

MINUTES
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE MEETING
EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM
ADAMS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
Monday, December 15, 2008, 2:00 p.m.

Members Present: Holly Adams, Sohail Agboatwala, Brenda Campbell, John Dew, Mary Ann Hooten, Tish Matuszek, Judy McCarley, and Tracy Newvine

Members Absent: Larry Blocher (with notice), Meryem Boulale, Bill Grantham, Kim Jones (with notice), Jack Miller, Jared Sellers, Candice Howard-Shaughnessy (with notice), Lance Tatum, Dan Tennimon (with notice), and Lisa Vardaman

Others present: Edith Smith and Emily Brewer

Handouts: IEC Meeting Agenda, Proposal for PA 6699 Capstone in Public Administration course description, Review of College of Arts and Sciences Programs, Alabama Quality Award Feedback Report, and PDSA Model.

Meeting Report:

- 1) The meeting, held in the Executive Conference Room in Adams Administration Building, was called to order at 2:00 p.m. Tracy Newvine made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 10, 2008 meeting; Mary Ann Hooten seconded the motion; and the minutes were approved.
- 2) **Discuss SACS Off-Site Team Feedback on Institutional Effectiveness:**
Dr. Dew briefly discussed the feedback from the SACS Off-Site Review Team. The SACS Off-Site Team reviewed the Compliance Report and had questions in a few specific areas. Here are the areas of concern:
 - a. Core requirement section 2.8 that deals with having full-time faculty in sufficient to maintain program quality and program integrity. Dr. Dew stated that a major effort is underway to do some writing and expanding in areas such as student evaluation of advising and student satisfaction with programs and faculty.
 - b. Section 3.4.7 which deals with the oversight of consortial relationships, in particular the oversight of our international partnerships. Dr. Dew stated that the off-site team went online and found some locations that claimed that through their collaboration with Troy University their institution was accredited by SACS. In addition, the team found five or six year old information regarding a team we partnered with to help establish some of our earlier programs that we later sued. TROY no longer have a working relationship with them but on their website it still says that they have a partnership with Troy State University and all the various locations. Dr. Dew noted that the Academic Steering Committee is reviewing a new policy on

- c. Must provide more documentation of off-campus academic support services.
 - d. Dr. Dew explained that we were in partial compliance in the section that deals with the percent of courses taught by full-time faculty. The criminal justice program fell below the 25 percent level. Dr. Dew stated that the program is still conducting a search for additional faculty members for criminal justice.
 - e. Must provide more evidence or documentation of administrative staff evaluations and that we have a process in place for reviewing changes to academic programs.
 - f. The team had some problems with the faculty rosters. The team reviewed a sample of about 200 faculty members and they found about 30 that were not up to their standards. 85 percent of those had problems because the number of graduate semester hours a faculty member had in a specific area was not included in the roster. For example, a faculty member who taught a music course has a MS in Education and a concentration in music, but the roster did not state how many graduate semester hours that individual had in music. The rosters are being modified to include this information.
 - g. The on-site team wants to see by location what kind of assessment information we have for each program. A report will be written to help them understand that each location has two populations. One is the population of students who are enrolled for a program that is authorized by SACS at that location. Amongst that population of students, they may take the majority of their classes online. The other population is students who are enrolled for programs that are provided by eCampus and received their advising or administrative support through that location. Therefore, it is very difficult to assess an academic program at that location, because for many of these programs the majority of the classes are actually being taught through eCampus.
- 3) **Approval of Alteration to PA 6699 Capstone in Public Administration:**
 Dr. Dew explained that in a previous meeting the committee agreed that proposals for small changes would not need to come to the committee and Dr. Dew would approve those on behalf of the committee. Since this is a capstone course, Dr. Dew felt that the proposal would need the committee's approval. The proposed change in the course description was to add the statement, "To enroll in PA 6699, students must have a 3.0 grade point average or better." There were no concerns regarding this alteration; therefore, the committee approved the proposal.
- 4) **Continued Review of College of Arts and Sciences Programs:**
- Dr. Dew gave the committee a written review from Dr. Candice Howard-Shaughnessy on the Biology Program, Biology Major, Marine Biology Program, Chemistry Program/Major, Master of Science in Environmental and Biological Sciences, and Environmental Science Program.
 - a. Biology Program – There are four student learning outcomes. Three of which have been met. SLO #4 has a Plan for Improvement, but no data was entered.

