



TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
Office of the Provost

Office of Planning & Assessment™

Institutional Effectiveness Weekly Report

August 30, 2019

Special Report

Preparation for SACSCOC Fifth-Year Interim Report

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



This week, we feature an update from each team leader on their progress to date. A similar progress report will be provided to Dr. James in Spring 2020.

Team 5.4 Update – Provided by Jodie Billingsley

Standard 5.4 requires evidence that Texas Tech University employs academic and administrative officers with the credentials and expertise appropriate to the duties and responsibilities associated with their positions. There is also an expectation that administrator qualifications align with position descriptions and that these administrative and academic officers are regularly evaluated to allow feedback on performance.

Step 1: I have corresponded with 32 TTU administrative and academic officers requesting current position descriptions and CVs by September 27, 2019. To assist with this process, I researched the systems that I have access to and provided any relevant documents that I thought may be helpful with this request. The collection of position descriptions and CVs will demonstrate that the administrator qualifications align with the position descriptions.

Step 2: To provide evidence that the administrative and academic officers are regularly evaluated to allow feedback on performance, I will begin collecting performance evaluations for the same 32 identified individuals.

Step 3: Using the information received in the first two steps along with information found in the administrative and academic officers' online biographies, I will begin writing the first draft of the narrative for this standard.

Update on Teams 6.1, 6.2.b., 6.2.c – Provided by Rob Stewart

The team working on Standard 6.1 met on July 30 to review the Standard, an outline (prepared by OPA) of what the response should cover, types of evidence to consider for the response, and for team members to be thinking about what they want to contribute to the response. Copies of the response to the former Core Requirement 2.8 were subsequently distributed as a reference. The committee is scheduled to meet again on October 9 to begin planning the actual draft response.

The Standard 6.2.b team met on August 29 to review the Standard, an outline (prepared by OPA) of what the response should cover, types of evidence to consider for the response, and for team members to be thinking about what they want to contribute to the response. This team is scheduled to meet again in early October to begin planning the draft response.

Both teams await finalization of faculty data by IR later in the Fall semester in order to complete a draft reflecting Fall 2019 metrics.

Team 8.1 Update – Provided by Patrick Hughes

Team 8.1 met on Tuesday, August 20 from 11:00AM – 12:00PM. Team members include Wendy-Adele Humphrey, Patrick Hughes, Jay Killough, Michelle Kiser, Kenny Shatley, Libby Spradlin, and Vicki West. The meeting began with significant discussion of 8.1, particularly around how Texas Tech defines student achievement. Team members decided to use “A Plan for the 21st Century” as an authoritative document, particularly Priority 1. Spradlin shared an institutional example from Richland College during the meeting, which helped to provide a point of reference for the team. Writing assignments were distributed, and Michelle Kiser will collect drafts and collate responses. Subsequent to the meeting, Vicki West distributed an updated Priority 1 document, which the team found quite useful.

CR 8.1 Writing Assignments

Humphrey – Law School Achievement

Jay Killough – Job Placement Rates

Vicki West – Overall results from Strategic Plan Table 1 from 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020

Kenny Shatley – Graduate School Achievement (i.e., enrollment numbers, degrees conferred).

Patrick Hughes – University Retention, University-Level Student Success

Team 8.2.a Update – Provided by Libby Spradlin

OPA staff are creating a plan to demonstrate compliance for TTU degree programs. We are working on identifying exemplar assessment reports to highlight within the narrative. We will also rely heavily on data gathered from PAR reviews to substantiate our evidence of improvement. We will ask for Dr. James’ input in late October, after 18-19 assessment reports are complete.

Update on Teams 9.1, 9.2, 10.7 – Provided by Genevieve Durham

CR 9.1

In May 2019 I met with identified representatives from all academic colleges, including the Law School but excluding the Libraries.

- I presented the representatives with a summary overview of CR 9.1 and described what was needed from each of their areas.
- I followed the meeting with a reminder of the deadline for submitting requested information (9/20) and also included the presentation used during the face-to-face meeting.
- On August 13, 2019 I resent the email reminder to all academic unit representatives. Following that resend, I received a request from a unit about seeing the unit's specific responses to CR 9.1 (previously CS 3.4.11 and FR 4.2) when TTU submitted responses to the old standards. OPA (specifically J. Hughes) sent all relevant responses to me via email. I plan to distribute those on August 30th.

