moderately disagree	2%	4%	3%	2%
Neutral	24%	21%	20%	18%
Moderately agree	24%	31%	24%	14%
Strongly agree	49%	41%	51%	66%
To meet current demand, what is your ideal staff FTE?				
Number of respondents	*144*	*110*	*143*	*93*
Average staff FTE	4.72	5.22	7.06	4.52
What would your ideal staffing level be in three years (FTE), considering anticipated future demand?				
Number of respondents	*143*	*107*	*140*	*91*
Average staff FTE	5.30	5.74	7.36	5.20

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Which best describes your Office remote staff policy?				
Number of respondents	*154*	*119*	*153*	*98*
Some/all staff can be fully remote	23%	24%	20%	37%
Some/all staff can work remotely part time, but required to be in the office one+ day/week.	40%	45%	32%	39%
All staff are required to work in-person; remote work permitted through special approval.	30%	22%	37%	19%
Other	7%	10%	11%	5%
Level of Agreement: Senior Leaders value the work of the Office.				
Number of respondents	*153*	*115*	*151*	*94*
Strongly disagree	1%	0%	3%	1%
Moderately disagree	7%	3%	6%	1%
Neutral	3%	4%	3%	5%
Moderately agree	32%	33%	30%	24%
Strongly agree	58%	59%	58%	68%
Level of Agreement: Office is adequately funded to meet its operational needs.				
Number of respondents	*154*	*115*	*150*	*94*
Strongly disagree	10%	11%	7%	7%
Moderately disagree	23%	23%	24%	12%
Neutral	12%	10%	10%	21%
Moderately agree	39%	37%	42%	35%
Strongly agree	16%	19%	17%	24%
Level of Agreement: Our Office space is appropriate (NOTE: if your office is fully remote, please select "N/A").				
Number of respondents	*142*	*102*	*135*	*83*
Strongly disagree	4%	5%	4%	4%
Moderately disagree	9%	9%	10%	7%
Neutral	6%	14%	16%	7%
Moderately agree	30%	37%	32%	29%
Strongly agree	51%	35%	38%	53%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Agreement: Our Office's software/hardware is appropriate.				
Number of respondents	*154*	*114*	*151*	*95*
Strongly disagree	4%	4%	3%	2%
Moderately disagree	9%	10%	10%	13%
Neutral	9%	13%	11%	5%
Moderately agree	49%	41%	47%	45%
Strongly agree	29%	32%	29%	35%

Level of Agreement: Our Office's professional development/training opportunities are appropriate.				
Number of respondents	*152*	*115*	*151*	*95*
Strongly disagree	5%	7%	7%	4%
Moderately disagree	14%	16%	13%	15%
Neutral	16%	20%	11%	7%
Moderately agree	39%	37%	36%	43%
Strongly agree	26%	21%	32%	31%

