

MINUTES
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS COMMITTEE MEETING
EXECUTIVE CONFERENCE ROOM
ADAMS ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
Monday, October 5, 2009, 2:00 p.m.

Members Present: Holly Adams, Sohail Agboatwala, Kang Bai, Larry Blocher, Brenda Campbell, John Dew, Bill Grantham, Candice Howard-Shaughnessy, Kim Jones, Tish Matuszek (vTel), Judy McCarley, Tracy Newvine, and Lance Tatum

Members Absent: Meryem Boulale, Mary Ann Hooten (with notice), Jack Miller, Dan Tennimon (with notice), and Lisa Vardaman

Others present: Emily Brewer, Wendy Broyles, Richard Federinko, and Edith Smith

Handouts: IEC Meeting Agenda, Changes & Alterations for IEC Review, An Overview of Institutional Effectiveness (proposed introduction for the revised IRPE handbook)

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

1. Status on Approvals:

Dr. John Dew passed around the handout of Changes & Alterations for IEC Review, briefly discussing each item listed on that handout. He reminded the committee that he has been given the power to approve minor changes to keep the committee from completing paperwork for such minor changes during regular committee meetings. These recent approvals were reviewed and approved by the committee.

2. Proposed Introduction for IRPE Handbook revision:

Dr. Dew opened the floor for any comments and recommended changes; no significant changes seem necessary. This document will be on the agenda for approval in the November meeting. Dr. Dew discussed what further revisions of the handbook he would like to see made. The revised handbook will include a graphic demonstration of the cycle of institutional effectiveness. A section titled "Change Management" will be included for controlling changes, such as current guidelines for some changes, clarification of cohort offerings guidelines, a new document on SCP that will be shorter for us to prepare and for SACS to review, etc. Dr. Dew mentioned that he, Somer Givens, and Emily Brewer will be attending an SCP workshop in Birmingham on October 9, this Friday, and will bring back information from that workshop relevant to the handbook revision. The revised handbook will still include current definitions and updated forms. The goal is to have the revised handbook ready in December to issue after the SACS conference December 6-8.

Dr. Lance Tatum asked if the revised handbook will address Academic Curriculum Groups and the governance review cycle. Dr. Dew agreed that some documentation regarding curriculum groups could certainly be addressed as well as the best model for the review process.

3. Going Paperless:

Dr. Dew talked about the initiative towards becoming paperless. Once the compliance website is up and running – and until that time, we can use the IRPE area of the troy.edu

website – we will post an SCP to that website and send out an email notice that the SCP is available for review. Rather than using a routing sheet with a hardcopy of an SCP, we will pass around an approval sheet, which would be the only necessary paper form involved in the process; an electronic version may be possible, however, to decrease the paper trail further. Mrs. Brenda Campbell mentioned the need for an electronic vault for key people to submit or make changes that are necessary. Dr. Edith Smith thinks the parallel review process would cause problems, with multiple committees submitting the same changes and causing double work for those key people making changes to a document; serial review is still necessary, though will be done more expeditiously in this electronic format. The issue was raised that the Graduate Council wants two weeks to review documents now, which means the IEC will have to be aware of scheduling and receipt and review of documents that are sent on to the Grad Council. A model was decided upon that involved college review first, and then a document can move on to other committees; Dr. Tatum brought up the idea of a conceptual framework, in that front-end questions should be addressed before doing all the work and the concept should receive senior-level approval first.

4. Role of the IEC:

Dr. Dew stated that, according to the 2007 IRPE handbook, the IEC is scheduled to review the College of Health and Human Services, College of Communication and Fine Arts, eCampus, and Student Services during the year 2009-2010. Because we are in a unique situation, regrouping after the SACS review, we have the opportunity to reevaluate this role. Review of colleges and administrative groups was difficult with Dashboard; there is already much more information in a more user-friendly format in HOMER. Dr. Dew proposed that, rather than have the IEC review each area, a team of reviewers in each college or group might review their own program and peer faculty with the help of an outside expert. Dr. Smith pointed out that the quality of this proposed review could become very fragmented and lose the consistency of the IEC handling the review because some colleges or groups might not review their programs to the same level as others; common structure in the form of a three-year report similar to the Chancellor's briefings could be used for feedback to the programs after IEC review. Dr. Tatum asked about the current quality assurance model for eCampus. Dr. Dew commented that SACS liked that model. Dr. Tatum said that assessment run and reviewed by the college is attractive, but that specific guidelines for what defines successful programs at TROY are needed. Dr. Bill Grantham noted that there is value in the comparison of programs within a college. Dr. Smith said there are very positive comments on a unified approach. Dr. Candice Howard- Shaughnessy agreed that consistency is valuable across the board.

In the next IEC meeting, then, we will assign parts of review of programs through HOMER. We must decide how to prepare feedback. We have an opportunity to become more proactive. We will provide criteria on format rather than simply give direction to vision. Closing the loops on plans turning into improvement needs to be easy to track. Perhaps we can add a slide to our HOMER files that names the reviewers of data provided. The university's overarching vision must drive plans and assessments. SACS language defines "program level outcomes," but we want to see that details connect back to the strategic vision; the university's strategic plan connects to the plan for the college and that plan for the college connects to and feeds from the program level expected outcomes. In our review of programs, we also want to see a culture of reading and elements of research at the program level. Administrative groups also need this opportunity for assessment; the same is true for centers and institutes that are community and economic developments, which we have seen great improvement in reporting done for HOMER.

In review, we need more discussion and work at the college or group level, especially for assessment. This current discussion may reflect upon IEC future membership towards better peer review. We need to keep our momentum going for the next SACS review. In the next IEC meeting, a proposal will be made to provide support at the college/group level to target the planned areas: College of Health and Human Services, College of Communication and Fine Arts, eCampus, and Student Services.

5. Other Business:

Dr. Dew reminded committee members that the SACS conference is being held in Atlanta, December 6-8, 2009. On the 8th will be the announcement of reaffirmation, etc.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:15 p.m. The next meeting is set for November 9, 2009.