Institutional Effectiveness Team Meeting  
August 10, 2009 @ 1:30 PM 

Academic Affairs Conference Room 

INVITEES / ATTENDEES (IE Team): Annabel Brooks; Shawn Brayton; Peter Braza; Pam Chally; Lucy Croft; Imeh Ebong; Mark Falbo; David Fenner; Faith Hall; Shirley Hallblade; Barbara Hetrick; Marianne Jaffee; Judy Miller; Tom Serwatka; Shari Shuman; Bobby Waldrup; Mark Workman; 

Chair called meeting to order at 1:35pm. 

1. Announcements—Importance of maintaining a vibrant IE Committee 

Shawn Brayton: Provided a thorough SACS update. Some of the highlights she presented were as follow: (1) informed the committee that the university responded to the SACS on-campus report recommendations provided by the SACS visiting team in the form of a written and detailed report. (2) One of the primary focuses observed at this year’s SACS Summer Institute is that they are beginning to emphasize the five-year interim report. What this basically means is that SACS focus is beginning to shift away from the 10-year re-affirmation to a 5-year cycle. She went on to reassure the committee that this is not a new focus but rather SACS has always had at its discretion the option to conduct an interim review after 5-years. This appears to be happening because SACS’ accrediting body has said that the 10-year cycle is too long. More importantly, UNF is participating in the 5-year review cycle. See addendum for components of the SACS Fifth-year Interim Report (attached) 

Mark Falbo: Provided a historical catch-up for the committee; to wit: 

(1) SACS Visiting Team Recommendations (February 2009) 

a. To revise the assessment plan, i.e., scaling back the number of outcomes, consideration of sampling qualitative artifacts, developing an operational definition of “community-based transformational learning.” 

b. To revise the budget, i.e., reflecting existing committed resources and personnel 

(2) Rewrite team assembled: David Jaffee, Adam Carle, Annabel Brooks, Li Loriz, Betsy Nies, Dan Richard, Mark Falbo 


(3) Revised QEP received by SACS 13 June 2009
(4) Hard copies will be made available soon, but a .pdf copy will be sent by end of business today for your review

(5) Please contact me at mark.falbo@unf.edu to schedule time to review or discuss the revised QEP personally or with your department.

(6) Center for Community-Based Learning welcomes the addition of Rabena Johnson, as Executive Secretary, and Heather Burk, as Coordinator, CBTL Instructional Support.

**Judy Miller:** Introduced herself to the committee. Additionally, she shared her fundamental viewpoints and beliefs about assessment and how it could increase student learning university-wide. Her first point was that assessment is the right thing to do; assessment is valuable. We have a responsibility to our students to institute an effective and robust assessment program thus, resulting in delivering the very best education we can. She stated that assessment helps us to talk with each other about our priorities; to design coherent curricula; and to collect information to use for improvement. Lastly, she stated that to make assessment more manageable and sustainable in the coming months she will lead a process of reviewing and selecting assessment software to replace our current adhoc assessment software. She will be looking to involve the IE committee into this process to ensure that the right assessment software is selected.

**Mark Workman:** The committee was presented with an overview of the university's strategic plan and performance indicators update. While it remains a work in progress, the strategic planning committee has been able to make huge strides that will prove to be extremely beneficial for the university on the whole. The committee looks forward to the point when these recommendations and suggestions made by the committee can be implemented in a more meaningful and accessible way.

Meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm. Minutes submitted by Derek Pringle.
Components

- Principle of Integrity (same as reaffirmation report)
- Abbreviated Institutional Summary Form (similar to reaffirmation report)
- Mini-Compliance Certification
  - Core Requirements (selected)
    - 2.8: Number of Full-Time Faculty
    - 2.10: Student Support Services
  - Comprehensive Standards (selected)
    - 3.3.1.1: Institutional Effectiveness: Educational Programs
    - 3.4.3: Admission Policies
    - 3.4.11: Qualified Academic Program Coordinators
    - 3.10.3: Financial Aid Audits
    - 3.11.3: Physical Facilities
  - Federal Requirements (all)
    - 4.1: Student Achievement
    - 4.2: Program Curriculum
    - 4.3: Publication of Policies
    - 4.4: Program Length
    - 4.5: Student Complaints
    - 4.6: Recruitment materials
    - 4.7: Title IV Program Responsibilities
- Report on issues identified at the completion of the reaffirmation cycle that required monitoring for verification of continued compliance
- Impact Report on the Quality Enhancement Plan

Audience and Process

Reviewed by the Commission on Colleges and subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the initiation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.
First Fifth-Year Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I: Associate</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II: Bachelors</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III and IV: Masters</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level V and VI: Doctoral</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (public: 55, private: 21)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top Cited Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th># Institutions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Items Cited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Number of Institutions</th>
<th>% of Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNF’s Action Plan

- Keep our Compliance Report up-to-date for use at the fifth year;
- Re-evaluate 2.8 beginning fall 2009;
- Strengthen our position with 3.3.1.1;
- Collect new evidence end of 2012 to assure continued compliance; and
- Create an annual reporting process for the CBTL to properly document significant changes made and rationale for making the changes.