

PROCEEDINGS

A Communique of the Commission on Colleges

VOL. 57, No.3

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

SPRING - 2005

Derek Bok to Address Annual Meeting Delegates in December



The 110th Annual Meeting of the Commission on Colleges will commence on December 4, 2005, at 5:00 p.m. in Atlanta with Derek Bok as the featured speaker.

Well-known in higher education circles, Bok has been a lawyer and professor of law, dean of the law school, and president of Harvard University. He has served as 300th Anniversary

University Professor and, since July 2003, has served as research professor. He has written five books on higher education: *Beyond the Ivory Tower* (1982), *Higher Learning* (1986), *Universities and the Future of America* (1990), *The Shape of the River* (1998), and *Universities in the Marketplace* (2003). He has also published *Labor and the American Community* (1970) and *The Cost of Talent* (1993) about how our executives and professionals are paid and why it matters. He has served on the board of trustees of the World Resources Institute, the University of Massachusetts and chair

of the board of overseers of the Curtis Institute in Philadelphia. In 1999, he became the National Chair of Common Cause. He is presently chair of the Spencer Foundation and faculty chair of the Hauser Center for the Study of Nonprofit Organizations and Philanthropy at Harvard. His research interests include the state of higher education and a project sponsored by several foundations on the adequacy of government in the United States in coping with the nation's domestic problems. He published a book on this subject, entitled *The State of the Nation* (1996), and a sequel, entitled *The Trouble with Government* (2001). His latest book is entitled *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education* (2003).

Michael Johnson named Associate Executive Director

Executive Director James Rogers has announced the appointment of Michael S. Johnson, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs at Spring Hill College in Mobile, Alabama, as Associate Executive Director with the Commission on Colleges. In his new position, he will serve as Commission representative to over 100 member institutions and will have broad responsibilities for working with peer groups to establish and implement policy. He replaces John O. Dwyer who retired in December 2004.

"Dr. Johnson has had extensive experience with the Commission—serving as chair and as a member of a number of visiting committees and as a reader for the Commission's Committees on Compliance and Reports," Rogers stated when announcing the appointment. "His recent leadership experience with the college as it prepared its Compliance Certification and Quality Enhancement Plan for reaffirmation in 2006 will bring a fresh perspective to the staff."

Johnson has worked for 19 years at Spring Hill College where he served in various academic and administrative roles including that of directing the college's institutional effectiveness activities, chairing the graduate council, and serving on the faculty as a professor of economics and the director of the MBA Program. He has also held faculty appointments at the University of New Orleans and Cornell University.

Johnson earned an AB in economics from Davidson College and holds a PhD in economics from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His wife, Hannah, is a minister and they have two children and one granddaughter. He will join the staff August 1, 2005.



- 2 ▶ Actions of the Executive Council During Its Spring Meeting
- 2 ▶ Updates in the Review Process for Reaffirmation
- 3 ▶ Financial Reporting Timelines
- 3 ▶ Commission Dateline
- 4 ▶ 2005 Annual Meeting At-A-Glance
- 5 ▶ 2005 Annual Meeting Pre-Conference Workshops
- 12 ▶ 2005 Educational Excellence Expo
- 13 ▶ 2005 Annual Meeting Housing Reservation Form
- 14 ▶ Program for the SACS-COC Summer Institute
- 20 ▶ Myth or Fact?

Actions of the Executive Council During Its Spring Meeting

The Executive Council of the Commission on Colleges met February 26–28, 2005, to discuss issues facing the Commission and to act on a number of proposals. Listed below are some of the significant actions taken by the council:

1. The council approved no dues increase for the 2005-2006 fiscal year.
2. The council approved the Commission staff recommendation to increase the amount of incidental expense reimbursement paid to evaluators from \$50 to \$100 for committee members and from \$100 to \$200 for committee chairs. This change became effective March 15, 2005.
3. The council modified and approved the “Statement on the Responsibilities and the Ethical Obligations of Commissioners.” The statement will be forwarded to the total Commission for review and approval at its meeting in June. In addition, the council directed Commission staff to prepare a similar statement for committee evaluators and Commission staff.
4. The council authorized the appointment of an *ad hoc* committee to study current Commission documents and policies on contractual agreements and to propose modifications that would include a focus on joint and cooperative degrees.
5. The council approved a \$10 increase to \$285 for the annual meeting registration fee.

The Executive Council is the executive arm of the Commission and is composed of 13 peers: an institutional representative from each of the 11 states in the Southern region, a public member, and the Chair (non-voting member).

Updates in the Review Process for Reaffirmation

The Commission continues to consider input from institutions and evaluators as it “tweaks” the new review process under the *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*. Commission staff members are in the process of gathering information from those involved in the review of the 80 - member 2005 reaffirmation class. This input could inform future decisions for changes in the composition of the On-Site Review Committee, the role of the lead Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) evaluator during the on-site review, the inclusion of more presidents in the process, clearer interpretation of some of the standards, and the value of continuing COC staff advisory visits to campus.

Some of the most recent changes approved by the Commission or its Executive Council include:

1. The approval of a policy entitled “Core Requirement 2.3: Documenting an Alternative Approach.” This policy provides guidelines for an institution whose chief executive officer serves a dual role as chief officer for a governing system to comply with the requirement that the chief executive officer of an institution have primary responsibility to the institution.
2. The interpretation of Comprehensive Standards 3.2.5 (dismissal of board members) and 3.2.12. (a chief executive officer’s control of fundraising activities). The interpretations will be forwarded to the Commission for final action in June 2005.
3. A decrease in the number of institutions in a cluster as reviewed by an Off-Site Review Committee. In the past, a committee would review five or six institutions’ Compliance Certifications. Now most committees review three or four.
4. A modification to the content of the orientation for Leadership Teams that places more emphasis on strategies for completion of review documents and on lessons learned to date from previous reviews.
5. A change to the training of committee chairs requires them to attend a two-day training session in Atlanta prior to

their service on a committee. In the past, chairs were trained in a large group with other evaluators who served as committee members.

In addition, the committee charged with developing a resource manual from materials provided by eight subcommittees focusing on all the areas of the *Principles* will submit its final report to the Executive Council for review at the council’s meeting in June 2005. The resource manual is designed to assist institutions in assessing compliance with Core Requirements and Comprehensive Standards without prescribing a specific approach or mandatory checklist. While acknowledging the diverse nature of institutional missions and the range of educational programs represented within the membership of the Commission, the final resource document will provide a rationale, illustrative questions, and examples of types of documentation that an institution might consider as it assesses its compliance with accreditation requirements. The document will not duplicate other Commission handbooks; rather, it will be used in concert with those documents and with the policies and procedures of the Commission. Following review by the Executive Council in June, the final document should be ready for distribution this fall.

