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

OUTCOME 1: Texas Tech will be found in compliance with all external accrediting agencies and State of Texas mandates

- A critical element of the IE Handbook is the TracDat exemplars that can be resourced by departments. OPA recently added the School of Law to the exemplars, so that now all colleges are equally represented in the IE Handbook. The exemplars are located on the OPA website, and are also linked from the IE Handbook.
- OPA has completed scanning and saving all faculty transcripts that had been processed in the Provost’s Office with the exception of four, which require further information. OPA will now transition to working with IOR transcripts. After these transcripts are scanned and saved, OPA will move these files to the Provost’s basement.
- OPA is currently administering the Mathematics CAAP module. Three administrations have been conducted so far and six more are scheduled for next week.
- Beginning February 22, Chairperson meetings will include a Chair Packet. The Chair Packet consists of OPA Staff Contact Information, a Faculty Issues section, a Degree Program Assessment section, an Overview of Institutional Assessment section, as well as a section for Assessment Opportunities, and a section for ongoing notes.
- DigitalMeasures Activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database - University (116,037)</th>
<th>8 Hours</th>
<th>1 Day</th>
<th>2 Days</th>
<th>1 Week</th>
<th>1 Month</th>
<th>6 Months</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>27,373</td>
<td>59,320</td>
<td>72,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTCOME 2: The Office of Planning and Assessment will contribute to the Office of the Provost’s institutional planning processes

- There are a number of iPortfolio items to address with this week’s report:
  - OPA spoke with Geoff Irvine, the CEO of Chalk & Wire, to discuss funding options for the second year of the iPortfolio pilot. The plan is to add approximately 100 more students to the pilot before the institution-wide launch in the third year. Funding for the institution-wide pilot has not been solidified, so negotiations for the pilot are managed on a year-to-year basis. Chalk &
Wire has agreed to fund the accounts associated with the second year pilot. The Provost’s Office previously committed to funding start-up costs associated with marketing, recruitment, and training.

- The first year pilot students were emailed the iPortfolio contest flyer on Friday, February 12 and Monday, February 15. Two $250 prizes will be awarded for the best iPortfolios. OPA has had daily contact with these students since then, by providing electronic portfolio examples, encouragement, and offers of assistance.
- OPA met with Erika Bowles and Tamara McClain with University Housing to discuss Learning Communities’ involvement with iPortfolio during the third year of implementation. Learning Communities pose an excellent opportunity to infuse co-curricular activities into iPortfolios.
- OPA is moving forward with the formal assessment process of iPortfolio. OPA will facilitate a Core Curriculum Committee meeting where the assessment of artifacts will take place. The meeting will be one hour in the TLPDC.
- OPA is compiling a comprehensive list of rubric examples from institutions across the country. We expect to share these as a stimulus for current and future pilot faculty members as they prepare their own rubrics.

- The Academic Engagement Ad Hoc Committee Meeting created to discuss Outreach and Engagement issues met for the first time on February 17. OPA is represented to discuss assessment-related issues. OPA presented the results from the 2015 Raiders Engaged survey and listened to feedback. The group engaged in a very valuable discussion on criteria and definitions of outreach and engagement. The data analysis of the 2015 Raiders Engaged administration has begun and a report will be completed by the end of April. Grace Hernandez contacted OPA seeking a justification for the significantly higher Priority Four numbers from 2014 to 2015. There was a significant increase in outreach and engagement reported data from 2014 to 2015, mostly due to improvements in the administration of the instrument. The 2015 administration was the most successful administration to date. A number of factors have led to a cleaner administration, including:

  - the survey went out much sooner than in previous years allowing for more communication, follow-up, and discussion with participants (in OPA, we routinely communicate with survey respondents to confirm data).
  - the survey itself saw improvements which made it easier to complete and navigate. For example, demographic data was pulled by respondent R number, making it much easier to contact respondents.
  - in addition to the earlier deployment time, the enhanced ability to access data quickly allowed for immediate follow-up and clarification.
  - through Dr. Birgit Green and OPA staff, outreach and engagement stakeholders (i.e., offices on campus whose mission is to promote outreach and engagement) were able to work much more collaboratively than in previous years, allowing for quality instrumentation and outreach/communication efforts.
  - and finally, blocking the outreach and engagement field in DigitalMeasures until after the survey closed was very valuable. OPA loaded entries into DigitalMeasures for Faculty Annual Reports with the option for faculty to edit their existing contribution(s).