- b. Biology Major – There were four SLOs and three of them were met. Suggestions were made that the SLO #5 needs a PFI to increase the Praxis II scores. The committee thought this was not stated correctly since there were only four SLOs. Either verify or create a PFI.
 - c. Marine Biology Program – This program uses the Major Field Test for assessing. Suggestions were made to make a PFI, such as a study guide or study groups for the Major Field Test.
 - d. Chemistry Program/Major – This program has 45 SLOs. Dr. Shaughnessy noted that there were too many SLOs. Dr. Edith Smith mentioned that SACS suggested three to five SLOs. This program listed the SLOs out be courses instead of real objectives. If the program wants to stick with classroom exams, then they need to ensure standardization for consistency purposes.
 - e. Master of Science in Environmental and Biological Sciences – Dr. Shaughnessy reported that all of the SLOs were achieved. There were no recommendations.
 - f. Environmental Science Program – Dr. Shaughnessy reported that three of the four SLOs were met. She suggested that the SLO #5 needs a PFI to increase the scores. Since she reported that there were only four SLOs, the committee agreed that this needs verification or a PFI needs to be created.
- Dr. Judy McCarley
 - a. Pre-Professional Biology Major – Dr. McCarley reported that the program gave the percentages but did not include the sample size. They used the standard components of classroom tests to measure their SLOs. They have four SLOs. The first three SLO they use certain questions on different tests. The last SLO they use the Major Field Test for Biology. The first three SLOs were met, and the last one was not met. The location needs updating.
 - b. Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice – They use the Major Field Test. The "n" was given for all the SLOs except for one. There were three SLOs and all were met. The location needs updating.
 - c. Master of Science in Criminal Justice – The location needs updating. They use comprehensive exams. The number of students and percentages of students are given. There are three SLOs and two were not met.
 - Dr. Dew suggested postponing the discussion of the BS in Comprehensive Science and BS in Computer Science until the next meeting so that Dr. Blocher can go over his review.

5) **Designate responsibility for reviewing PERs in Advancement:**

Brenda Campbell – Marketing, University Relations, and Sponsored Programs.
 Sohail Agboatwala – Radio and Television, Development, and Alumni Affairs.
 Dan Tennimon – Annual Giving/Special Events and Stewardship/Foundations.

The Advancement PERs will be discussed at February meeting.

Dr. Dew briefly explained what to look for in a PER. First, look at the expected outcomes in column one to see if they are consistent with the mission of the organization and if it supports the mission of the University. Then look to see if the division actually assesses those expected outcomes. In addition, look to see if there is data and if they have a couple of year's worth of performance related data. If they do not meet the objectives, then look to see if they have a plan for improvement (PFI).

6) **Alabama Quality Award Summary Feedback Reports:**

The IEC committee provided input last year when applying for Level 1 – the Bronze Level. Troy University received the Bronze level award. Mac Adkins went to the awards ceremony to receive the award. Dr. Dew thought the committee should review the feedback. After the committee review Advancement, the group will start reviewing drafts of the next application for the Silver Level. Dr. Dew noted that TROY needs more comparable data so we can compare ourselves to other institutional, and more longitudinal display of the data.

7) **Discuss PDSA Model:**

TROY has a complex diagram that shows how we do strategic planning and how we modify our plans. This diagram is shown in the Institutional Effectiveness Handbook. Dr. Dew is advocating for a similar, scaled down model, called the Plan, Do, Study, Act. It is widely used and easy to articulate. He recommends adopting this model in the future, and he asked the committee to read over the PDSA handout.

Other Business: SACS approved the Level Change. SACS Site Visit for the Level Change will be in January 2010.

The next scheduled meeting was announced for January 15, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. in the Executive Conference Room of the Adams Administration Building, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:15 p.m.