PROCEEDINGS (ISSN 0038-3813) is published eight times per year by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1866 Southern Lane, Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097. Four issues are published by the Commission on Colleges and three issues and an annual report are published by the Council on Accreditation and School Improvement. Periodicals postage paid at Decatur, Georgia and additional offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to PROCEEDINGS, 1866 Southern Lane, Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097. Subscription price of \$10.00 annually is included in membership dues. Phone 404/679-4500. USPS No. 445580.



Financial Reporting Timelines


The reaffirmation review process under the *Principles of Accreditation* has created new financial timelines for institutions. The new timelines for this decennial review require an institution to submit its audits/financial statements with its Compliance Certification for review by an Off-Site Review Committee rather than as part of the documents examined by an institution's On-Site Review Committee.

Under the new process, all institutions are divided into two tracks: Track A institutions are those offering only undergraduate programs; Track B institutions are those offering undergraduate and graduate programs. Track A institutions are required to submit their Compliance Certifications, including audited financial statements, on March 15, 14 months after Leadership Orientation in January of the previous year. Track B institutions are required to

submit their Compliance Certifications on September 10, approximately 14 months after their orientation in June of the previous year. If an institution cannot submit timely audited financial statements along with its Compliance Certification, it may do so as a separate report within six weeks following the initial due date of the Compliance Certification. That will give an Off-Site Review Committee two weeks to review financial statements in advance of its meetings. If an institution cannot meet the deadlines described above, then it must submit audited financial statements six weeks in advance of the On-Site Review Committee's visit.

To sensitize institutions to the new timeline, the Commission has begun inviting finance officers to an orientation meeting for Leadership Teams conducted in Atlanta at the beginning of an institution's reaffirmation. The morning

session provides an overview of the process; the afternoon session allows finance officers to meet together with Commission staff member Donna Barrett, Associate Executive Director for Finance, so that she can discuss the timing and submission of financial information and answer any questions that may arise. In addition, Barrett conducts a session during the Commission's annual meeting in December.

Institutions should check the Commission's Web site at www.sacscoc.org and click the "Institutional Resources" link to view the specific reporting dates for the submission of documents to the Commission. You can also find information and registration for programs that will be offered at the Commission's December meeting to be held this year in Atlanta. 

COMMISSION DATELINE

- May 16 – May 19** Off-site reviews of 2006 reaffirmation class, Track A
Atlanta, Georgia
- May 23 – May 24** Orientation session for newly elected commissioners
Atlanta, Georgia
- June 13** Leadership Team orientation for 2007 reaffirmation class, Track B
Atlanta, Georgia
- June 21 – June 23** Summer meeting of the Commission on Colleges
Jacksonville, Florida
- July 24 – July 27** Institute on Quality Enhancement and Accreditation
Orlando, Florida
- July 31** Final date for submission of membership dues
- September 9** Due date for submission of Compliance Certifications for
2006 reaffirmation class, Track B

2005 SACS-COC Annual Meeting At-A-Glance

Headquarters: Hyatt Regency Atlanta
December 3-6, 2005



Saturday, December 3

- 8:00 a.m. Conference registration
- 9:00 a.m. Pre-conference workshops
- 1:00 p.m. Pre-conference workshops
- 4:30 p.m. Afternoon roundtable discussions

Sunday, December 4

- 7:00 a.m. Conference registration
- 8:00 a.m. Pre-conference workshops
- 11:00 a.m. Orientation for first-time attendees
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch (*on your own*)
- 1:00 p.m. Commission staff perspectives
- 2:30 p.m. Concurrent sessions-I
- 3:45 p.m. State meetings
- 5:00 p.m. COC first general session (*Speaker: Dr. Derek Bok*)
- 6:00 p.m. COC opening reception and exposition

Monday, December 5*

- 7:00 a.m. Conference registration
- 7:30 a.m. Presidents' breakfast
- 7:30 a.m. Morning roundtable discussions
- 9:00 a.m. COC second general session (*Speaker: TBA*)
- 10:00 a.m. Refreshment break (*Exhibit Hall*)
- 10:30 a.m. Concurrent sessions-II
- 12:00 p.m. Conference lunch (*Exhibit Hall*)
- 12:30 p.m. Presidents' luncheon
- 1:00 p.m. Concurrent sessions-III
- 2:15 p.m. Refreshment break (*Exhibit Hall*)
- 2:45 p.m. Concurrent sessions-IV
- 4:00 p.m. Break
- 4:15 p.m. Concurrent sessions-V

Tuesday, December 6

- 8:00 a.m. Conference registration
- 7:30 a.m. Morning roundtable discussions
- 9:00 a.m. COC third general session and college delegate assembly business meeting (*Speaker: Ambassador Andrew Young*)
- 10:30 a.m. Group meetings with COC staff
- 12:00 p.m. Conference ends

*Presidents' Day

2005 SACS-COC PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS

Register Early! Space is limited!

W-1

(Re) Opening the Assessment Toolbox (Part 1), J. Worth Pickering, Director of University Assessment, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA; Jean M. Yerian, Director of Assessment, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA; Stephen C. Zerwas, Director of Assessment, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, NC; Karen M. Gentemann, Director of the Office of Institutional Assessment, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA; Kathleen Rountree, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, NC; and Martha Smith Sharpe, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA (*half-day or full-day session*)

The goal of this two-part workshop is to provide faculty and administrators with an opportunity to renew and/or learn skills with assessment tools that will be helpful to all who are interested in transforming their departments into a learning-centered organization. The morning session starts with an assessment primer, followed by writing measurable objectives and creating rubrics and prompts. The afternoon session includes using embedded assessment techniques and communicating assessment results. All sessions are designed to be interactive, with opportunities to practice skills as they are learned. Participants will receive a CD containing the presentations and related resource materials.

Target audience: These sessions are designed for faculty and staff who are new to assessment or returning to assessment and in need of some review. Intermediate-level assessment practitioners who want to learn, relearn, or fine-tune their previously identified assessment skills will also benefit from the sessions. Participants may attend the full day or choose the morning or afternoon session.