- Planning for the Online Senior Assessment (OSA) has begun. Pending approval for a scholarship from President Opperman, marketing for the assessment will be updated and planning will be finalized. The OSA is scheduled to open March 21.
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 released enrollment and semester credit hours attempted in distance and non-distance education course for each institution of higher education. Texas Tech’s distance education for fall semester 2015 demonstrates the following. SCH refers to Student Credit Hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Instruction</th>
<th>Instruction Mode</th>
<th>Instruction Location</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Attempted SCH</th>
<th>% of Dist SCH</th>
<th>% of Total SCH</th>
<th># of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Out-of-State</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Country</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inter/institutional</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High School Dual Credit</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Distance Education</td>
<td>Inter/institutional</td>
<td>Individual Telecomm</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hybrid/Blended</td>
<td>3,502</td>
<td>10,516</td>
<td>16.20%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inter/institutional</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two-Way Interactive</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance Total       21,999 65,033 100% 15.30% 5,492
Non-Distance Face to Face On-Campus 125,862 360,118 84.70% 30,401
Grand Total 147,861 425,151 100% 35,893

- On Friday, February 12, 2016, Rex C. Peebles, Assistant Commissioner released this memo: “I am writing to clarify the role of the THECB with respect to the approval of courses and programs, especially with respect to courses and programs offered at locations other than an institution’s main campus. Essentially, any location owned or operated by a college or university away from the main campus and utilized for instructional and/or research purposes is subject to course and program approval by the THECB. The THECB must be notified when the institution begins preliminary planning for a new degree program. This provision stipulates the THECB shall evaluate the role and mission of an institution in conjunction with the development of the higher education strategic plan to ensure the institutions collectively contribute to the state’s goals identified in the plan. Note that part of the process includes notifying any institution of higher education within a 50 mile radius of the site at which the proposed course/s or program/s will be offered. If any of the colleges or universities within the prescribed area object, the expectation is that the involved institutions will reach an agreement. If not, it comes to the office of the Assistant Commissioner for Academic Quality and Workforce for adjudication. [Statutory authority is found in the Texas Education Code (TEC) §61.0512(g). Rules are found in TAC Chapter 4, Subchapter Q, 4.270-4.279; TAC Chapter 5, Subchapter D, 5.71-5.78; and TAC Chapter 9, Subchapter I, 9.161-9.163. Additional authority is found in TEC §61.0512(b), and TEC §61.051 (a-5).]

- At the end of this week’s Weekly Report is OPA’s February Policy Analysis. This analysis addresses the Higher Education Act.

OUTCOME 4: Texas Tech University faculty and staff will be well-prepared to meet OPA’s faculty credentialing, assessment, and strategic plan expectations

- On February 16, IR sent the Fall 2015 Student evaluation numbers for the DigitalMeasures upload. The data was then mapped and a project sheet was prepared and sent to IT. Mike Simmons was contacted to request assistance.
• OPA met with Ian Wilkinson from IT Education, and Ian created several MediaSite accounts for OPA staff members.
• There were three DigitalMeasures consultations this week. This first consultation was with Dr. Menouar in Petroleum Engineering on Annual Report development. The second consultation was with Janessa Walls to help the School of Law utilize DM more fully. Additionally, OPA worked with the Law School to develop a list of faculty with a JD. This was a request from Wendy Humphrey/Dean Dickerson.
• In an ongoing effort to assist Media and Communication with developing a TracDat account and system for managing assessment data for their college-level core curriculum, OPA met with Kevin Stoker to discuss TracDat 5 and a general plan for assessment. This will be an ongoing process.

*In addition to direct contributions toward the departmental goals, OPA continues to focus on continuous improvement measures.*