What professional development content does your staff participate in? NOTE: Multiple-response question; column will not add to 100%.				
Number of respondents	*150*	*108*	*148*	*91*
Data management	31%	38%	52%	42%
Basic analytics	29%	27%	49%	38%
Advanced analytics	33%	28%	41%	29%
Software tools	69%	68%	70%	65%
Data literacy	28%	24%	38%	32%
Data governance	39%	43%	41%	41%
Data visualizations / communicating results	61%	50%	71%	73%
Leadership/management	29%	35%	43%	36%
Technology-related content	39%	32%	42%	41%
Generative artificial intelligence/AI	45%	35%	36%	36%
Office does not provide professional development	7%	6%	5%	5%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
What professional development activities does your staff participate in? NOTE: Multiple-response question; column will not add to 100%.				
Number of respondents	*150*	*113*	*151*	*95*
Attended the AIR Forum (annual conference)	35%	37%	40%	38%
Attended a state or regional IR/IE/Assessment/Planning conference	61%	62%	77%	55%
Attended a non-IR/IE/Assessment/Planning conference	38%	37%	39%	44%
Attended live webinars/watched recorded webinars	93%	89%	87%	87%
Watched recorded tutorials	65%	67%	67%	60%
Enrolled in online courses	45%	40%	52%	48%
Enrolled in vendor training	35%	35%	40%	37%
Read journals/papers	59%	54%	64%	60%
Office does not provide professional development	1%	0%	1%	3%
Level of Agreement: Contributes directly or indirectly to overall student success.				
Number of respondents	*152*	*118*	*151*	*97*
Strongly disagree	0%	2%	1%	1%
Moderately disagree	2%	2%	2%	0%
Neutral	5%	8%	7%	6%
Moderately agree	45%	40%	34%	35%
Strongly agree	48%	49%	55%	58%
Level of Agreement: Contributes directly or indirectly to equitable student success.				
Number of respondents	*151*	*118*	*150*	*96*
Strongly disagree	0%	2%	1%	1%
Moderately disagree	3%	1%	5%	0%
Neutral	12%	10%	13%	9%
Moderately agree	50%	47%	41%	38%
Strongly agree	35%	41%	41%	52%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Agreement: Collaborates with colleagues across the institution in support of student success.				
Number of respondents	*152*	*118*	*150*	*96*
Strongly disagree	0%	3%	1%	1%
Moderately disagree	1%	0%	2%	0%
Neutral	2%	3%	5%	2%
Moderately agree	30%	35%	35%	17%
Strongly agree	68%	59%	57%	80%
Level of Agreement: Provides educational opportunities or coaching to enhance the data literacy of institutional stakeholders.				
Number of respondents	*152*	*118*	*150*	*96*
Strongly disagree	6%	3%	5%	3%
Moderately disagree	19%	19%	12%	11%
Neutral	20%	25%	19%	20%
Moderately agree	33%	32%	41%	35%
Strongly agree	22%	21%	23%	30%
Staff headcount				
Number of respondents	*147*	*115*	*142*	*97*
Average staff headcount	3.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Office Staff: Gender Identity				
Number of respondents	*70*	*39*	*51*	*33*
Headcount of staff by Gender Identity: Women	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.3
Headcount of staff by Gender Identity: Men	2.0	2.2	2.2	1.9
Headcount of staff by Gender Identity: Another gender	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Headcount of staff by Gender Identity: Identity is unknown/chose not to disclose	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.2

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Office Staff: Race/ethnicity				
Number of respondents	*88*	*82*	*108*	*65*
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: American Indian or Alaska Native	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.33
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: Asian	1.86	1.69	1.50	1.54
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: Black or African American	1.17	1.67	1.57	1.00
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: Hispanic or Latino/a	1.38	1.10	1.70	1.75
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: Middle Eastern or North African	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.00
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: White	2.61	3.08	2.58	2.46
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: Bi/Multiracial	1.00	1.17	3.75	1.22
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: Race/ethnicity does not have an option provided	1.00	0.00	1.00	4.50
Headcount of staff by Race/ethnicity: Race/ethnicity is unknown or who have not disclosed	1.08	1.16	1.23	1.17
Office Staff: Highest Degree Attained				
Number of respondents	*61*	*54*	*72*	*46*
Headcount of staff by Highest Degree Earned: Baccalaureate degree or lower	1.62	1.61	1.75	1.63
Headcount of staff by Highest Degree Earned: Master's degree/Specialist	2.29	2.21	2.19	2.37
Headcount of staff by Highest Degree Earned: Doctoral degree, including prof practice doc	1.59	1.72	1.62	1.65
Headcount of staff by Highest Degree Earned: Highest degree is unknown	1.08	1.35	1.18	1.14
Does your Office employ a Senior Associate Director, Associate Director, and/or an Assistant Director?				
Number of respondents	*102*	*94*	*120*	*72*
Yes	30%	57%	48%	38%
No	70%	43%	52%	63%
Senior Associate Director				
Number of respondents	*9*	*15*	*15*	*9*
Staff FTE	1.22	1.58	1.72	1.22
Average Hours Worked/Week	41.56	40.83	41.77	42.50
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 100,336	$ 114,321	$ 111,275	$ 78,044
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	100%	87%	69%	78%