Saturday

December 3, 2005

9:00 a.m.—12:00 p.m.

\$75

Part 1 is limited to 75 participants.

W-2

Assessment Anxieties: Understanding Them, Overcoming Them, and Identifying Strategies for Sharing Assessment Successes, Marilee Bresciani, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Assessment; and Matt Fuller, Program Coordinator, Office of Institutional Assessment and Diversity, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX

For many institutions, assessment is not a new idea, yet the implementation of it causes many to think that it is. Often, faculty and staff with varying levels of involvement and motivation for assessment struggle with their differences and assessment professionals or those charged with assessment are caught right in the middle. This session will use interactive discussions and case studies to help practitioners of all backgrounds understand some of the common misconceptions of assessment on campus and offer techniques for moving toward informed enhancement of student learning and development.

Target audience: This workshop is geared to intermediate-level participants and assumes that participants will have more than a basic knowledge of assessment.

Saturday

December 3, 2005

9:00 a.m.—12:00 p.m.

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

W-3

What's Learning Got to Do With It? Developing and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes, Barbara H. Jones, Coordinator, Institutional Effectiveness, Somerset Community College, Somerset, KY; and Wesley Payne, Dean of Business, Technologies and Mathematics, Delgado Community College, New Orleans, LA

What's Learning Got to Do With It? Learning and the assessment of learning outcomes have everything to do with documenting institutional quality and demonstrating accountability and continuous improvement under the *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*. This workshop will focus on student learning outcomes at the course, program and institutional level; include a review of several assessment models that use a variety of tools and techniques; and explore strategies for implementing learning-centered processes at the institution.

Target audience: The workshop's target audience includes institutional effectiveness and assessment professionals, instruc-

Saturday

December 3, 2005

9:00 a.m.—12:00 p.m.

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

Continued on next page

tional and student services deans, and faculty. Basic knowledge of learning and assessment is recommended, but the workshop will include information at both the basic and advanced learner levels.

W-4

Planning and Analysis as Essential Components of Institutional and Programmatic Accreditation, Michael F.

Middaugh, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning, University of Delaware, Newark, DE

Regional and programmatic accrediting bodies expect clear written evidence of systematic strategic planning and analysis that assesses the effectiveness of that planning. This workshop provides solid grounding in the components of effective planning with an array of examples of the institutional research strategies and products which must underpin that planning. Each workshop participant will be provided a workbook that contains both conceptual frameworks for planning and analytical activity, and case study applications that illustrate exemplary use of those frameworks.

Target audience: The target audience includes provosts, deans, department chairs, and other support personnel involved in academic planning, as well as faculty and professionals involved in institutional planning and accreditation activity.

**Saturday
December 3, 2005
9:00 a.m.—12:00 p.m.**

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

W-5

Preparing for Compliance Certification: Conducting a Readiness Audit, Julia Pet-Armacost, Assistant Vice President,

Information, Analysis, and Assessment; and Basma Selim, Coordinator of SACS Reaffirmation in the Division of Information, Analysis, and Assessment, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL

A Compliance Certification readiness audit is instrumental in identifying areas in which an institution may have potential compliance issues and where there may be insufficient evidence to support compliance. Conducting this audit enables an institution to uncover potential problem areas, implement changes to fix the problems, and have the technology and resources ready prior to preparing the Compliance Certification document. This workshop will provide participants with the details of the readiness audit process developed at the University of Central Florida. Participants will learn about the steps of the process and have an opportunity to develop an audit plan for their institution.

Target audience: This is an intermediate-level session. The workshop is intended for senior personnel (e.g., provost, vice provost, SACS liaisons) to develop an understanding of the potential benefits of a compliance readiness audit as well as for mid-level personnel (e.g., director of institutional effectiveness, director of accreditation, chairs of Compliance Certification teams) who would have responsibility for leading the Compliance Certification effort. Participants may work for both large and small institutions, and both public and private. It is assumed that the participants would have some elementary knowledge of the *Principles of Accreditation*.

**Saturday
December 3, 2005
9:00 a.m.—12:00 p.m.**

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

W-6

The Role of the Department Chair in General Education Assessment, Rachelle Prioleau, Chair, Department of Fine Arts and

Communication Studies, University of South Carolina—Upstate, Spartanburg, SC

In the 2004 edition of *The Department Chair: A Resource for Academic Administrators*, the ever-evolving role of the department chair was reviewed. The researchers noted that among the “recently added responsibilities” of department chairs, program assessment has emerged as a major issue of accountability. More frequently, departments are responsible for ensuring quality instruction within the general education program, implementing assessment plans, and documenting results. In this process, chairs must work effectively with faculty and administrators to coordinate activities. Participants are encouraged to bring the following information to the workshop: institutional mission statement, general education competencies, general education curriculum, a brief description of current assessment strategies, and the latest assessment report.

Target audience: The audience for this workshop includes department chairs, institutional assessment coordinators, as well as faculty and administrators who have the responsibility of coordinating, designing, or implementing general education assessment procedures. The session will be of particular interest to faculty and department chairs who are responsible for reporting assessment results and documenting the departmental efforts to enhance student learning.

**Saturday
December 3, 2005
9:00 a.m.—12:00 p.m.**

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

W-7

(Re) Opening the Assessment Toolbox (Part 2), J. Worth Pickering, Director of University Assessment, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA; Jean M. Yerian, Director of Assessment, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA; Stephen C. Zerwas, Director of Assessment, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, NC; Karen M. Gentemann, Director of the Office of Institutional Assessment, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA; Kathleen Rountree, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, NC; and Martha Smith Sharpe, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA (*half-day or full-day session*)

The goal of this two-part workshop is to provide faculty and administrators with an opportunity to renew and/or learn skills with assessment tools that will be helpful to all who are interested in transforming their departments into a learning-centered organization. The morning session starts with an assessment primer, followed by writing measurable objectives and creating rubrics and prompts. The afternoon session includes using embedded assessment techniques and communicating assessment results. All sessions are designed to be interactive, with opportunities to practice skills as they are learned. Participants will receive a CD containing the presentations and related resource materials.

Target audience: These sessions are designed for faculty and staff who are new to assessment or returning to assessment and in need of some review. Intermediate-level assessment practitioners who want to learn, relearn, or fine-tune their previously identified assessment skills will also benefit from the sessions. Participants may attend the full day or choose the morning or afternoon session.

Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.

\$75

Part 2 is limited to 75 participants.

W-8

Documenting the Outcomes and Improvement of Student Learning, Ed Rugg, Director, Center for Institutional Effectiveness and Professor of Educational Research, Kennesaw State University, Kennesaw, GA

Student learning—its achievement and improvement—has become a key concern of institutional and program accreditors across the nation.

Improving student learning is central to an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and is expected for compliance with several Comprehensive Standards, as outlined in the *Principles of Accreditation*. Because of a lack of precedence in many disciplines, the task of documenting the outcomes and improvement of student learning is often daunting. This interactive workshop is aimed at clarifying the task, exploring the assessment issues, and offering practical tips and strategies for articulating, evaluating, and documenting student learning outcomes. Ideas for supporting necessary faculty development will also be shared.

Target audience: This workshop is designed to be most instructive to the novice in the articulation, evaluation, and improvement of student learning outcomes. However, experienced colleagues have also gained valuable new insights from several of the elements of this workshop that have been presented and discussed in other formats and venues.

Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

W-9

Strengthening General Education: Assessment Practices that Lead to Real Improvement, Teresa Flateby, Director, Evaluation and Testing, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL; Marilee Bresciani, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Assessment, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; and Allen DuPont, Director, General Education Assessment, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

In this workshop, participants will critically examine aspects of general education assessment as practiced at three large public universities. Each university is at a different level of assessment maturity and takes a slightly different approach to assessing general education. Participants will examine processes to determine objectives and student learning outcomes as well as course-embedded and integrative institutional assessment approaches. Ways in which assessment data have been used to foster curriculum change will be presented, and participants will leave the workshop with multiple assessment methods to consider using or adapting for their own institutions.

Target audience: Faculty, assessment coordinators, and others who are interested in effectiveness in the undergraduate curriculum may benefit from this session.

Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.

\$75

Limited to 40 participants.

W-10**Institutional Effectiveness: A New Back-to-Basics Approach,**

J. Joseph Hoey IV, Director of Assessment, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA; and Susan Bosworth, Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA

**Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.**

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

While the *Principles of Accreditation* represents a progression towards a less prescriptive set of criteria, they also place greater emphasis on student learning and continuous cycles of organizational improvement; institutional effectiveness continues to be a fundamental requirement for achieving accreditation. This workshop will cover (1) the basics of planning, evaluation, and assessing institutional effectiveness; (2) meeting institutional effectiveness requirements under the *Principles of Accreditation*; and (3) examples of current best practices in institutional effectiveness. Planning and assessment frameworks will be given for both academic programs and administrative units. Methods of integrating assessment into traditional academic processes will also be discussed. Examples will be provided of how to assess impact and document institutional effectiveness in a variety of academic settings, from community colleges to major research institutions. Various approaches to assessing general education will be included.

Target audience: This presentation will be of maximum benefit to those institutions that have begun or are about to begin the reaffirmation effort and intend to provide compliance documentation in an electronic format.

W-11**Developing and Reviewing Program Assessment Plans,**

Robert Armacost, Director, University Analysis and Planning Support; Julia Pet-Armacost, Assistant Vice-President for Information, Analysis, and Assessment; and Paula Krist, Director, Operational Excellence and Assessment Support Office, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL

**Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.**

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

This workshop will cover how to develop, document, and review program assessment plans to support quality enhancement. Topics include developing mission statements, defining objectives and student learning outcomes, selecting measurement approaches, documenting results and their use, and conducting reviews to ensure the quality of the process. The primary focus will be on academic programs, but the approach applies to educational support programs as well. Participants will conduct exercises to develop and review assessment plan elements.

Target audience: The intended audience includes mid-level personnel who have some responsibility for conducting assessment, teaching people to do assessment, or ensuring the quality of the process.

W-12**Write on the Web: A Simple Approach to Publishing SACS Documents,**

Danita McAnally, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Advancement; and Mark Hanna, College Librarian, Amarillo College, Amarillo, TX

**Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.**

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

This session will demonstrate a simple approach to creating Web-based documents and posting the documents via a database. Transition steps for changing an institution to a Web-based environment for publication of documents, including the Certification Compliance and the QEP will be the focus. Discussion and interaction will include: (1) development of archives for supporting documents, (2) building documents as master publications with hyperlinks to support documents, (3) problems to be avoided by applying effective organizational strategies for the site as well as expectations for navigation tools, and (4) access to a Web-based content management system (CMS). Review will include free and commercial approaches in creating an all-electronic institution. A sample Web site with templates will ease development for participants in creating online documents.

Target audience: This workshop is designed for beginner and intermediate-level audiences, including deans, provosts, presidents, QEP directors, etc.

W-13

A Simple Approach to Evaluating Programs Using Student Assessment Data, Retta E. Poe, Associate Dean, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, and Professor of Psychology; Dennis K. George, Assistant to the Provost for Planning and Accountability, and Professor of Public Health; and Antony D. Norman, Assistant to the Dean for Assessment and Professor of Psychology, Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green, KY

Demonstrating that academic programs are successful in achieving educational outcomes requires the collection of program assessment data. However, instead of initiating specific program assessments, faculty in some cases may be able to aggregate typical student assessment data, including portfolios, juried performances, theses or honors projects, comprehensive exams, oral presentations, internship evaluations, and papers or essays, and use these data in evaluating program effectiveness. This workshop will include activities designed to “tweak” student assessments so that the data can also be utilized for program assessment. Participants will develop program outcome statements, identify existing student assessment data that might serve for program assessment, and construct and utilize evaluation rubrics.

Target audience: This session is intended for anyone who has responsibility for academic program assessment, including faculty members, department chairs, and deans; however, it will be targeted toward those who are relative newcomers to program assessment. Although the workshop will be presented at a basic level, it will be appropriate for individuals who must design and implement assessments of all types of academic programs, including certificate, associate, baccalaureate, and graduate.

Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

W-14

Creating a Climate of Continuous Improvement through Program Review and Planning Practices, Ron Stroud, Director of Institutional Effectiveness; Dennis Brown, Vice President of Instruction; Richard M. Rhodes, President; and Donna Cieslik, Nursing faculty member, El Paso Community College, El Paso, TX

Targeting basic and advanced audiences, the presenters will demonstrate an innovative, replicable, mature, and broad-based program review and planning model that uses quantitative data to close failing programs or to trigger focused planning to improve weak programs and the administrative processes that affect them, all with faculty buy-in. Attendees will learn how faculty take the lead in writing procedures, in determining indicators (including student learning outcomes and regional job demand data), in recommending program closure or continuation, and in writing strategies to address unmet standards. Attendees will input actual data and strategies, and recommend closure or continuation of a program before learning what the college really did.