• Fall 2015 outcomes for the PPI grant have been submitted to ETS. The schedule for submitting outcomes data has changed to once a year, and will now only be due annually in August. An email has been sent to the degree program coordinators who are participating in the grant to request assistance in administering a survey to faculty members who are familiar with the students in the programs and their success.
• OPA collaborated with the Study Abroad Office to create several surveys in REDCap to assess the Study Abroad Fair and post-study abroad student satisfaction. OPA will house the data, which will be pulled periodically at the Study Abroad Director’s request.
• The Office of Planning and Assessment has begun reviewing specific requirements related to filling the Sr. Administrator position held by Katie Garner Randolph.
• The 2016 WTAC will be this upcoming October. A specific date has yet to be finalized. The planning committee had its first of many regular meetings on February 15. The meeting addressed conference location, leadership responsibilities, and general expectations. The WTAC is a collaborative conference with OPA and Angelo State’s Office of Accountability.
• Cayuse has been implemented at Texas Tech University to manage IRB submissions. OPA typically submits IRB under the “exempt” category. This week OPA reviewed the process and developed an internal template.
• Each month, OPA and IR meet to discuss deadlines and requirements related to the upload of data for the Voluntary System of Accountability. On February 17 we discussed recent changes related to new data expectations. OPA will review these changes more extensively before providing detailed information to Institutional Research.
• Each month, a representative from OPA attends the Teacher Education Council (TEC) in the College of Education. This month, among other items, the COE assessment plan was discussed and how they will meet the institutional expectations and deadlines.
The Higher Education Act (HEA) expired at the end of 2013.

- The HEA is a sweeping piece of federal legislation that includes the entire student loan system, the Pell grant tuition assistance program for low- and middle-income students, teacher-preparation provisions, and various programs that help disadvantaged students access higher education.

Senators Lamar Alexander (R-Tenn.) and Patty Murray (D-Wash.), the chairman and ranking member of the Senate education committee, have announced that they’re forming bipartisan working groups to draft a reauthorization of the higher education law.

The working groups will specifically address accreditation, accountability, affordability and financial aid, and sexual assault and safety.

- "The Higher Education Act we see today—a nearly 1,000-page law with an equal amount of pages devoted to higher education regulations—is simply the piling up of well-intentioned laws and regulations, done without anyone first weeding the garden," said Alexander in a statement, adding that his priorities include "eliminating unnecessary red tape, saving students money, and removing obstacles to innovation."

- Hearings on how to rewrite the law thus far:
  1. The role of consumer information in college choice
  2. Looking at the idea of risk-sharing
  3. Affordability issues

Meanwhile Rep. John Kline (R-Minn.), the chairman of the House education committee, has been focusing on a higher education legislative overhaul as well.

Hearings convened by Kline:
  1. A broad hearing that looked at flaws of the entire law
  2. A more narrowly focused hearing on how to increase access and completion for low-income and first-generation students

Republicans on the House committee hope to fix the law by focusing on five main areas:
  1. Empowering students to make informed decisions
  2. Simplifying and improving student aid
  3. Promoting innovation
  4. Increasing access and completion
  5. Ensuring strong accountability while limiting the federal role.

Despite broad interest in overhauling the law, issues could delay the higher education reauthorization: a congested congressional calendar, forthcoming appropriations battles, and looming 2016 presidential politics.

The most important components in the existing 1000 page HEA Bill:
Know Before You Go
Focus on how to disburse the most useful and most accurate information about institutions of higher education to students and parents in a way that's not overwhelming.
- Including tuition, fees, available scholarships, loans, and loan repayment estimates.
- Additionally, data such as graduation and dropout rates, job attainment rates, and average starting salaries.

Increasing Access and Completion:
TRIO programs will likely get some reformatting in an overhauled higher education law. And with Republicans looking to shed some of the federal government's financial burden, programs like the College Access Challenge Grant will likely get some face time as well. That program provides matching funds to partnerships of federal, state, and local governments and philanthropic organizations that are aimed at increasing the number of low-income students who are college ready.

Pell Grants:
One of the most difficult parts of overhauling the Higher Education Act will be putting the Pell grant on solid financial footing. In the past, Congress has had trouble fully funding the Pell grant, which is a quasi-entitlement program and gets both discretionary and mandatory federal funding. During the recession, the Obama administration increased the income threshold for eligible recipients, and more people than ever accessed the grant, causing the cost of the program to skyrocket.

Republicans have supported policies to change Pell eligibility requirements by limiting the grant to low-income students only and allowing students to draw down the federal aid over a six-year period. While Democrats support the latter, they are generally determined to maintain the maximum grant and eligibility for as many students as possible.

Teacher Preparation:
There are more than 80 teacher prep programs across 10 agencies, and a major goal of Republicans will be to streamline as many as possible. In fact, last year, Kline proposed shifting the Teacher Quality Partnership program into the ESEA altogether. Democrats, meanwhile, are more likely to seek to expand teacher prep offerings, especially for on-the-job training in high-need schools, rural schools, or high-need subjects.