Section 3. Staffing the Office

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Associate Director				
Number of respondents	*10*	*25*	*28*	*11*
Staff FTE	1.40	1.39	1.54	1.18
Average Hours Worked/Week	42.20	39.52	41.35	44.09
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 87,600	$ 94,843	$ 92,074	$ 105,889
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	73%	82%	73%	92%
Assistant Director				
Number of respondents	*13*	*22*	*28*	*11*
Staff FTE	1.27	1.12	1.18	1.36
Average Hours Worked/Week	39.00	38.48	40.98	40.50
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 83,948	$ 82,889	$ 85,144	$ 77,408
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	71%	64%	82%	90%
Does your Office employ Junior and/or Senior Analysts?				
Number of respondents	*102*	*93*	*120*	*72*
Yes	75%	77%	81%	82%
No	25%	23%	19%	18%
Staff FTE: Senior Analysts				
Number of respondents	*55*	*50*	*68*	*46*
Staff FTE	2.38	1.82	2.02	1.83
Average Hours Worked/Week	39.40	38.68	40.72	41.55
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 74,641	$ 84,714	$ 75,876	$ 84,811
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	74%	79%	73%	70%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Staff FTE: Junior Analysts				
Number of respondents	*50*	*49*	*61*	*38*
Staff FTE	1.42	1.83	1.85	1.85
Average Hours Worked/Week	37.63	37.96	39.57	38.78
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 57,797	$ 66,913	$ 62,661	$ 67,408
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	86%	82%	83%	86%
Does your Office employ Junior and/or Senior Assessment Staff?				
Number of respondents	*102*	*93*	*118*	*72*
Yes	13%	20%	23%	10%
No	87%	80%	77%	90%
Staff FTE: Senior Assessment Staff				
Number of respondents	*8*	*10*	*14*	*2*
Staff FTE	1.25	1.08	1.46	
Average Hours Worked/Week	41.31	38.61	38.13	
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 72,915	$ 81,203	$ 71,503	
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	88%	75%	77%	
Staff FTE: Junior Assessment Staff				
Number of respondents	*7*	*7*	*14*	*2*
Staff FTE	1.17	1.14	1.18	
Average Hours Worked/Week	31.86	32.20	39.82	
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 47,500	$ 49,386	$ 62,400	
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	80%	78%	73%	
Does your Office employ or share Technical Staff?				
Number of respondents	*102*	*91*	*118*	*72*
Yes	27%	29%	22%	25%
No	73%	71%	78%	75%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Staff FTE: Technical Staff				
Number of respondents	*27*	*24*	*23*	*17*
Staff FTE	1.43	1.11	1.91	1.48
Average Hours Worked/Week	36.67	33.85	41.03	38.53
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 72,188	$ 87,396	$ 75,295	$ 69,885
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	84%	78%	61%	82%
Does your Office employ or share Administrative Support Staff?				
Number of respondents	*102*	*91*	*116*	*72*
Yes	23%	26%	35%	26%
No	77%	74%	65%	74%
Staff FTE: Administrative Support Staff				
Number of respondents	*23*	*23*	*40*	*19*
Staff FTE	0.77	0.99	0.92	0.75
Average Hours Worked/Week	30.70	31.02	35.16	32.35
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 48,731	$ 51,794	$ 52,190	$ 52,624
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	95%	86%	91%	76%
Does your Office employ Undergraduate and/or Graduate Student Staff?				
Number of respondents	*102*	*91*	*116*	*72*
Yes	25%	32%	29%	26%
No	75%	68%	71%	74%
Staff FTE: Graduate Student Staff				
Number of respondents	*12*	*17*	*19*	*8*
Staff FTE	0.93	0.51	0.88	0.79
Average Hours Worked/Week	20.30	15.23	17.18	20.88
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 18,554	$ 4,805	$ 14,550	$ 28,587
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	92%	94%	71%	75%

Section 3. Staffing the Office

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Staff FTE: Undergraduate Student Staff				
Number of respondents	*19*	*10*	*18*	*10*
Staff FTE	1.01	0.34	0.61	0.90
Average Hours Worked/Week	13.00	9.33	16.66	11.33
Annual Salary/Wage	$ 9,000	$ 7,000	$ 8,664	$ 12,000
% Respondents Agree: Salary/wage aligned with experience, education, work effort	84%	90%	81%	50%
Does your Office typically have faculty associates?				
Number of respondents	*152*	*116*	*144*	*98*
Yes	3%	4%	5%	7%
No	97%	96%	95%	93%
Faculty Associates				
Number of respondents	*4*	*4*	*7*	*7*
Headcount of Faculty Associates			1.86	1.86
Average hours contributed to Office per week			12.71	9.14
Distribution of Office Work Output				
Number of respondents	*143*	*105*	*129*	*90*
Compliance reporting	22%	21%	23%	17%
Non-compliance reporting	12%	14%	12%	12%
Providing reports/information for institution-level decision support	16%	17%	15%	15%
Providing reports/information for program/division-level decision support	12%	10%	11%	13%
Institutional data governance	3%	3%	3%	3%
Improving institutional data literacy	3%	2%	2%	3%
Business intelligence (BI) activities	5%	6%	5%	5%
Institutional effectiveness activities	6%	5%	6%	8%
Assessment activities	7%	6%	7%	7%
Accreditation activities	7%	8%	8%	8%
Strategic planning activities	5%	6%	5%	7%
Other work output produced	1%	2%	1%	2%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Compliance reporting				
Number of respondents	*139*	*102*	*127*	*89*
Little to none	4%	2%	2%	3%
About 25%	14%	10%	11%	20%
About 50%	17%	19%	12%	27%
About 75%	27%	29%	24%	19%
Most/all	39%	40%	50%	29%
Work does not exist	0%	0%	0%	1%
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Non-compliance reporting				
Number of respondents	*136*	*100*	*127*	*87*
Little to none	6%	7%	4%	3%
About 25%	14%	12%	15%	31%
About 50%	18%	23%	20%	14%
About 75%	27%	30%	29%	23%
Most/all	35%	27%	31%	28%
Work does not exist	0%	1%	0%	1%
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Providing reports/information for institution-level decision support				
Number of respondents	*139*	*100*	*125*	*88*
Little to none	0%	5%	2%	1%
About 25%	17%	14%	14%	23%
About 50%	25%	17%	25%	23%
About 75%	29%	35%	30%	23%
Most/all	29%	29%	30%	31%
Work does not exist				

