

**MINUTES**  
**Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)**  
**Executive Conference Room**  
**Adams Administration Building, Troy Campus**  
**Monday, March 5, 2012, 2:00 p.m.**

**Members Present:** Holly Adams (phone), Sohail Agboatwala, Kang Bai, Wendy Bailey, Bill Belcher, John Dew, Deb Gearhart, Candice Howard-Shaughnessy, Don Jeffrey, Kim Brinkley-Jones, Christina Martin, Judy McCarley, Jack Miller (phone), Dan Tennimon, Isabelle Warren, and Brian Webb

**Members Absent:** Larry Blocher (with notice), Janet Gaston, Bill Grantham, Mary Ann Hooten, and Roy Hudson (with notice)

**Others present:** Emily Brewer, Wendy Broyles, Somer Givens, and Charlotte Minnick

**Handouts:** IEC Meeting Agenda, Changes and Alterations for IEC Review

**Meeting Report:**

1. **Call to order and approval of minutes** – The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. The meeting minutes from November 14, 2011, were approved. Dr. Dew announced Dr. Judy McCarley’s retirement, effective April 1, 2012; this was her last IEC meeting. Dr. Dew thanked for her committee service.

2. **Update of Assessment Technology** – Dr. Dew updated the committee on recent work to purchase Blackboard Outcomes and Compliance Assist. The Blackboard piece will be used for courses identified as critical to the assessment of programs; the new product has been bundled with the university’s current renewal, and the paperwork is in Dr. Bookout’s office, close to completion. The contract for Compliance Assist has been signed, and paperwork is in discussions for accounting revisions. Compliance Assist is moving forward a bit faster than Blackboard. We will continue revisions of current HOMER reports. The next generation of HOMER will be more streamlined. The Software Selection Team is delighted with our progress; Dr. Dew gave many thanks to Dr. Vardaman for leading that team. Wendy Broyles will be working on an implementation plan. By our next meeting, we will have a much firmer picture.

3. **Status on approvals** – Dr. Dew referenced a handout showing what changes have come through for IEC approval since the committee’s last meeting. The decision several years ago to let the committee chair sign off on many of these items has freed the committee’s time to focus on assessment. Most items we see this time of the year are minor changes for the academic catalogs. New programs are reviewed specifically for defined, measurable student learning outcomes, but these are also reviewed by the graduate or undergraduate academic committee, the appropriate college curriculum committee, dean, and Dr. Ingram. Our approval process seems to be working for systematic and orderly review. Dr. Dew added that in the last Academic Steering Committee meeting, Wendy Broyles shared a flow chart of our approval process, followed by discussion of the overall cycle time related to external review and catalog inclusion; there will be follow-up discussion among the deans in an attempt to shorten the cycle time, to be thorough but also expeditious.

4. **Update on HOMER activities** – Dr. Kang Bai provided an update on HOMER report submissions. As of March 1, HOMER report submissions are 84% completed. CHHS, SCOB, and CCFA have submitted 100% of their reports; CAS has submitted 83%; and COE has submitted more than 63%. Global Campus locations have been 80% submitted, 45 of 57 sites. Overall, 98% of non-academic units and 80% of academic programs have been submitted. Dr. Dew thanked everyone for their support, and said we are making significant progress. Dr. Bai said the last non-academic report needed is that of CIBED; Dr. Bailey and Mr. Belcher agreed to follow up.

**5. Status of Academic Program Reviews in Spring 2012** – Two review teams have been formed for each college, including that college's dean, assessment coordinator, and Dr. Bai on both, with Dr. Barron serving on the team to review graduate programs and Dr. Fulmer serving on the team to review undergraduate programs. Some teams have had their initial meeting.

