

MINUTES
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE MEETING
EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM
ADAMS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
Monday, September 14, 2009, 2:00 p.m.

Members Present: Holly Adams, Sohail Agboatwala, Kang Bai, Larry Blocher, Brenda Campbell, John Dew, Kim Jones, Tish Matuszek (vTel), Jack Miller (via phone), Tracy Newvine, and Dan Tennimon (vTel)

Members Absent: Meryem Boulale, Bill Grantham, Mary Ann Hooten (with notice), Candice Howard-Shaughnessy (with notice), Judy McCarley (with notice), Lance Tatum (with notice), and Lisa Vardaman

Others present: Emily Brewer, Wendy Broyles, Somer Givens, and Edith Smith

Handouts: IEC Meeting Agenda, SCP Guidelines

Meeting Report: The meeting, held in the Executive Conference Room in Adams Administration Building, was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

1. Overview of SACS Response:

Dr. Dew said that the offsite SACS review team agreed that we are doing well. However, the onsite SACS review team, led by Dr. Rugg, said that major changes are necessary. Dr. Rugg was very critical of TROY's IEC activities and lectured that our basic approach and even our definition are off. We need to be more oriented for story-telling; we should not reduce the assessment, but rather we should richly and robustly tell the story. Summative assessment is good, but program level and formative assessment are lacking. We need to look at enrollment for viability of programs. Based on the new language agreed upon in December 2007, we need to state the extent to which expectations are met: "failed to meet," "met," or "exceeded." We also need to disaggregate data by location and by program. Dr. Rugg does not understand how multiple delivery modes are available to all students at TROY and how that makes disaggregating data very difficult.

Dr. Dew went on to say we had a bad start overseas. We were "woefully under prepared" to present Global Campus. Also, Dashboard does/did not encourage plans for improvement; there was no guarantee you could find the plan for improvement written on the institutional effectiveness side if you entered it in Dashboard.

2. Homer preview and Plans for Further Improvement:

Emily Brewer pulled up the current intranet site for "Homer," <http://10.10.0.84/>

Dr. Dew talked about changes that are being made and what goals we have for this website. He will write something for the homepage to replace the Latin placeholder text. These "Homer" files present information organized in SACS categories: academics, administrative, locations, etc.; information will be available about academic programs by year, with annual briefings for three years available. We previewed the Academics area in the College of Arts and Sciences, particularly one of the annual Chancellor's briefing and the Geomatics BS file. The "Homer" PowerPoint format makes this information very easy to put together and easy to move around. We hope "Homer" emphasizes that we have a culture of continuous improvement: program overview, recent improvements, expected outcomes and

results, and plans for further improvement. A suggestion was made to add a date stamp on “Homer” files, such as “as of Fall 2009.” We also previewed the MBA file in the College of Business.

We are not telling SACS that “Homer” is complete, but rather that “Homer” is initiated and we are adding to it. We want Dr. Rugg to say we are making significant progress, Dr. Dew said. Next Monday, we will ship the SACS response and the QEP revision, so SACS will be looking at this “Homer” website as early as September 25 to October 1. By Monday, the “Homer” page will be public; as much as possible should be posted by the end of next week. Links to the “Homer” site will exist from troy.edu as well as from the IRPE area of the troy.edu site. Wendy Broyles will set up a follow-up meeting for tomorrow with Dr. Dew and Michael Foster to discuss “Homer” files that have been submitted to be loaded on the “Homer” site. “Homer” will also facilitate cleanup of information.

Sohail Agboatwala spoke up about problems he is having completing “Homer” files. He does not have expected outcomes or plans for improvement for his area, but he will enforce having these things in the future.

Chancellor’s Briefings will have a standard format for January 2010, which will be discussed in a meeting with Dan Joslyn within the next few weeks. Dr. Dew says this “Homer” project will be sequential. The IE will provide survey data in April or May, so we can have the summer to process data. “Homer” files will be updated in September or October, which can be used for Chancellor’s Briefings in January. The first year may be rough because we are waiting to hear from SACS in December, but this process will flow more smoothly in the future. We probably won’t be waiting until next September to update, refine, and improve the current “Homer” files; we will most likely follow-up by Spring with more formative assessment. Programs with Specialized Accreditation in the Colleges of Business and Education have already received recommendations for more formative assessment. Now, we only have proposed recommendations from the SACS onsite team.

3. Plans to Re-Write IRPE Handbook:

Dr. Dew talked about plans to rewrite the IRPE Handbook that Dr. Rugg so brutally discredited during the SACS onsite visit. We will cut down the History section, if not completely remove it. More information will be included regarding the approval processes to make changes to programs, including the updated and streamlined ability to submit Substantive Change Prospectuses on DVD, and the possibility of creating an online mode for the review process to allow 30 days per committee. We hope to shorten the cycle and make it more effective, moving the process along and not allowing things to become lost in one committee or another. We plan to replicate Dr. Roling’s model for submission deadlines to committees for review. Existing forms and activities sections of the Handbook should be fine, and last year’s suggested changes will be considered. Forms will be available in various places as well.

