<div align="center">

MINUTES
Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC)
Executive Conference Room
Adams Administration Building, Troy Campus
Monday, April 9, 2012, 2:00 p.m.

</div>

Members Present: Kang Bai, Wendy Bailey, Bill Belcher, Emily Brewer, John Dew, Janet Gaston, Deb Gearhart, Candice Howard-Shaughnessy, Roy Hudson, Don Jeffrey, Christina Martin, Jack Miller (phone), Dan Tennimon, Isabelle Warren, and Brian Webb

Members Absent: Holly Adams (due to technical issues), Sohail Agboatwala (with notice), Larry Blocher (with notice), Bill Grantham, Mary Ann Hooten, and Kim Brinkley-Jones (with notice)

Others present: Wendy Broyles, Somer Givens, and Lee Vardaman

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 March 5, 2012, were approved.

2. **Status on approvals** – The handout of changes since the committee's last meeting will be distributed following the meeting via email.

3. **Update of Assessment Technology** – A handout of the proposed timeline for implementation was distributed. Flexibility is key for this assessment solution, as each academic discipline seeks to meet different reporting demands as well as those required by SACSCOC. We expect to identify a couple of courses for each program, not every course, for inclusion in the Blackboard Outcomes system. Campus Labs' Compliance Assist will facilitate commonality in general appearance, within each college especially; Campus Labs also offers templates for specialized accreditation bodies. This acquisition is a huge leap forward for the institution. Dr. Dew showed his appreciation again to Dr. Vardaman for leading the selection team.

4. **Status of Non-Academic Program Reviews in Spring 2012**

   a) **Academic Support** – Dr Vardaman and his team have compiled their comments for each department. Most reports had high and low points, though the team noticed a lack of consistency within the reports themselves, which resulted in a difficult review. Some groups must not have been completely clear about what was expected, but some reports were very good. Overall, the Academic Support area had a few shining spots; none were exceptional across the board. The following reports each included some aspect of a bright spot: the Honors program, eTROY, Leadership Development, First Year Studies, and Libraries. Dr. Dew will work with Wendy to distribute feedback.

   b) **Administrative Support –** Jack Miller reported that his team also had mixed results. The team noted special commendations for IT and Sponsored Programs, and they also indicated a couple things and made some recommendations. Recent achievements often detracted from the report, but IT added those to the back of their report as an addendum. Enrollment Management assigned champions for their plans for further improvement. Common deficiencies included immeasurable goals, expected outcomes that were not tied to goals, and a timeline that exceeded the reporting

period so that nothing was completed. Recommendations included strict adherence to format for these groups, since administrative offices are not concerned with specialized accreditation; other recommendations were to align expected outcomes with goals, to include an addendum for recent improvements, to set milestones for lengthy timelines, and to split one massive report by campus. Dr. Dew will work with Wendy to distribute feedback.

5. **Status of Academic Program Reviews in Spring 2012**

   a) **College of Arts & Sciences** – The review team for graduate programs has met; some were good, some were bad, and revisions are in progress. Janet has met with Dr Bai on the college's undergraduate reports. The departments had not clearly understood before but are now following the template to complete revisions. They are working to tie student learning outcomes into a curriculum map for each program.

   b) **College of Communication & Fine Arts** – CCFA has scheduled a meeting for next Tuesday.

   c) **College of Education** – Review teams will meet before the end of the semester. HOMER is temporarily on hold due to urgent federal reporting due in coming weeks.

   d) **College of Health & Human Services** – Dr. Christina Martin plans to submit feedback out to her department chairs by April 20. Some curriculum maps need revision; Other reports have data, and it is mapped correctly, but action plans need to be revisited.

   e) **Sorrell College of Business** – Dr. Wendy Bailey indicated SCOB is working to reorganize. Once they have determined an appropriate structure, they may need to start over with HOMER rather than only revise.

Dr. Dew added that the Deans recognize their dilemma and that they must pull from within for a valid set of assessment reports for 2009-2011 Our goal with these HOMER reports is to say, "look how much we have improved" by showing cycles of continuous improvement. These reports will really be great in 2013 if we continue assessing and improving programs. While we may pass with only data, we may not.

The academic deans are scheduled to meet with Dr. Ingram tomorrow to debrief on the HOMER review process and what they have learned.

Dr. Bai added that the colleges have worked very hard. Following the format is best. He said he would like to meet extensively with the other assessment coordinators like he met with Janet Gaston.

The big picture is that we are in a good place. We expect we will look as good as other institutions on our five year report. SACS continues to move the finish line, and our SACS core team is meeting tomorrow to address policies required for 2014.

6. **Other Business** – Dr. Dew shared that letters have gone out to notify deans who is eligible for reappointment to this committee. Dr. Bailey reported that an Assessment 101 workshop for the Blackboard Symposium on April 2 was successful and will be repeated for eColloquium next week.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:40 p.m. The next scheduled meeting is May 14, 2012.