Target audience: The presentation targets both basic and more advanced audiences, in that it provides a model for institutions struggling to develop an effective process of integrating program review with planning. It also describes how institutions that have closed the loop can streamline their practices to use program review to enhance even administrative areas.

Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

W-15

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP): Community Colleges, Margaret Sullivan, Director, Consulting Network, Commission on Colleges, Decatur, GA

Selecting a topic for the QEP relates to the strengths and weaknesses identified and described in the institution’s strategic plan. This data-based document provides the basis for numerous topics, including potential goals, objectives, and outcomes. Selecting the focus of the student learning-based QEP requires administrators, faculty, and staff to examine institutional priorities. This workshop will address various approaches in selecting a QEP topic, QEP design, and evaluation criteria important in preparing the QEP.

Target audience: This workshop is designed especially for community college institutional Leadership Teams in the 2006 and 2007 classes; however, others may benefit from the session.

Saturday
December 3, 2005
1:00 p.m.—4:00 p.m.

\$75

Limited to 75 participants.

W-16**Enhance Learning and Motivation by Teaching Students****HOW to Learn!**

Saundra Y. McGuire, Director, Center for Academic Success, Adjunct Professor of Chemistry, and Associate Dean of University College, and Linda H. Bui, Associate Professor, Entomology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA

Today's students come to college with widely varying academic skills, interests, and motivation levels. Faculty often lament that students are focused on achieving high grades, but are not willing to invest much effort in learning. Most students think that memorizing information just before an examination is tantamount to learning the material, and they spend considerably less time studying than is commensurate with their grade expectations. This interactive workshop will help faculty and administrators understand why today's students do not have effective learning strategies, and will present cognitive science research-based methods that can be used to enhance student learning.

Target audience: The target audience for this workshop includes college and university faculty, staff, and administrators who would like to know more about how to use basic learning principles and strategies to enhance student learning at all levels—first year through graduate school.

Sunday**December 4, 2005****8:00 a.m.—11:00 a.m.****\$75***Limited to 75 participants.***W-17****Designing an Assessment System to Enhance Program****Quality,**

Julia Pet-Armacost, Assistant Vice President, Information, Analysis, and Assessment; and Robert Armacost, Director, University Analysis and Planning Support Office, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL

This workshop describes how to develop and implement a successful program assessment process that focuses on quality improvement. Specific topics include: the role of assessment in continuous improvement, key characteristics of program assessment success, essential components of an assessment process, organizational structures and support, the role of quality assurance in managing the process, and Web-based technologies to facilitate program assessment. Participants will have an opportunity to conduct self-assessments of their institutions' processes. The assessment system design principles apply to institutions of all sizes. The intended audience includes mid-level personnel, senior personnel, and institutional researchers who have some responsibility for assessment.

Target audience: This is a basic to intermediate-level workshop. The workshop is intended for mid-level personnel (e.g., director of institutional effectiveness) who have responsibility for the day-to-day functioning of an assessment system as well as for senior personnel (e.g., provost, vice provost) to develop their understanding of systemic approaches to assessment. The focus is on a "scalable assessment system" that applies to institutions of all sizes, both public and private. It is assumed that the participants would have some elementary knowledge of assessment and the *Principles of Accreditation*.

Sunday**December 4, 2005****8:00 a.m.—11:00 a.m.****\$75***Limited to 75 participants.***W-18****Student Engagement as a Theme for a Quality****Enhancement Plan (QEP),**

Robert Smallwood, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Assessment, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL

Outcomes from the administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) have prompted institutions to consider focusing on student engagement as an integral part of their QEP. The purpose of this workshop is to review what definitions of student engagement have been advanced, what measures in addition to the NSSE might be used to assess variation in student engagement, and what strategies might be employed for enhancing student engagement within academic and student affairs departments, including individual faculty initiatives within the classroom. Careful attention will be devoted to keeping the focus on student learning while advancing and monitoring student engagement initiatives.

Target audience: This workshop will be useful to those institutions either considering or intending to include attention to student engagement in their QEP themes. It will repeatedly emphasize and illustrate the linkage and alignment of measures of student engagement with direct, objective measures of student learning.

Sunday**December 4, 2005****8:00 a.m.—11:00 a.m.****\$75***Limited to 75 participants.*

W-19**Faculty Development: A Powerful Tool for a Good Accreditation Visit,**

L. Dee Fink, Immediate Past President, Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education, and Director, Instructional Development Program, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK

The current *Principles* call for colleges and universities to provide evidence of learning-centered educational programs and faculty growth as professional educators—all for the purpose of improving the quality of educational programs. A powerful tool for responding to this new challenge is for institutions to have strong, campus-based faculty development programs. The leaders of this workshop will offer an in-depth look at three questions: (1) what are faculty development programs and what do they do, (2) how does an institution establish (or strengthen) a faculty development program, and (3) how can a faculty development program help the institution both in terms of creating better educational programs and preparing for accreditation?

Target audience: The target audience includes administrators and faculty leaders who want an in-depth understanding of programs that can enhance the professional development of their faculty as teachers.

Sunday**December 4, 2005****8:00 a.m.—11:00 a.m.****\$75***Limited to 75 participants.***W-20****Classroom and Institutional Assessment: Using CLAQWA to Assess Thinking and Writing,**

Teresa Flateby, Director, Evaluation and Testing, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

Fostering and assessing writing skills and higher-order thinking skills are critical to an effective undergraduate curriculum. Accordingly, the Cognitive Level and Quality of Writing Assessment (CLAQWA) was developed to serve these purposes, both for individual courses and the entire institution, and is appropriate for program improvement and value-added assessment purposes. In this participatory workshop, individuals will: (1) learn to assess students' papers consistently with CLAQWA to determine writing proficiency or weaknesses, (2) learn about the online CLAQWA feedback/tutorial system, (3) write assessment prompts to reflect and encourage appropriate cognitive levels, and (4) discuss strategies or programs institutions can use to address weaknesses identified in assessment results.

Target audience: Faculty, assessment coordinators, and others who are interested in effectiveness in the undergraduate curriculum may benefit from this session.