CR 9.2

- No solicitation of information from other units is necessary to complete the report on CR 9.2. This is because the THECB defines limits pertaining to undergraduate and graduate degrees and also requires that degree programs exceeding those minimums provide justification when proposing them. We have no degree programs that total *fewer* than the number of SCH identified by SACSCOC as a minimum requirement for the level of degree.

10.7

- No solicitation of information from other units is necessary to complete the report on CR 10.7. This is because our institution has uniform policies for awarding credit and also for reviewing credit awarded for any transferred courses. The institution does not have any degree programs not based on credit hours.

Team 10.2, 10.3 Update – Provided by Garrett McKinnon

In preparation for Texas Tech University's upcoming fifth-year interim report to SACSCOC, our office has begun preparing documentation and supporting evidence regarding the two main sections of the resource manual that have been identified as pertinent to our core functions. Those sections are 10.2 and 10.3 (though it should be noted that publishing the "cost of attendance" data outlined in section 10.2 does, in fact, fall outside our core function).

My associate, Lindsay Hallowell, and I have identified the printed and online documents which fulfill the requirements outlined in both sections 10.2 and 10.3, and will have no difficulty compiling a full report well before the deadline listing the physical location and/or specific hyperlinks at which that information can be accessed. In addition, per the archival requirements set forth in 10.3, we have documented instances of fulfilling requests for information from very old catalogs for which electronic records do not exist (e.g., an email dated April 17, 2019, from an assistant professor at Liberty University requesting course descriptions from 1996 and 1997, and another email dated February 27, 2019, from a former student requesting course descriptions from 1990 and 1991).

We have carefully reviewed the outline provided by your office, and will work on creating the full document this fall in preparation for submission of the initial draft by the January 2020 deadline.

Team 10.5 Update – Provided by Ethan Logan

I write to provide an update from the group of administrators meeting to review and provide support for our response to Standard 10.5 Admission Policies and Practices:

Our initial meeting of this group was on July 25, 2019. During this meeting, we discussed the following components:

1. Review of the reporting deadlines for our contribution
 - a. January 30, 2020 – 1st report due to OPA
 - b. Provide documentation for the period under review – Fall 2019/Spring 2020
2. The reporting/review of this Standard will include:
 - a. Inclusion of all Admissions practices across the institution’s constituencies
 - b. Provide documentation in support of our adherence of this standard
 - c. Ensure that our Admission policies are in alignment with the University’s Mission
 - d. Catalog the samples of our documentation from our components
3. Action Items from this initial Meeting:
 - a. Review of our members in this committee and any outstanding units which need to be consulted
 - b. Begin gathering/assembly of all marketing materials
 - c. Discussion of the narrative response and coordination of contributions (Ethan will coordinate)
 - d. Our next meeting is scheduled for September 19th, our itinerary for this meeting consists of:
 - i. Review the Undergraduate Admissions response to DOE inquiry on Admission
 - ii. Introduce the specific admission policies from all of our admitting departments
 - iii. Review the Governor’s request for documentation for admission processes (in light of the NCAA and institutional admission controversy recently in the national media)
 - iv. Review the committee structure for admission decisioning (where applicable)
 - v. Review admission appeal processes
 - vi. Discuss dual enrollment admissions
 1. On Ramps
 2. Compass
 3. Estacado High School/Early College High School Program

Update on Team 10.9 – Provided by Jennifer Hughes

OPA staff have compiled nearly 300 cooperative academic agreements provided by eLearning and the Office of International Affairs. These agreements are the primary source of evidence for this response. Our next step is to convene a meeting between eLearning and OIA to discuss how these agreements are evaluated. The standard mandates that we provide evidence that Texas Tech “regularly evaluates” said agreements.

