

**Meeting Minutes**

**SACS Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Meeting 1**

January 26, 2010

3:00 – 4:00 PM

<b>Attended:</b>	G. Mattox, Chair	V. Floyd	J. Herbert-Carter	D. Florence
	T. Akintobi	A. Fox	P. Kennedy	
	R. Matthews	R. Morrow	S. Watson	
	B. Booth	S. Lamb	P. MacLeish	

Topic/Agenda Item	Discussion/Conclusions	Follow-Up/Actions
Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drs Mattox and Floyd welcomed the committee and charged everyone with completing the Institutional Effectiveness portion of the SACS process.</li> </ul>	
What is SACS?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2001 was last SACS reaffirmation. Presently in 10 year – reaffirmation due 2011</li> <li>• Our SACS Team consists of six committees: The Steering Committee, Compliance Certification Committee, Institutional Effectiveness Committee, Quality Enhancement Plan Committee, Communications and Documentation Committee and the Logistics Committee</li> <li>• Review of the SACS Process (PowerPoint handout)</li> <li>• <u>SACS Hotlist</u> (areas where most institutions are questioned by the SACS offsite committees)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Quality Enhancement Plan—because it’s a new process that most institutions are not familiar with</li> <li>○ Audit—because most audit processes are not complete by the due date the Compliance Certification Document is due.</li> <li>○ Faculty Qualifications—usually a documentation issue</li> <li>○ <b><u>Institutional Effectiveness</u></b>—because we must not only show what we do for evaluation purposes, but how it affected positive change within the institution</li> <li>○ All of these issues can be cleared up in the Focused Report, due to SACS six weeks before the onsite visit</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A shared drive has been created to upload information. Each member of the committee will have at least write-only access to the drive.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will develop an editorial style manual to ensure consistency in our writing and documentation.</li> <li>• Compliance Assist! Software was chosen to assist in submitting our final SACS product</li> </ul>	
<p>Roles and Responsibilities of the Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IE process involves a detailed review of MSM evaluation methods based on the strategic plan</li> <li>• We can't say what we are going to do (the review committee will assume that we are not doing it), but what we are doing and we must prove it.</li> <li>• SACS principles of Institutional Effectiveness (committee's main focus). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.5-The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide planning and evaluation process that incorporate systematic review of programs and services that (a) results in continuing improvement and )b) demonstrates that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.</li> <li>○ 3.3-The institution identifies expected outcomes, assess the extent to which it achieves these outcomes and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>A Discussion of Current Evaluation tools generated the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Academic – annual reports submitted to the Dean</li> <li>Faculty Evaluations</li> <li>Outcomes from retreats</li> <li>Department external reviews</li> <li>External Program Reviews (submitted to NIH)</li> <li>5-year department reviews</li> <li>Student Learning Outcomes</li> <li>Step I &amp; II passage rate</li> <li>Shelf Exams</li> <li>Match rates - Percent of 1<sup>st</sup> Choice, 2<sup>nd</sup> choice</li> <li>Attrition rate</li> <li>Percent of graduation rate</li> <li>Length (4 year vs. 5 years vs. 6 years)</li> <li>Percent that does not graduate</li> <li>Board passage rate – average score vs. national average</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generate spreadsheet of needed documents</li> <li>• Verify contents of the spreadsheet</li> </ul>

Resident Step III passage rate  
In service exams  
Specialty board passage  
Learning outcome objectives  
Learning objectives for every course  
Pass course – achieved objectives MD components have pre-made objectives and shelf exams  
Every course evaluated every 3 years by curriculum committee  
New courses evaluated by curriculum committee before offered  
Electives updated every year by APC  
Curriculum Evaluation Committee Reports  
Other Committee Reports to the APS  
Student Evaluations of Departments  
Look at syllabus for offered courses

Students evaluate faculty and faculty receives an incentive based on review

We need policies and procedures from each academic committee

- **Administrative support services**

- Title III Reports
  - Balance score card – Finance and Sally Davis
  - Budget alignment – does it match outcome
  - Survey Department Administrator's group (suggestion for a Research Administrators Group)

- **Educational support services**

- IT (blackboard, laptop programs, online courses)
  - Counseling (percent of students receiving emotional counseling and school counseling)
  - Student Affairs/Financial Aid – See what kind of data is generated (percent of students receiving student loans, scholarships)
  - Mentoring systems
  - Library (number of journals, subscriptions)
  - Grady – new computer classroom for students
  - Ph.D. and Masters program outcomes
  - New Ph.D. student lab
  - New Masters Program
  - Admissions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Program Review – 2004 Faculty Development Program Teaching Academy Faculty Advisory Committee All evaluations get documented All committees on campus – capture reports Role of Ad-hoc committees on campus</li> <li>• <b>Research within educational mission</b> RAC Research not isolated – interact with students in classroom GAMS Review Strategic Plan for teaching mission as it pertains to SACS</li> <li>• <b>Community/public service within educational mission</b> CH/PM had outside review in June – report to Dean’s office NCPC review PRC Community based research Community based learning OIA student service grants (Beverly Taylor)</li> </ul>	
Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look into where all the information is stored.</li> <li>• Ask unit Directors for reports.</li> <li>• Committee members should review the strategic plan</li> <li>• There is a SACS resource room in the Library.</li> <li>• Dr. MacLeish asked about cookies for the next meeting</li> </ul>	
Adjourn		
Next Meeting		February 9, 2010, 3:00 – 4:00pm