- a) **College of Arts & Sciences** – Ms. Janet Gaston was unavailable to report on the status of CAS HOMER review, though Dr. Bai confirmed she has met with her dean on this but not with the review committees.
- b) **College of Communication & Fine Arts** – Mr. Hudson had a conflicting meeting and was not available to report on the status of CCFA HOMER review.
- c) **College of Education** – Drs. Isabelle Warren and Charlotte Minnick reported that COE is catching up, connecting all the dots. Specialized accreditation for teacher certification programs requires student level data retention, so COE has a wealth of data to sort through in compiling their HOMER reports. SLOs are tied to LiveText, and they have the ability to drill down to any student artifact. Dr. Warren is working to align assessment efforts to both NCATE and the State Department of Education. She is also trying to create one format for all 39 COE programs (this college has the most academic programs). She has three years of longitudinal data, and the college is beginning to understand better now what they are working with; they have enough data now to do something more rigorous.
- d) **College of Health & Human Services** – Dr. Christina Martin reported that CHHS has met, and that good information was shared in the meetings. She will be sharing comments with each department chair for corrections and revisions. CHHS reports are decent overall, with common issues and some inconsistencies in curriculum mapping. She said a common challenge is shared by programs being offered in multiple locations. Dr. Dew commented on a question regarding the two-year assessment cycle that this is a flexible design, not to supersede specialized accreditation.
- e) **Sorrell College of Business** – Dr. Wendy Bailey and Bill Belcher reported that SCOB has had a good review and received good feedback. Dr. Bailey had not participated in creating HOMER, but she observed that requirements for ACBSP and AACSB are very different; she is currently working to develop two parallel systems for those specialized accrediting agencies, and she wants to also work on HOMER systemization. The college also experiences a challenge involved in collecting major field test data and linking that to student learning outcomes. Curriculum mapping in SCOB has also been inconsistent. Mr. Belcher added that a newly acquired ETS software package links SLOs to the question level on major field tests, which will benefit systemization of assessment efforts in the college.

Dr. Dew added that he has asked Dr. Ingram to include a time in the April 10 Academic Steering Committee meeting for the academic deans to provide an update on HOMER review status, follow up actions based on their reflections, and to share what they have learned through this process.

We have made significant improvement since 2009. We have a much more robust set of data, but we also recognize gaps. Our 2013 data will be even better when we begin writing our 2014 report for SACSCOC. Dr. Dew voiced many thanks to Dr. Hawkins for support of assessment technology acquisition and to IEC members for their work on the HOMER review teams.

The non-academic HOMER review teams will report in our April IEC meeting.

Dr. Dew shared his concerns regarding SACSCOC section 2.10 on student services, in which we must provide evidence of non-academic units' SLO connection. We have many activities in this area, such as library workshops and residential life contributions to student learning. We will begin collecting data on

what students are learning through experiences such as those provided by the First Year Studies' service learning initiatives.

**6. Status of SACS Core Team** – Dr. Dew shared that the SACS core team will begin to meet again this week. The team includes Rex Snider, Dr. Hal Fulmer, Dr. Diane Barron, Dr. Deb Gearhart, Dr. Lee Vardaman, Emily Brewer, and Wendy Broyles. The team will begin examining new SACSCOC requirements and guidelines, and will follow up on university policies regarding teach-out, complaint management, and credit hour definition. We have a couple of years to implement these policies and develop a list of evidence to collect. The 2014 report is the mid course review, and SACSCOC has only eliminated the easy things. Must include everything included in our 2010 monitoring report, which means all of 3.3.1, everything related to consortia relationships, and even student access to technology.

Our 2014 report will receive offsite review, in a group with other institutions. They may visit to review any new locations established since our last review. Our next full review is due in 2019. More often than not, institutions are writing follow up reports to their mid-term review. The process is very subjective, based on what the committee chair thinks. All federal requirements will be included in the five year review, and we will be responsible for any new federal requirements added between now and then.

**7. Other Business** – Somer Givens mentioned the upcoming *Chronicle* survey of 600 faculty and staff, to be delivered via email invitation on March 19. This survey will involve about half of TROY's full time personnel. More responses will mean a higher tier for the institution's results. The survey will be open through April 13; Somer asked committee members to encourage others to complete the survey.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:45 p.m. The next scheduled meeting is April 9, 2012.