Update on Teams 12.1, 12.4 – Provided by Cathy Duran

Dr. Duran has assembled a significant number of team members for both 12.1 (Student Support Services) and 12.4 (Student Complaints). The 12.1 team is composed of approximately 40 TTU staff members, and the 12.4 team has approximately 20 TTU staff members. Both teams will ensure that our narratives encompass **all** TTU student services and **all** types of student complaints. Below is an excerpt from an email message sent to the 12.4 team on August 26, 2019. Dr. Tara Miller will be the point of contact for evidence collection.

The Office of Planning & Assessment (OPA) has begun preparations for the SACSCOC Fifth Year Interim Report, which is due March 2021. As Team Leader for Standard 12.4 (Student Complaints), it is my responsibility to develop a comprehensive report listing the complaint processes at Texas Tech University, along with appropriate evidence. Dr. Elizabeth Massengale will be taking the lead on collecting and compiling the required information, along with Dr. Matt Gregory and Dr. Tara Miller. We are communicating with you because you have been identified as a contact for student complaint process. Although 2021 is two years away, the first draft of the report is due to OPA by January 2020. We are reaching out to you now to provide an overview of what we will need from your areas as well as supporting materials for your reference. Sometime early in the fall semester, we will be in touch regarding your specific role in developing this report, but essentially I will be asking for examples as evidence to support student complaint processes. For the 5th year report, evidence should be collected from the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters. The 12.4 SACSCOC standard is attached, and here is the link to the previous SACSCOC report (2015), titled Federal Requirement 4.5: <http://www.depts.ttu.edu/opa/sacscoc/fifthyear/fr4.5ccr.pdf>.

If you are not the correct contact person for this important role, or have questions for us, please let us know as soon as possible. Looking forward to working with everyone! Thank you. cd

Update on Team 13.7 – Provided by Brandon Hennington

Hennington submitted an initial draft outline of 13.7. The outline is included below.

13.7. The institution ensures adequate physical facilities and resources, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities. (Physical resources)

- A. Are overall physical facilities of the institution adequate in quality, scope, and condition to support the mission of its programs and services?

Facility Condition Audit – Our daily services program provides and ensures that each facility, staff, student and visitor have the best experience available while in our buildings. The preventive maintenance program services the environmental air quality in our E&G buildings. Fire systems provide protection throughout all the TTU campus, thus providing certifications that the entire population is protected. All systems are certified annually. Our elevator program ensures that our campus internal and external population has safe access to our buildings. All elevators are certified by the staff once a year.

Deferred Maintenance (DFM) - TTU tracks and prioritizes deferred maintenance and identifies funding sources to address deferred maintenance. Since Fiscal Year 2009, TTU has allocated an annual base budget of 2.1 million dollars. The Operations Division Engineering Services prepares the Campus Condition Index Report (see attached) annually per mandate by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB). The Operations Division coordinates and manages all TTU's construction projects and building renovations (less than 2 million dollars) and utilities maintenance efforts.

Capital Improvement Program (CIP)/President's Forum (PF) Projects – The university maintains a CIP program whereby project requests from various areas around campus are assimilated and prioritized for possible funding. Since 2016, the university has allocated \$1M to address these types of requests.

Facilities Allocation Council (FAC) – Refer to TTU OP 61.24. The FAC is a council of administrators with representation from various divisions throughout the university as well as two rotating members that represent the colleges on campus. The FAC is tasked with several functions which includes providing a consensus approach for allocating limited financial resources that can be used for facility improvements. The committee administers funding for minor and intermediate construction and renovation projects submitted through the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) process, which address classrooms, labs, ADA needs, or life safety. The focus for funding will be determined each year by the council or president.

- B. Are there specific areas of concern in physical resources? How are these concerns being addressed by the institution?

FAC funding – Addresses a variety of projects that are submitted by the various E&G groups on campus. The committee considers the requests with respect to addressing life safety, ADA, or educational mission.

Presidential Forum Funding – In FY17, the university president's office authorized the allocation of a maximum of \$2M per year in general purpose classroom renovations and \$2M per year in class lab renovations. The funding will total \$20M for the entire initiative.

SFMO Funding – Each year, the President's Office allocates set amount typically around \$500K to \$1M for life safety projects identified by the State and university Fire Marshal's offices.

