TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Office *of the* Provost

Office *of* Planning & Assessment™

Institutional Effectiveness Weekly Report
December 7, 2018

The Office of Planning and Assessment reports its weekly activities and contributions toward Texas Tech University's institutional effectiveness efforts and departmental objectives.

OUTCOME 1: The Office of Planning and Assessment will contribute to Texas Tech University's ongoing compliance with all external accrediting agencies and State of Texas mandates.

✦ Fifth Year Interim Report
  ▪ Most Team Leaders have participated in meetings with OPA staff to discuss preliminary expectations for the Fifth Year Interim Report. A master document to track activity has been developed and will be maintained throughout the entire process.
✦ OPA is beginning to evaluate degree program assessment reports for 17-18 using the Program Assessment Rubric (PAR). Each degree program will be reviewed by two OPA staff members and an average score will be provided along with qualitative feedback. OPA's deadline to evaluate degree programs is February 1, 2019 and PAR Reports will be provided to department chairs during the spring department chair consultations.
✦ Faculty Credentialing Documentation as it Relates to Section 6
  ▪ The 2018 Faculty Credentialing Report is finalized and will be presented to the Provost.
✦ Quality Enhancement Plan Updates
  ▪ OPA is assisting the Office of the Provost with outlining the process for submitting Communication Literacy assessment results. A memo will be disseminated in early spring outlining the process. OPA will provide some assistance with data management and final analysis.
✦ Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and State of Texas Reporting
  ▪ Every odd numbered year, institutions are required to report compliance with HB 2504 to the Governor's Office by December 31. OPA has completed the report and is currently making final submission plans including getting the Provost's signature and verifying recipient addresses.
  ▪ The final 2017-2018 Core Curriculum Annual Report has been finalized and is now currently under review by the Core Curriculum Steering Committee. Once final revisions are made, the report will be made publicly available.

OUTCOME 2: Texas Tech University faculty and staff will be well-prepared to meet OPA's faculty credentialing, assessment, and strategic plan expectations.

- ✦ Assessment Innovation Grant- The AIG award provides four $500 awards to individuals/departments who are engaged in innovative assessment. The winners have been asked to be present at the first OPA Coffee Break on February 6. This year's winners are:
  - ▪ Dr. Gordana Lazic, Assistant Professor Practice, Communication Studies
  - ▪ Dr. James Dunham, Facilitator of Staff Development CISER
  - ▪ Gerald Beyer, Professor; Richard Rosen, Professor, and Brian Shannon, Professor from School of Law
  - ▪ Dr. Kelli Cargile-Cook, Professor, Department of Professional Communication
- ✦ Training and Consultation Tracking
  - ▪ These totals include consultations and communications where the OPA provides support for faculty and staff on non-project specific activity.

	Number of individuals	Number of issues addressed	Number of email sent on issue	Number of phone calls	Number of in informal consultations	Number of formal trainings
Week of Nov 19, 2018	17	11	22	5	3	0
Week of Nov 26, 2018	28	31	46	6	0	4
Week of Dec 3, 2018	46	52	85	6	0	2
As of Sept 1, 2018	430	451	609	101	32	12

- ✦ Training Opportunities
  - ▪ OPA is in the process of creating a Spring 2019 newsletter that will be released to all TTU faculty and staff in mid-January 2019. The newsletter will announce the Assessment Innovation Grant award winners, the spring 2019 Coffee Breaks schedule, the 2019 TxAHEA Conference date and location, and also provide a reminder for the Institutional Effectiveness Excellence Award as well as OPA resources for faculty and staff.
- ✦ Adjustments to the activities of the Assessment Liaison Committee will be implemented beginning next spring based on feedback from the committee. The Assessment Liaison Committee will move to an active contact list of individuals that will be:
  - ▪ First contacts for all institutional approved updates to assessment activities and practices;
  - ▪ Asked to provide feedback on training videos and publicly available reports;
  - ▪ Informed and encouraged to participate in OPA programs that promote assessment such as trainings and Coffee Breaks; and
  - ▪ Used to assist OPA with promoting reporting deadlines, marketing programs, and informing the campus community of SACSCOC updates.
- ✦ General Faculty Credentialing
  - ▪ Spring 2019 courses are uploaded into DigitalMeasures. This required some additional API coding by TTU's Application Support personnel to include CRN numbers and semester codes.