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Providing reports/information for program/division-level decision support				
Number of respondents	*138*	*100*	*124*	*88*
Little to none	4%	10%	6%	5%
About 25%	20%	20%	15%	26%
About 50%	28%	27%	30%	24%
About 75%	23%	24%	26%	15%
Most/all	25%	19%	23%	31%
Work does not exist	1%	0%	0%	0%

Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Institutional data governance				
Number of respondents	*137*	*98*	*124*	*88*
Little to none	34%	35%	31%	28%
About 25%	18%	13%	18%	17%
About 50%	12%	16%	21%	18%
About 75%	7%	10%	10%	10%
Most/all	13%	14%	11%	15%
Work does not exist	16%	11%	9%	11%

Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Improving institutional data literacy				
Number of respondents	*138*	*97*	*124*	*88*
Little to none	30%	36%	27%	22%
About 25%	14%	15%	21%	13%
About 50%	11%	9%	14%	14%
About 75%	9%	12%	13%	16%
Most/all	21%	18%	18%	25%
Work does not exist	14%	9%	7%	11%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Business intelligence (BI) activities				
Number of respondents	*138*	*98*	*125*	*88*
Little to none	27%	35%	28%	32%
About 25%	21%	13%	22%	19%
About 50%	15%	14%	20%	6%
About 75%	12%	10%	14%	8%
Most/all	14%	19%	10%	20%
Work does not exist	11%	8%	5%	15%
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Institutional effectiveness activities				
Number of respondents	*138*	*98*	*124*	*89*
Little to none	24%	22%	18%	16%
About 25%	20%	27%	20%	21%
About 50%	17%	15%	14%	19%
About 75%	11%	11%	15%	16%
Most/all	25%	22%	31%	26%
Work does not exist	3%	2%	2%	2%
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Assessment activities				
Number of respondents	*137*	*98*	*124*	*88*
Little to none	24%	34%	31%	31%
About 25%	29%	29%	19%	25%
About 50%	19%	15%	10%	11%
About 75%	13%	10%	15%	15%
Most/all	15%	9%	23%	17%
Work does not exist	0%	3%	1%	1%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Accreditation activities				
Number of respondents	*138*	*99*	*125*	*91*
Little to none	21%	19%	19%	22%
About 25%	34%	32%	26%	22%
About 50%	20%	17%	13%	16%
About 75%	7%	9%	14%	13%
Most/all	18%	21%	29%	25%
Work does not exist	0%	1%	0%	1%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Percentage of Institution's Work Output Completed by Office: Strategic planning activities				
Number of respondents	*138*	*99*	*125*	*91*
Little to none	21%	19%	19%	22%
About 25%	34%	32%	26%	22%
About 50%	20%	17%	13%	16%
About 75%	7%	9%	14%	13%
Most/all	18%	21%	29%	25%
Work does not exist	0%	1%	0%	1%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Office Maturity: Conducting basic analytics				
Number of respondents	*146*	*105*	*135*	*88*
Not occurring	1%	0%	1%	0%
Reactive	17%	10%	10%	9%
Proactive	44%	48%	44%	41%
Optimized	38%	42%	44%	50%
Level of Office Maturity: Conducting advanced analytics				
Number of respondents	*146*	*104*	*134*	*87*
Not occurring	11%	9%	16%	15%
Reactive	52%	50%	32%	43%
Proactive	28%	35%	40%	30%
Optimized	9%	7%	11%	13%
Level of Office Maturity: Conducting assessment projects.				
Number of respondents	*143*	*101*	*130*	*87*
Not occurring	13%	21%	15%	7%
Reactive	32%	30%	22%	37%
Proactive	40%	40%	46%	43%
Optimized	15%	10%	18%	14%
Level of Office Maturity: Using data ethically and responsibly				
Number of respondents	*143*	*104*	*133*	*86*
Not occurring	1%	0%	1%	2%
Reactive	7%	6%	5%	6%
Proactive	52%	58%	47%	51%
Optimized	40%	37%	47%	41%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Office Maturity: Managing data				
Number of respondents	*144*	*103*	*134*	*86*
Not occurring	0%	2%	1%	0%
Reactive	24%	17%	16%	17%
Proactive	57%	58%	52%	56%
Optimized	19%	23%	31%	27%