Sunday**December 4, 2005****8:00 a.m.—11:00 a.m.****\$75***Limited to 40 participants.***W-21****Assessing Graduate Programs in Doctoral Research**

Universities, J. Joseph Hoey IV, Director of Assessment, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA; and Lorne Kuffel, Associate Provost for Institutional Research, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA

This workshop will focus on best practices in assessing graduate programs within doctoral/research universities. A framework for graduate program assessment, extant data sources, and examples from a variety of disciplines will be presented. Evaluation of research and public service functions will be briefly discussed, and further resources provided. Hands-on learning experiences will include (1) formulating expectations for graduate student learning, and (2) analysis of a graduate program case study. Discussion will follow on how examples and processes can inform practice in participants' institutions. Participants will gain background knowledge and hands-on ability to design, implement and interpret results from graduate program assessment as required under the *Principles of Accreditation*.

Target audience: This workshop will focus on those who teach, coordinate, or otherwise have supervisory responsibilities over graduate programs especially in the context of research-intensive and research-extensive institutions.

Sunday**December 4, 2005****8:00 a.m.—11:00 a.m.****\$75***Limited to 75 participants.*

W-22**Preparation and Implementation of Assessment Surveys,**

Marilyn Greer, Director, Institutional Research, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX

The topics in this workshop start from the initial ideas required to generate a research objective through the complete design, analysis, reporting and use of the assessment results. Sample size, response rates, and use of the results will also be covered, all with explicit examples. Instruction on conducting focus groups will also be included in the workshop. A comprehensive revised workbook that includes appendices of sample surveys and reference material will be available for all participants.

Target audience: The target audience includes any staff or faculty performing assessments on student outcomes and institutional researchers new to the field of survey assessment.

Sunday**December 4, 2005****8:00 a.m.—11:00 a.m.****\$75***Limited to 75 participants.***W-23****The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP): Senior Institutions,**

Margaret Sullivan, Director, Consulting Network, Commission on Colleges, Decatur, GA

Selecting a topic for the QEP relates to the strengths and weaknesses identified and described in the institution's strategic plan. This data-based document provides the basis for numerous topics, including potential goals, objectives and outcomes. Selecting the focus of the student learning-based QEP requires administrators, faculty, and staff to examine institutional priorities. This workshop will address various approaches in selecting a QEP topic, QEP design, and evaluation criteria important in preparing the QEP. This session is designed especially for individuals who work at institutions that offer bachelors, masters, or doctoral degrees.

Target audience: This workshop is designed especially for the 2006 and 2007 institutional Leadership Teams; however, others may benefit from the session.

Sunday**December 4, 2005****8:00 a.m.—11:00 a.m.****\$75***Limited to 75 participants.*

Register Early! Space is limited!

Educational Excellence Expo is in its sixth year!

The Commission on Colleges will present its Educational Excellence Exposition for the sixth year at the 2005 SACS-COC Annual Meeting. Exhibits will include displays by organizations representing a range of educational resources such as hardware and software service and design companies; assessment consultants; publishers; financial, investment, and lending institutions; insurance, real estate development, marketing, and merchandising consultants; student housing and building consultants; representatives from higher education; and others.

Early exhibitors and sponsors are AIG VALIC, American Campus Communities, Assessment Resource Center (Univ. of Missouri), Barnes & Noble College Booksellers, Inc., Campus Management*, Capstone Development Corp., Carter, Commerce Capital*, Corvus, LLC, Datatel, Educational Testing Service*, Follett Higher Education Group, Josef Silny & Associates, Inc., Lawler-Wood, LLC, MBS Textbook Exchange, Partners Development, Principia Products, a division of Gravic, Inc., Quest Software, Qwizdom, Inc., Smarthinking, Inc., SP Controls, Sunguard SCT, TIAA-CREF*, Turner Construction, and World Education Services.

* Denotes sponsor

**For additional information or to recommend prospects,
contact Joan Downes at (770) 416-9510 or joan@hmsbiz.com.**

SACS-COC HOUSING RESERVATION FORM

December 3 - 6, 2005 / Atlanta, Georgia

Reservation Information

Housing for the SACS-COC 2005 Annual Meeting will open on April 1, 2005. Reservations will be made on a first-come, first-served basis. The SACS-COC Housing Bureau will make room reservations on receipt of the hotel reservation form. To be assured of availability of your choice hotel at the SACS-COC conference rate, please make your reservation by the cut-off date of *November 4, 2005*. Changes and/or cancellations can be made up to 72 hours prior to arrival by contacting SACS-COC Housing Bureau. Reservations can be made in one of the following ways.

INTERNET: Book your reservation online using the interactive site at <http://www.sacscoc.org>.

FAX: 404-842-0954

MAIL: CONNECTIONS
SACS-COC Housing Bureau
820 Church Street
Decatur, GA 30030

TELEPHONE: 404-842-0000 (*changes only*)

Acknowledgments & Special Requests

Acknowledgments will be sent from the SACS-COC Housing Bureau after each reservation booking, modification and/or cancellation. Please review all information for accuracy. E-mail acknowledgments will be sent if an e-mail address is provided (preferred), or they will be faxed or mailed. If you do not receive an acknowledgment within 7 days of submitting information or have questions, please call the SACS-COC Housing Bureau.

You will not receive a confirmation from the hotel. Special requests cannot be guaranteed; however, hotels will try to honor all requests. Hotels will assign specific rooms and room types upon check-in based on availability.

Deposit/Guarantee

Reservations will not be accepted without a deposit of one night's room rate plus 14% tax (subject to change) for each room reserved. Deposits will be accepted in the form of a check made payable to *Connections*, the SACS-COC Housing Bureau, or a valid credit card with signature authorizing the card to be charged for the room deposit. Credit card must be valid through December 2005. If the charge to the credit card is denied, we reserve the right to release your reservation.

Modification/Cancellation Policy

All changes and cancellations must be made by contacting the SACS-COC Housing Bureau via e-mail, fax, U.S. mail, or telephone. Do not contact the hotel. Modifications/changes will be accepted up until 72 hours prior to the date of arrival. All reservations cancelled with a check deposit will be charged a \$20 processing fee regardless of when they are cancelled. Cancellations made within 72 hours prior to date of arrival will forfeit the entire deposit.

Check-In/Check-Out

Normal check-in time is 3:00 p.m. and check-out is 11:00 a.m. Early arrivals will be accommodated whenever possible.