- API access for Zafar Miller with RCoBA is nearly finalized. He updated his FERPA training. Cathy Austin asked the IT Security Team if they approve the methodology and we are waiting for this approval before releasing Mr. Miller.
- OPA staff finished work with the Nuventive Vitae team to complete forms and fields. A final piece is to go over the Vitae course catalog screen and is scheduled for next week.
- Open Work Requests

Request #	Date Opened	Title	Status
124	7/23/2018	Annual Report set-up College of Business	12-6: The report is updated. OPA staff will review. 12-4: DM completed the requested changes. However, OPA staff found several corrections and the report was sent back to DM developers. 11-26: Dr. Jaeki Song made several requests for updates to the report. Also, a change in report format for Outreach and Engagement is needed.
125	7/23/2018	Revision to "AACSB Table 15-1: Summary of Faculty Sufficiency and Qualifications (2013 Standards, v. 2017)"	12-7: We are waiting to hear from RCoBA staff that the report is working correctly.
145	10/11/2018	GPR, Publications report	11-28: DM staff and Kenny Shatley met and he confirmed that the report is running correctly. Work request closed.
147	10/26/2018	Import RCoBA Degree Programs and Extra Compensation	11-27: DM completed the imports. OPA and/or RCoBA need to confirm that the import is correct. 11-26: RCoBA staff and OPA staff made updates to the import file. We needed to split the data so that degree programs imported separately from extra compensation so that one import didn't mess up the other.
148	11/21/2018	Add "Achievement" to Purpose dropdown	11-27: DM completed the request and it is closed. 11-21: CASNR faculty request that "Achievement" be added to the Fellowships, Scholarships and Awards screen.
149	11/21/2018	Data Copy Request: Chunmei Wang	12-7: The import is complete. Request closed. 11-21: Prof. Chunmei Wang asked that her DM account be imported from Texas State University. Expected completion is 12-7.
150	11/26/2018	API Access Request	11-27: DM completed the request. OPA continues working on further details with the TTU IT division before Mr. Miller's access is activated. 11-26: After much discussion between OPA, RCoBA, and TTU's Application Development team, this request is to allow Zafar Miller API access to DM data. He will pull data for specific reports at RCoBA.
151	11/28/2018	Change Dropdown	12-4: DM completed the request and it is closed. 11-28: RCoBA faculty requested that the Students Home Department dropdown within the

			Directed Student Learning screen be updated to change Wind Energy to National Wind Institute.
152	11/29/2018	Updates to Faculty Annual Report for College of Human Sciences	11-29: HS's Lynn Huffman and Dottie Durband sent extensive change requests to their annual report. Many of these have to do with Outreach & Engagement, but there are others. OPA staff prepared a template with the many changes and submitted it to DM developers. Expected completion is 12-17.
153	11/30/2018	Change in Department Name	12-4: DM completed the request and it is closed. 11-30: RCoBA faculty requested that the department name Energy, Economics and Law be changed to Energy Commerce and Business Economics.
154	12/3/2018	Add question about Outreach & Engagement	12-3: Related to request #152 above, HS would like to ask the question about Outreach & Engagement on the Fellowships, Scholarships and Awards screen. (This question is already included on several other DM screens.) Expected completion is 12-17.
155	12/5/2018	Second Faculty Transcript Report	12-5: The Provost's Office would like to be able to produce a Faculty Transcript Report which includes only tenure and tenure/track faculty. This second version of the report should accomplish that. Expected completion is 12-13.

✦ TxAHEA
  ▪ OPA is working on developing a new website for the 2019 TxAHEA Conference. OPA purchased a website domain that will house the conference page, and which will reflect the partnership between all institutions. The website is planned to be completed by the end of January 2019 before the call for proposals is announced.
✦ Institutional Collaborative Assessment Updates
  ▪ Raiders Engaged- The deadline was extended and so OPA is still reviewing and cleaning data. Once we return to work after the Christmas Break, data will be finalized and initial results will be available. OPA will assist in the leadership of a new metrics taskforce for Outreach and Engagement throughout the spring semester. Updates will be available closer to the first meeting.
✦ Student Portfolios- OPA assisted TTU Worldwide eLearning with the analysis of a student portfolio on student experiences. The data was summarized and provided.

OUTCOME 3: The Office of Planning and Assessment will continually monitor the university's compliance with laws, policy statements, and policies deriving from the State of Texas, THECB, and SACSCOC.