Level of Office Maturity: Creating effective data visualizations				
Number of respondents	*145*	*105*	*134*	*87*
Not occurring	4%	8%	4%	2%
Reactive	34%	27%	23%	21%
Proactive	45%	48%	54%	48%
Optimized	17%	18%	19%	29%
Level of Office Maturity: Creating effective reports/communicating results				
Number of respondents	*145*	*104*	*134*	*88*
Not occurring	1%	0%	2%	0%
Reactive	23%	22%	17%	16%
Proactive	52%	58%	57%	60%
Optimized	24%	20%	23%	24%
Level of Office Maturity: Meeting stakeholders' needs for reports/information				
Number of respondents	*144*	*106*	*132*	*88*
Not occurring	1%	0%	1%	0%
Reactive	29%	33%	20%	20%
Proactive	50%	43%	60%	55%
Optimized	20%	24%	19%	25%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Office Maturity: Managing its projects/information requests				
Number of respondents	*145*	*103*	*134*	*86*
Not occurring	1%	1%	1%	0%
Reactive	30%	26%	22%	20%
Proactive	49%	51%	49%	49%
Optimized	21%	21%	29%	31%
Level of Office Maturity: Managing its technology				
Number of respondents	*137*	*102*	*132*	*85*
Not occurring	6%	6%	2%	4%
Reactive	31%	36%	23%	38%
Proactive	47%	42%	64%	41%
Optimized	15%	16%	11%	18%
Level of Office Maturity: Use of generative AI				
Number of respondents	*141*	*101*	*131*	*83*
Not occurring	48%	52%	56%	52%
Reactive	38%	37%	25%	37%
Proactive	13%	10%	18%	10%
Optimized	1%	1%	0%	1%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution uses reports/information to improve student outcomes				
Number of respondents	*145*	*100*	*132*	*89*
Not occurring	3%	2%	2%	0%
Reactive	22%	27%	23%	27%
Proactive	57%	56%	58%	58%
Optimized	17%	15%	18%	15%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Institutional Maturity: Employees know when reports/information should be used for decision making				
Number of respondents	*145*	*97*	*129*	*86*
Not occurring	3%	3%	4%	1%
Reactive	46%	54%	43%	52%
Proactive	45%	38%	44%	40%
Optimized	6%	5%	9%	7%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution effectively changes and progresses as an organization				
Number of respondents	*141*	*97*	*126*	*83*
Not occurring	5%	8%	8%	2%
Reactive	52%	62%	50%	58%
Proactive	39%	25%	38%	33%
Optimized	4%	5%	4%	7%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Senior leaders value transparency regarding reports/information				
Number of respondents	*145*	*97*	*130*	*87*
Not occurring	8%	6%	2%	5%
Reactive	28%	27%	41%	25%
Proactive	49%	52%	36%	46%
Optimized	15%	15%	21%	24%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution's culture is to use reports/information to inform decisions.				
Number of respondents	*145*	*100*	*129*	*87*
Not occurring	1%	5%	2%	3%
Reactive	39%	35%	35%	34%
Proactive	50%	51%	49%	47%
Optimized	10%	9%	15%	15%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Institutional Maturity: Employees' use of generative AI.				
Number of respondents	*114*	*83*	*108*	*74*
Not occurring	39%	47%	45%	42%
Reactive	54%	42%	40%	49%
Proactive	8%	10%	15%	8%
Optimized	0%	1%	0%	1%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institutional data is kept private.				
Number of respondents	*133*	*99*	*132*	*86*
Not occurring	1%	0%	2%	0%
Reactive	9%	8%	8%	8%
Proactive	53%	63%	47%	58%
Optimized	37%	29%	44%	34%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institutional data are kept secure.				
Number of respondents	*137*	*100*	*131*	*87*
Not occurring	1%	0%	0%	1%
Reactive	3%	9%	4%	2%
Proactive	52%	53%	48%	54%
Optimized	44%	38%	48%	43%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institutional data is well managed.				
Number of respondents	*136*	*99*	*130*	*85*
Not occurring	2%	1%	2%	2%
Reactive	27%	29%	22%	22%
Proactive	51%	49%	48%	49%