4. Plans for Compliance Website:

Emily Brewer talked briefly about her work with Michael Foster to establish TROY’s compliance website to demonstrate our progress towards meeting SACS requirements. This will be our priority once “Homer” is up and running. This website will not only contain information regarding our compliance with SACS recommendations, but will also contain ACHE documentation, Consortial agreements, Specialized Accreditations, and State approvals. This website will facilitate locating documentation for our next SACS review. Most information on that website will be public information, though some areas, such as ACHE correspondence, will be password protected. Other documents to be consolidated and

included on this website are Consortia Review files, program and location approvals in electronic format, specialized accreditation, minutes for certain meetings, and many other documents dating back to 1975. Much of our most valuable information seems to be just floating around in one location's files or another. It may take a year and a half to really get this website up and running, but it will be a very valuable asset.

5. New SACS Guidelines on Substantive Change Prospectuses:

Somer Givens passed around copies of a handout regarding the current guidelines, updated in June. SCP can be submitted on DVD rather than paper. Syllabi are no longer required, which is a good thing. There are ten sections of the SCP; Somer has provided an outline in the handout which will also be emailed to committee members. SACS is getting picky about what they want to see, including that the number of full-time faculty is adequate to support a program and evidence of faculty workload, as well as financial support for the program. SACS will use a checklist to make sure all necessary information is provided. The cover page is a four-page document SACS wants to see on every letter of notification and on every SCP submitted. She has had SACS approve the cover document. Somer talked more on the details of the handout, speaking on what SACS requires. She also has copies of standard appendices, etc. available; contact her to receive copies of any such further SCP documentation. On October 9, Somer, Dr. Dew, and Emily Brewer will be attending a workshop regarding SCP; they will bring back any more new information from that workshop.

Cohort locations are currently giving us the most headaches. We are giving SACS a spreadsheet of cohorts; most specifically, SACS is interested in the start and end date and the location. The Deans of the Colleges are often unaware of cohorts until after the start date; IRPE will work with the Deans to create a list of criteria for a viable cohort. Before cohorts begin, the Regional Director would police whether a proposed cohort meets the Dean's requirements. This approval system needs to be created and implemented as soon as possible. Our cohort reporting to SACS must be pristine. Dr. Ingram is fully supportive and agrees that no cohort is worth our accreditation. Our goal is total transparency for SACS.

Programs have been eliminated at a lot of locations, and many Global Campus teaching sites have been changed to "A" sites, or eCampus support centers; Emily will send Tish Matuszek a copy of the list we sent to SACS regarding closings. Also, Global Campus has reopened the quarterly review system regarding viability by region and by site as a result of cleanup; this viability issue will be looked at continually by program. Dr. Dew believes the same viability review process would be good for Alabama campuses. In the future, information about closings will be available on the SACS Compliance website, rather than having someone email a requested file.

6. Quality Assurance Audit Teams Overseas:

Dr. Dew talked briefly about Quality Assurance Audit Teams visiting TROY locations overseas. The Consortia Review Committee reviewed the SACS requirements and created an audit checklist for overseas locations. In July, the first Quality Assurance Audit Team, which consisted of two faculty members, visited Malaysia, Ho Chi Minh City, and Hanoi. Formal Audit reports came back to the Consortia Review Committee. Corrective action plans, developed from the Formal Audit Reports, will be a useful, effective step forward and should continue on an annual basis. Overseas, we have problems with the ratio of textbooks to students as well as having instructors follow copyright laws. On the one hand, there were some embarrassing discoveries, such as the fact that 100% adjunct professors taught in Ho Chi Minh City in 2006-2007; this number looks much better and much healthier for the next

two semesters, though. On the other hand, almost all of the full-time faculty members in the Sorrell College of Business serve on the curriculum committee; these are not only full-time faculty members, but they have an active voice in curriculum matters at their overseas location. This Auditing process will show that we have good control of what we are doing overseas.

7. Other Business:

Dr. Edith Smith spoke on the issue of research being interwoven into the programs' expected outcomes. We were not prepared to report on research when SACS team asked; SACS was not pleased with TROY's vision of research for tenure promotion and college guidelines. As an institution aspiring to deliver doctoral level programs, SACS said we should have a better strategic vision as to research expectations and documentation of research events. On the faculty level, we can use digital measures to gather faculty achievements; deans can use that information to assess faculty research involvement. Then there is the issue of student involvement in research. There are many things that we know happen but are not reported, such as faculty level scholarly progress with student research involvement and student research presentations. To make a coherent document in the future, we must develop a reporting system to facilitate assessment in order to assess our baseline to move forward. This need is not a result of something we've done wrong. We need to spread the news to facilitate reporting. We find that program outcomes of faculty and student research reported are too often student learning outcomes; this information should come through program reports in the "Homer" files. Research needs to be collected from all programs, from all colleges, and from all locations. Research vision and collection can be done by campus or by location. For the annual "Homer" report on research information must come from the program report to the dean and from IRPE survey reporting back to the dean, etc., so that a group of people or formal council can find and consolidate the data in the groups SACS wants to see. We hope to establish a process for assessing research outcomes across the university. Tish Matuszek offered to help in this process development; Edith Smith says the "Process for Assessing Research Outcomes across the University" is published as part of the SACS response. Research should be part of the student learning outcomes, especially for the graduate programs; the fact that this is stated in our academic catalog could get us in trouble with SACS; over time and through revisions we have worked a lot of that information out.

Dr. Dew spoke up about a concern that the colleges do not have the current capacity to manage the necessary additional assessment of data and documentation of that assessment. He has suggested that Associate Deans be added for this capacity to the Colleges of Education, Business, and Arts and Sciences. Reaffirmation of SACS accreditation in December will be too late to pick up slack; we need these additional positions approved, posted, and filled as soon as possible.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m. The next meeting is set for October 5.