DFM Funding – Each fiscal year, a total of approximately \$2.1M is allocated to address maintenance needs in facilities and for infrastructure. The infrastructure includes streets, utilities, and grounds maintenance. These maintenance needs often address numerous issues at a time which include ADA, life safety, and planned and deferred maintenance.

C. Does the institution have a master facility plan in place designed to meet current and future needs of the institution?

The university develops and maintains the following planning documents for capital expenditures to address facility and infrastructure needs:

- Campus 5-year Master Plan (MP-1) for all large capital projects over \$1 Million;
- 5-year Deferred Maintenance (DFM);
- Grounds 5-year Paving Plan; and
- Utilities 5-year maintenance/capital expenditure plan.

a. How is it revised and updated?

Each of the plans outlined above are updated annually with input from various departments around campus and within the Operations Division. Metrics regarding repair work orders, maintenance expenditures, and working knowledge of the areas are used to prioritize the needs and projects.

D. How does the institution evaluate the appropriateness and sufficiency of physical resources at off campus instructional sites, whether such sites are under the direct control of the institution?

Our facility inventory team visits all our off-campus sites once a year. During this site visit, our team is verifying that the spaces are being used according to their space assignment as designated by The Higher Education Coordinating Board. If the use of the space has changed or there has been construction, we update our records accordingly and use this information until the next yearly site visit.

E. Are there details available relating to classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other specific areas that address adequacy and appropriateness of facilities? Capacity reviews? Utilization studies?

Each year we inspect every teaching and laboratory space on campus during our annual capacity audit. At that time, we are reviewing any changes to the space capacity which is then added to our records for use in the following year.

Along with the annual capacity audit, we use our SUE scoring system to capture capacity and utilization trends. Each classroom and class laboratory are scaled based on usage and percent fill. This scoring procedure gives a glimpse into which spaces are being used frequently versus those that are not being used as often. With low performing spaces we can review any possible space issues and execute innovative solutions to bring the space SUE score up.

Another way we combat space changes is working directly with the building managers. This type of participation is referred to as SUA, this type of cooperation allows us to create a rapport with those that use the space daily. If any changes have happened throughout the year, the building managers can send that information via our yearly survey.

To double check space use, we employ the BRSS system to randomly selects spaces across our campus to verify for any possible space changes. This system allows us to create a mock audit as an additional quality control prior to our annual audit.

F. Are there surveys or other information sources that provide information as to whether physical facilities are adequate and appropriate?

One of our metrics for deciphering whether a space is adequate and appropriate is surveys. For our new classroom and laboratories, we send out Raider Room surveys. These surveys are completed by both faculty and students who are using the classroom or laboratory space. With this information we can adjust as needed to fit the needs of the space users. Raider room surveys are administered twice a year, at the end of the fall and spring semesters. When needed we work concurrently with the office of the registrar to conduct a campus wide teaching space survey. Our latest campus teaching space survey was distributed last year.

We also rely on feedback from building managers in our SUA or space use analysis survey which is dispersed yearly. This type of cooperation allows us to create a rapport with building managers and capture changes from those that are in the space daily. Our online informal portal or MIP is also used to capture space changes. The portal is an interactive campus map that shows building locations, room numbers in buildings to even office occupants. The portal is accessible to anyone with TTU log in credentials, participants can view their space and send feedback on specific spaces.

In addition to surveys and feedback, we have our SUE scoring system as an additional check for adequacy and appropriateness. This metric allows us to see which spaces are being used and which space are not being used frequently. This gives us the opportunity to convert low performing spaces to high use spaces with renovation or updated room technology.

G. What is the extent of deferred maintenance?

Operations BMC continues to maintain and provide a safe and well-maintained E&G facility to allow for the educational needs of the faculty/staff to continue. Our deferred maintenance program provides additional funding for OPS/BMC to provide a continual cycle of maintenance and repair items so that our facilities remain fresh, updated and modernized. Operations BMC has a full-time staff member auditing all our E&G facilities. This audit provides future planning for both the short term and long-term needs of our E&G facilities. This audit also provides protected financial needs for budgeting purposes.

a. Does the institution have a specific plan to manage deferred maintenance?