Optimized	19%	20%	28%	26%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution collects high-quality data.				
Number of respondents	*139*	*99*	*130*	*87*
Not occurring	2%	1%	1%	1%
Reactive	33%	34%	32%	28%
Proactive	55%	53%	52%	52%
Optimized	10%	12%	15%	20%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Employees follow procedures to ensure data is collected correctly				
Number of respondents	*138*	*99*	*129*	*81*
Not occurring	7%	4%	4%	4%
Reactive	38%	43%	41%	37%
Proactive	43%	40%	47%	46%
Optimized	12%	12%	9%	14%
Level of Institutional Maturity: IR/IE Office has access to data necessary to produce its work.				
Number of respondents	*139*	*101*	*132*	*87*
Not occurring	4%	0%	0%	1%
Reactive	27%	21%	14%	18%
Proactive	42%	50%	61%	52%
Optimized	27%	30%	26%	29%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution meets stakeholders' needs for reports/information for decision making.				
Number of respondents	*138*	*99*	*131*	*87*
Not occurring	1%	1%	0%	1%
Reactive	33%	31%	23%	33%
Proactive	57%	51%	63%	48%
Optimized	10%	17%	15%	17%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution produces high-quality reports/information appropriate for use by all levels and roles of its employees.				
Number of respondents	*140*	*99*	*130*	*85*
Not occurring	2%	1%	0%	1%
Reactive	37%	35%	29%	28%
Proactive	50%	46%	55%	54%
Optimized	11%	17%	16%	16%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Employees understand institutional reports/information.				
Number of respondents	*139*	*97*	*129*	*85*
Not occurring	1%	2%	2%	0%
Reactive	51%	42%	51%	53%
Proactive	43%	49%	41%	40%
Optimized	4%	6%	6%	7%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Employees use reports/information to inform their decisions.				
Number of respondents	*136*	*97*	*128*	*85*
Not occurring	1%	4%	2%	4%
Reactive	43%	43%	41%	44%
Proactive	51%	45%	50%	47%
Optimized	4%	7%	8%	6%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Employees use reports/information ethically and responsibly.				
Number of respondents	*128*	*90*	*123*	*78*
Not occurring	1%	1%	1%	0%
Reactive	27%	26%	23%	33%
Proactive	60%	58%	62%	59%
Optimized	12%	16%	15%	8%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution has an ongoing systematic process for institutional effectiveness and assessment.				
Number of respondents	*132*	*97*	*127*	*84*
Not occurring	6%	7%	2%	4%
Reactive	30%	36%	22%	32%
Proactive	52%	48%	55%	49%
Optimized	12%	8%	21%	15%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution fosters a culture of using assessment results to improve administrative and support units/areas outcomes.				
Number of respondents	*132*	*96*	*126*	*85*
Not occurring	11%	6%	3%	4%
Reactive	35%	46%	28%	44%
Proactive	45%	40%	55%	44%
Optimized	9%	8%	14%	9%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution fosters a culture of using assessment results to improve student learning outcomes.				
Number of respondents	*133*	*96*	*124*	*84*
Not occurring	7%	4%	1%	2%
Reactive	26%	38%	29%	44%
Proactive	59%	50%	56%	44%
Optimized	8%	8%	15%	10%
Level of Institutional Maturity: Employees are familiar with the purpose, process, and outcomes of institutional accreditation.				
Number of respondents	*132*	*97*	*125*	*86*
Not occurring	5%	3%	2%	0%
Reactive	27%	36%	34%	37%
Proactive	59%	54%	47%	52%
Optimized	10%	7%	17%	10%

	Midwest	Northeast	South	West
Level of Institutional Maturity: Institution has an ongoing systematic process for strategic planning.				
Number of respondents	*130*	*97*	*126*	*85*
Not occurring	2%	4%	5%	0%
Reactive	32%	34%	26%	27%
Proactive	56%	54%	56%	53%
Optimized	9%	8%	13%	20%