✦ THECB Updates
  ▪ Regional Targets Submission Results for 60x30TX

Regional Targets: 60x30 Educated Population Goal

Percent of Texans ages 25-34 with a certificate or degree (attainment)				
Region	**2016** (actual)	**2020** (projection)	**2025** (projection)	**2030** (projection)
High Plains	38%	42%	49%	56%
Northwest	37%	40%	49%	60%
Metroplex	46%	54%	60%	65%
Upper East Texas	34%	34%	40%	48%
Southeast Texas	32%	38%	44%	52%
Gulf Coast	45%	51%	58%	65%
Central Texas	48%	58%	64%	70%
South Texas	35%	37%	41%	47%
West Texas	34%	40%	48%	55%
Upper Rio Grande	42%	39%	43%	51%
Statewide	**42.3%**	**48%**	**54%**	**60%**

60x30TX   Regional Target, THECB estimations

Regional Targets: Completion Goal

Number of students completing a certificate, associate, bachelor's, or master's degree				
Region	**2017** (actual)	**2020** (projection)	**2025** (projection)	**2030** (projection)
High Plains	16,958	18,803	22,756	27,511
Northwest	5,374	6,499	7,865	9,509
Metroplex	76,984	93,547	113,210	136,865
Upper East Texas	12,975	14,207	17,194	20,786
Southeast Texas	9,366	9,761	11,813	14,281
Gulf Coast	58,548	80,862	97,859	118,306
Central Texas	57,300	68,270	82,620	99,884
South Texas	51,976	63,641	77,018	93,111
West Texas	5,233	6,890	8,304	9,965
Upper Rio Grande	9,416	13,520	16,362	19,781
Statewide	**333,920**	**376,000**	**455,000**	**550,000**

60x30TX   Regional Target, THECB estimations

Regional Targets: HS to HE Enrollment Target

Percentage of TX public high school graduates enrolling in an institution of higher education in Texas the first fall…				
Region	**2017** (actual)	**2020** (projection)	**2025** (projection)	**2030** (projection)
High Plains	50%	57%	60%	64%
Northwest	51%	57%	60%	64%
Metroplex	52%	57%	60%	64%
Upper East Texas	48%	56%	58%	62%
Southeast Texas	49%	54%	57%	61%
Gulf Coast	53%	60%	63%	68%
Central Texas	52%	57%	60%	64%
South Texas	53%	57%	60%	64%
West Texas	50%	55%	58%	62%
Upper Rio Grande	56%	64%	67%	71%
Statewide	**52%**	**58%**	**61%**	**65%**

60x30TX — Regional Target, THECB estimations

THECB developed a starter kit to support regional efforts

New Resources Posted!
- Updated data workbooks with institutional completion targets as submitted to THECB
- Regional strategy briefs

- Autism Grant Program Parent-directed Treatment: Request for Applications 2019-2020
  - The 85th Texas Legislature passed the General Appropriations Act, Senate Bill (SB) 1, Article III, Section 50, which directs the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to award grants to existing autism research centers at Texas public and private institutions of higher education for projects in three award categories:
    1) Parent-directed Treatment
    2) Board-certified Behavior Analyst Training for teachers/paraprofessionals
    3) Research, development, and evaluation of innovative autism treatment models

- The 2019-2020 Request for Applications (RFA) will provide grant awards to eligible applicants for Parent-directed Treatment.
- Funding will be awarded and distributed to one or more autism research centers at Texas public and private institutions of higher education.
- Parent-Directed Treatment – total amount available for all awarded projects is $1,787,269 over two years to existing autism research centers that collectively serve a combined total of 1,097 children through parent-direct treatment methods.
- The program has prescribed numbers of children to be served. In the first year (2019), the number of children served needs to meet or exceed 350 children for all projects combined.
    - In the second year (2020), the number of children served needs to increase to a minimum of 750 children.