Hotel Reservation Procedure

PLEASE NOTE:

- ❖ Reservations will not be processed if form is incomplete.
- ❖ Telephone requests are not accepted.
- ❖ Keep a copy of your completed form for your files.
- ❖ DO NOT mail form after faxing.
- ❖ Acknowledgments are mailed or faxed only to the primary guest.
- ❖ Make photocopies of this form, if you need more than one.

1. CIRCLE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD CHOICE. If your first choice is not available, a room will be secured at one of the alternate hotels based on availability.

1st	2nd	3rd	*Hyatt Regency Atlanta Hotel (\$132.00 single or double / \$132.00 triple / \$132.00 quad)
1st	2nd	3rd	Atlanta Marriott Marquis Hotel \$137.00 single or double / \$155.00 triple / \$177.00 quad
1st	2nd	3rd	Hilton Atlanta Hotel \$137.00 single or double / \$137.00 triple / \$137.00 quad

**Headquarters Hotel*

2. ARRIVAL DAY/DATE: _____

DEPARTURE DAY/DATE: _____

3. ROOM TYPE / PREFERENCE (*Check appropriate boxes*):

- One Bed Two Beds Smoking Non-Smoking

Total people in Room: _____

4. SPECIAL NEEDS:  _____

5. CREDIT CARD: Visa American Express Master Card
 Discover Card _____ Other

Card Number: _____ Exp. Date: _____

Card Holder's Name: _____
(Please Print)

Card Holder's Signature: _____

6. PRIMARY GUEST INFORMATION (*Please print*):

First Name _____ MI _____ Last _____

Institution/Company _____

Street Address or P.O. Box Number _____

City _____ State/Country _____ Zip Code _____

Daytime Phone _____ Fax Number _____

E-Mail Address _____

7. ADDITIONAL GUESTS (*List all additional guests*):

- A. _____ B. _____
C. _____ D. _____

PROGRAM FOR SACS-COC
INSTITUTE ON
QUALITY ENHANCEMENT
AND ACCREDITATION

J.W. Marriott Orlando Grande Lakes * July 24 - 27, 2005

Belle Wheelan, Secretary of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia
Moderator

SUNDAY, JULY 24, 2005

3:00 p.m. **Registration**
 Location: Prefunction area, Mediterranean Ballroom

5:00 p.m. **OPENING SESSION**
“Developing the Capacity to Become a Learning-Centered Institution”

Presenter: Richard J. Light, Walter H. Gale Professor of Education, Kennedy School of Government and Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Richard Light has been asked by three Harvard presidents—Derek Bok, Neil Rudenstine, and now Lawrence Summers—to explore assessment and evaluation in ways that will genuinely improve the undergraduate experience. The goal of his work has been to increase student learning, foster student engagement, enhance teaching, and strengthen student retention. To facilitate this process, Light invited about 20 colleagues at Harvard, along with colleagues from 24 other colleges and universities, to work collaboratively on this topic. In his presentation, Light will discuss seven major substantive findings as well as details about the process that this group has utilized. He will focus on how each institution might work toward becoming more learning-centered. He contends that many institutions are indeed defined as learning organizations, yet there are remarkably few colleges and universities, public or private, that have successfully reached this goal. Light will provide many concrete examples of ways in which institutions can enhance their learning environments—a few from his own campus and many more from very different kinds of campuses. His presentation will emphasize a number of specific and actionable examples specially designed for a broad variety of institutions, including those that are very different from Harvard.

6:30 p.m. **Reception**
 Participants are invited to gather for light hors d’oeuvres and fellowship.

MONDAY, JULY 25, 2005

7:30 a.m. **Registration**

8:00 a.m. Continental breakfast

8:30 a.m. **PLENARY SESSION**
“Establishing a Conceptual Framework for Quality Enhancement”

Presenters: Robert Armacost, Director of University Analysis and Planning Support Office, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL, and **Julia Pet-Armacost**, Assistant Vice President for Information, Planning,

and Assessment, University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL

Quality enhancement is a fundamental management principle for effective higher education delivery and administration. Improving the quality of educational programs and support services requires an integrated foundation spanning the strategic to operational dimensions. Any conceptual framework for quality enhancement must include clear articulation of mission (what you do), vision (where you want to go), measurement (how well you are doing), and action (what you do to improve) both on an institutional and a student learning basis. This session will present a framework and technology enablers that provide a systematic approach for creating integrated processes that establish the necessary foundation and foster continuous improvement.

10:00 a.m. Break

10:15 a.m. Breakout Groups

Participants are asked to choose a breakout topic that has potential for development at their home institution. Each group is expected to discuss fundamental requirements for establishing a successful institutional improvement program, including (1) a focused topic that is significant to various constituent groups; (2) the need for commitment by the CEO and other key leaders; (3) use of empirical data and an examination of best practices; (4) implementation strategies that include measurable goals, a realistic timeline, and an appropriate evaluation methodology; and (5) adequate human, financial, and physical resources.

❖ *First Year of College*

Dan Berman, Director, University 101, National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC

❖ *Emphasizing Teaching and Learning in General Education*

Donna Miller, Director, Institutional Research and Planning, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Tifton, GA

❖ *General Education Reform*

Teresa Flateby, Director, Evaluation and Testing, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL

❖ *Integrating Technology into Instruction*

Sally Johnstone, Executive Director, Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications (WCET), Boulder, CO

❖ *Enhancing Student Engagement*

Robert Smallwood, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Assessment, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL

❖ *Changing Pedagogy*

Eric Hobson, Director, Center for Teaching Excellence, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA

❖ *Faculty and Instructional Development*

Robert M. Diamond, President, National Academy for Academic Leadership, St. Petersburg, FL

❖ *Collaborative Learning*

Barbara Leigh Smith, Senior Scholar and Provost Emerita, The Evergreen State College, Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, Olympia, WA

Continued on next page

11:30 a.m. Break

12:00 p.m. Buffet Luncheon

“Student Engagement in Learning”

Presenters: **John Hayek**, Senior Associate Director, Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Bloomington, IN; and **Kay McClenney**, Director, Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and Senior Associate, Community College Leadership Program, The University of Texas at Austin, TX

Now in its seventh year, the NSSE has become one of the most widely used tools to initiate discussion and action related to teaching and learning on campus. More than 925 different colleges and universities have participated in NSSE since 2000. Two years following NSSE’s debut, CCSSE was launched. With completion of the third national administration in spring 2005, CCSSE has surveyed about 400,000 students from almost 400 colleges in 43 states. Many institutions utilize NSSE or CCSSE results in self-studies and the accreditation process. This session will highlight a number of properties common to educationally effective institutions and will provide a rich assortment of examples and tips on how community colleges and senior colleges and universities are using student engagement data to enhance student learning on campus.