The university develops and maintains a 5-year plan to address planned and deferred maintenance needs for the campus. The plan addresses facility and infrastructure maintenance. The university developed an in-house database system to track maintenance projects that are requested, funded and completed.

b. Is there evidence the plan is followed?

The information is reported each year to the THECB as a state requirement.

H. Are facilities properly and routinely maintained?

As a complement to the master plan, the TTU Operations Division conducts a Facility Condition Assessment of all major buildings on and off campus, with each building reviewed on a five-year rotating schedule. Assessments include structure, electrical systems, hardware, plumbing, insulation, heating and cooling systems, and many other criteria. The data gathered from these building condition assessments are the basis for future maintenance planning decisions. The Facility Condition Assessments ensure that TTU facilities remain in good

condition and remain adequate to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. An example of a recent assessment is attached [9].

The Operations Division is responsible for coordinating and performing routine, preventative, and deferred maintenance of TTU's physical assets. The Associate Vice President of Operations oversees the division's functions, which include building, grounds, and utility maintenance and services. TTU OP 61.02, Use of University Grounds, Facilities, and Amplification Equipment [11], prescribes policy for the appropriate use of university facilities, grounds, and equipment. Facilities personnel in Housing and Auxiliary Services also participate in managing the institution's physical facilities.

Lastly, the university has in-house staff that have necessary licenses and certifications to make certain that facilities comply with applicable building, regulatory, and design codes. Examples of in-house professionals include licensed electricians, plumbers, architects, engineers, and Registered Accessibility Specialists (RAS).

- I. How does the institution manage risk as it relates to physical resources? Is a risk-management plan in place with the institution's insurance company? TBD
- J. Are there proper levels of property insurance? Coverage for loss of use? TBD
- K. Is there a physical inventory? Frequency? How are items tracked? Tagged? Assigned? TBD
- L. Is there a disposal policy? TBD
- M. Were there findings related to fixed assets in the Auditor's Report on Internal Controls? Or in the federal awards audit? TBD
- N. Is the technological infrastructure sufficient for the needs of the institution, especially for distance and correspondence education programming?

The technological infrastructure is reviewed periodically, as new technology is made available, to meet the needs of the institution and online or distance programs. Our online and distance programs utilize blackboard, this platform is a university requirement and must be used by all colleges or departments that offer online or distance classes.

Update on Team 13.5 – Provided by Shannon Crossland

Team Members:

- Shannon Crossland, Team Leader
- Senior Director – Student Financial Aid & Scholarships
- Shannon Venezia
- Managing Director – Student Financial Aid & Scholarships
- Justin Noble (pending)
- Assistant Chief Audit Executive, TTUS

Activities to Date:

- Preliminary review and early draft provided April 23, 2019.
- Attached for reference:
- Reviewed "Questions to Consider" section of 13.6 and provided responses.
- Reviewed sample documentation to ensure all available. Confirmed availability.
- Reviewed cross-reference sections 12.6 and 13.4 and provided responses.

Upcoming Activities:

- Sections will be reviewed prior to draft submission.
- Begin work on first draft of narrative using references provided.
- Begin collection of sample documentation referenced in narrative draft.

Update on 13.8 Team – Provided by Ronald Phillips

Our team has made progress in showing that Texas Tech has a healthy, safe, and secure institutional environment. We have begun to meet with individuals whose positions are associated with the safety and security of Texas Tech University. We have also begun compiling documents and policies concerning campus safety and security. In addition to these actions, we have met with individuals to assess how to submit the above-mentioned documentation, including the preferred format in which the documents should be submitted.

Update on 14.1 Team – Provided by Jennifer Hughes

OPA is in the process of locating current references to Texas Tech's SACSCOC accreditation on TTU print publications and departmental websites. All references must be similar in their descriptions, and must provide the name, address, and telephone number of SACSCOC. In November, we will produce a list of these references for Dr. James, and we'll identify corrections that need to be made.

Update on 14.4 Team – Provided by Jennifer Hughes

OPA has updated the institutional letter that states our SACSCOC accreditation in "identical terms" to all disciplinary accreditors. OPA's student assistant is currently gathering the addresses of these accreditors, so that we can send an updated letter in late 2019. These letters are the primary evidence for 14.4.