Dates	Application Steps
December 17, 2018	Submission of Application Deadline
By December 19, 2018	Confirmation of Application Receipt by THECB
January 2018	THECB Announces Grant Awards
Upon execution of Notice of Grant Award (NOGA), in January 2019	Grant Period Begins
December 31, 2020	Grant Period Ends

- Tuition Rate for Non-Resident and Foreign Students for AY 2019-2020:
    - Coordinating Board staff has determined that the tuition rate for nonresident students enrolled in public universities and health-related institutions for the academic year 2019-2020 will be set at $472 per semester credit hour plus any designated tuition and, when appropriate, Board-authorized graduate tuition charged by your institution.
    - Exceptions include tuition rates for nonresident students enrolled in medicine, veterinary medicine, dentistry, and law. The tuition rates for those students are provided in other paragraphs of Section 54.051 of the Texas Education Code
    - The nonresident tuition set-aside for the Texas Public Educational Grant Program (TPEG) is three percent of the basic nonresident tuition rate of $472 per hour. TPEG set-asides are not subtracted from designated tuition or Board-authorized tuition.
- **Texas Higher Education Star Awards:** Awards established by the THECB to recognize exceptional contributions towards achieving one or more of the goals of the former long-range Texas higher education plan, Closing the Gaps.
    - Second Degree Accelerated BSN Program
        - Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center
    - College of Education Partnership
        - South Plains College/Texas Tech University
    - **The University Writing Center**
        - **Texas Tech University**
- SACSCOC

- Analyzing a case for compliance: How to focus and develop analysis for compliance with Core Requirements and the Standards in the Principles of Accreditation.

COMPONENT	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE
The narrative includes a statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement	Either the narrative does not include a statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement, or it is not applicable to the specific accreditation requirement.	The narrative includes a general statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement but it does not address each of the components of the requirement. The narrative is neither clear, concise, nor focused.	The narrative includes a statement of the institution's perception of its compliance with the requirement that addresses each of the components of the requirement (as necessary). The statement is focused solely on the requirement.
The **rationale** for the assertion	The narrative provides no explanation of reason(s) for the assertions regarding compliance with all aspects of the requirement.	The narrative provides a limited discussion of the reason(s) for determining compliance with all aspects of the requirement.	The narrative provides a clear and concise statement of the reason(s) for the assertion regarding the institution's perception of compliance with the requirement.
The **evidence** supporting the assertion	Either no evidence is presented to support the institution's case or the evidence provided is unacceptable because of two or more of the following characteristics: • It is not reliable • It is not current • It is not verifiable • It is not coherent • It is not objective • It is not relevant • It is not representative	Either the evidence provided is uneven in its support of the institution's case or it is deficient because of one of the following characteristics: • It is not reliable • It is not current • It is not verifiable • It is not coherent • It is not objective • It is not relevant • It is not representative	The evidence provided sufficiently supports the institution's case because of at least three of the following characteristics: • It is reliable • It is current • It is verifiable • It is coherent • It is objective • It is relevant • It is representative

COMPONENT	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE
The **evidence-based analysis** of compliance	No analysis is offered. The analysis is not based on the evidence presented. The analysis does not pertain to the requirement.	The evidence-based analysis does not address all aspects of the requirement. The evidence-based analysis lacks coherency, clarity, and focus.	The evidence-based analysis addresses all aspects of the requirement. The evidence-based analysis is coherent, concise, and focused.
Overall judgment of the case for compliance	The institution's case does not establish compliance because: a. it does not adequately address the requirement b. the evidence is either missing or lacking c. the analysis is not grounded in data presented d. it is not coherent, clear, nor focused		The institution's case establishes compliance because: a. it directly addresses all aspects of the requirement b. the evidence provided is sufficient c. the analysis provided is sufficient d. the case is coherent

- Reviewing the quality enhancement plan (QEP), an evaluative framework:

INDICATOR	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE	EXCEPTIONAL
C: focuses on *improving* specific student learning outcomes and/or student success	Topic appears focused on *faculty and/or institutional administrative strategies* rather than student learning and/or student success. Little or no identification of *specific outcomes* directly related to student learning and/or success. Goals and outcomes/objectives are generic and difficult to measure. Baseline data and target for improvement is not present.	QEP is generally related to student learning and/or student success. Outcomes are stated in very general terms. Strategies may threaten to shift focus away from improving student learning and/or student success during implementation phase. Baseline data and targets for improvement may be present but not clearly related or demonstrably appropriate.	QEP is clearly *focused* on outcomes related to student learning and/or student success. Outcomes are *specific* and *measureable*. Baseline data is present, and targets for improvement are identified.	QEP is *focused* on important outcomes related to student learning and/or student success. Outcomes are *specific* and *measureable*. Baseline data is present and has been analyzed. Targets for improvement are appropriate.
D: *commits resources to initiate,* implement, and complete the QEP	QEP narrative *lacks information* about institutional resources available and committed to initiate, implement, and complete the plan. Budget *lacks sufficient detail* to determine "new" vs. "re-purposed" resources. Funding the plan may depend on future state appropriations or grant monies. Implementing the plan will probably stretch the institution beyond its demonstrated capacity.	QEP budget provides *minimal information* about financial resources committed for initiation of the plan. Narrative addresses human resources and re-allocation of resources. Implementing and completing the plan may stretch the institution beyond its demonstrated capacity.	QEP narrative and budget provide *sufficient information* to demonstrate institutional capability. Human and financial resources to support the first two years of the plan are firmly committed. The institution has an appropriate plan to fund the completion of the QEP.	Human and financial resources are *clearly identified* for all stages of implementing and completing the plan. Institutional stake-holders are involved in ongoing planning and evaluation to adjust the resources as the plan proceeds, if necessary.
E: includes a plan to *assess* achievement	Outcomes related to specific student learning and/or student success are *poorly stated or non-existent.* Timelines for assessing the QEP's impact are missing. Assessments are **indirect** in nature. No group is clearly responsible to **analyze assessment data.**	Outcomes are related to student learning and/or student success, but **too general.** Some assessments are direct, but the balance leans toward *indirect assessments.* Institutional personnel responsible for analyzing and using assessment data are not **clearly identified** or **clearly overworked.**	Outcomes are *specific and clearly related* to student learning and/or student success. Assessments are *directly related* to *measurable outcomes.* Institutional personnel responsible for gathering and analyzing assessment data are **identified and appropriately supported.**	Outcomes are *specific, measurable, and clearly related* to student learning and/or student success. Assessments are appropriate and directly assess the outcomes. The plan includes both **formative and summative** assessments. Institutional personnel responsible for gathering and analyzing assessment data are identified and appropriately supported. A *timeline* for interim formative analysis and plan adjustments is outlined.

FIVE COMPONENTS OF QEP REVIEW FRAMEWORK:

A = **Topic.** The institution identified a topic through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes.
B = **Broad-based support.** The topic has broad-based support of institutional constituencies.
C = **Focus.** The plan focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success.
D = **Resources.** The institution commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP.
E = **Assessment.** The institution has developed a plan to assess the achievement of its QEP.

Standard 7.2: The institution has a QEP that (a) has a topic identified through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes; (b) has broad-based support of institutional constituencies; (c) focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success; (d) commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP; and (e) includes a plan to assess achievement. (*Quality Enhancement Plan*)

INDICATOR	UNACCEPTABLE	WEAK	ACCEPTABLE	EXCEPTIONAL
A: A **topic** *identified* through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation *processes*	The topic is **ill-defined and unclear** –or– the QEP has multiple topics. The QEP appears to have **little or no connection to ongoing institutional planning** and evaluation and may have been chosen by administrators without much, if any, input from other constituencies.	A core group of institutional representatives develop topic and plan. **Some attempt is made to tie topic/plan to prior institutional planning.**	A **clearly-defined topic is directly related to prior institutional planning** which had involved a broad-based effort. Plan then developed by key individuals and/or groups on campus.	A **clear and well-defined topic is directly related to – and arose out of – institutional planning processes.** Topic selection involved a wide range of constituents. Selection of topic determined by a representative process that considered institutional needs and viability of plan.
B: has **broad-based** *support* of institutional constituencies	No evidence of how appropriate institutional stake-holders involved in developing the plan *or have signaled their support for the plan.* QEP may ignore constituent groups important to its successful implementation.	Some evidence that **appropriate constituent groups were consulted** in process of developing the plan. Appropriate stake-holders generally agree that the QEP is worth implementing.	Process of identifying the topic and developing the QEP engaged **appropriate constituencies.** Stake-holders are informed and somewhat engaged in the implementation process.	QEP identifies important constituent groups engaged in developing and initiating the plan. Stake-holders are well-informed and appropriately engaged in the implementation and assessment of the plan.

FIVE COMPONENTS OF QEP REVIEW FRAMEWORK:

A = **Topic.** The institution identified a topic through its ongoing, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes.
B = **Broad-based support.** The topic has broad-based support of institutional constituencies.
C = **Focus.** The plan focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success.
D = **Resources.** The institution commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP.
E = **Assessment.** The institution has developed a plan to assess the achievement of its QEP.