1:30 p.m. Panel Discussion

“Creating an Environment to Promote Quality Enhancement: Case Studies”

Panelists will describe an improvement program underway at their institutions, including the: (1) context—background/impetus for the initiative and number of students served; (2) commitment and support—from institutional leaders, faculty, and other constituents; (3) methodologies—programmatically facets that are planned or underway; (4) resources—human and physical; (5) evaluation—assessment of program’s impact; and (6) next steps.

- ❖ ***Maricopa Center for Learning and Instruction (MCLI)***
Maureen Zimmerman, Acting District Director, Academic Affairs, Support Programs, and Services, Maricopa Community College, Tempe, AZ
- ❖ ***The Mathematics Connection at Miami Dade College***
Patrick Bibby, Professor of Mathematics, Miami Dade College, Miami, FL
- ❖ ***Intellectual Climate and the Undergraduate Experience***
Rosemary Levy Zumwalt, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, GA
- ❖ ***National Learning Communities Project***
Barbara Leigh Smith, Senior Scholar and Provost Emerita, The Evergreen State College, Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education, Olympia, WA
- ❖ ***Learning in a Technology-Rich Environment (LITRE)***
Karen P. Helm, Director, University Planning and Analysis, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC

2:45 p.m. Break

3:00 p.m. Breakout Groups

Breakout groups will be led by panelists in the previous session to enable participants to ask questions and ascertain the feasibility of their own improvement programs. Discussions will address topics such as understanding your campus culture; integrating an improvement initiative within your institutional structure; ensuring the buy-in of key constituents; identifying proper oversight; generating needed resources, etc. Each group will produce a list of requirements needed to ensure a successful program of institutional improvement.

4:30 p.m. Reports and Discussion from Breakout Groups

Each facilitator or his/her designee will present a summary of the afternoon breakout discussion during this plenary session. A written copy of all reports will be included in the *Institute Proceedings* to be sent to participants.

TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2005

8:00 a.m. Continental breakfast

8:30 a.m. PLENARY SESSION

“Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College: A National Panel Report”

Presenters: **Andrea Leskes**, Vice President for Education and Quality Initiatives, Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC; **David Aday**, Director of SACS Reaccreditation Project and Professor of Sociology, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA; and **Frank Wetta**, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Ocean County College, Toms River, NJ

The *Greater Expectations* initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities examined the aims of college study for the 21st century. The resulting report, *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College*, sketches out a New Academy that is purposeful and focused on learning and high achievement for all college students. With implications for individual institutions and higher education more broadly, the report has been widely disseminated and is influencing practice on many campuses. In addition to serving as a stimulus for conversations, planning, and action, the report has framed accreditation self-studies, including QEPs. This panel session will introduce the major concepts of Greater Expectations and provide examples of how two very different campuses have used them for academic planning and accreditation. Audience members will be invited to share their own experiences.

10:00 a.m. Break

10:15 a.m. Breakout Groups

The following working group sessions will focus on various dimensions of student learning. Ideally, breakout groups should not exceed 30 participants. If your first choice is full, please go to your second choice. A written summary of the discussion from each group will be presented to all participants.

- * *Defining, Assessing, and Documenting Student Learning Outcomes*
J. Joseph Hoey IV, Director of Assessment, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA
- * *Learning Styles and Teaching Students How to Learn*
Saundra Y. McGuire, Director, Center for Academic Success, and Associate Dean, University College, Louisiana State University and A&M College, Baton Rouge, LA
- * *Assessing Student Learning in General Education*
Teresa L. Flateby, Director, Evaluation and Testing, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL
- * *Assessing Student Learning in the Major*
Robert A. Smallwood, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Assessment, University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL
- * *Integrating Learning in Academic and Student Services*
Gerald L. Francis, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Elon University, Elon, NC
- * *Creating a Learning Culture and Acquiring Faculty Buy-In*
Marilee J. Bresciani, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Assessment, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX
- * *Linking Teaching Methods and Student Learning Outcomes*
Linda B. Nilson, Director, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation, Clemson University, Clemson, SC
- * *Resources and Tools to Assess Student Learning*
James C. Eck, Assistant Provost for Institutional Research and Assessment, Rollins College, Winter Park, FL

Continued on next page

12:00 p.m. Buffet Luncheon

“Evaluating the Impact of e-Learning on Student Achievement”

Presenter: **Sally Johnstone**, Executive Director, Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications (WCET), Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), Boulder, CO

E-learning in higher education is becoming ubiquitous whether combined with on-campus activities or as a stand-alone format for students who never come to a campus. This raises many issues for university and college leaders, including student achievement, costs, and faculty roles. It also calls into question how we may be able to do things differently and who may be able to benefit. Dr. Johnstone will certainly challenge your thinking about appropriate uses for e-learning.

1:30 p.m. Panel Discussion

“Learning-Centered Institutions at Work: Case Studies”

Panelists will introduce curricular and co-curricular programs at their institutions that focus on the improvement of student learning. The discussion will be followed by breakout groups, led by the panelists below, to converse further about ways to create an environment that is learning-centered.

- ❖ *The Community College of Baltimore County*
Rose Mince, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Learning and Student Development, The Community College of Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD
- ❖ *Parkland College*
Fay Rouseff-Baker, Executive Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning, Parkland College, Champaign, IL
- ❖ *Alverno College*
Glen Rogers, Senior Research Associate, Educational Research and Evaluation, Alverno College, Milwaukee, WI
- ❖ *Prairie View A&M University*
Lettie Raab, Executive Director of University College, Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX
- ❖ *University of Colorado at Denver*
Ellen Stevens, Director, Center for Faculty Development, University of Colorado at Denver, CO

2:45 p.m. Break

3:00 p.m. Breakout Groups

The panelists in the previous session will facilitate breakout sessions to discuss implications and challenges of creating a successful learning environment. Issues such as enriching the academic environment, removing bureaucratic barriers to learning, assessing student learning, and garnering faculty buy-in will be addressed.

- ❖ **Breakout Group 1**
Rose Mince, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Learning and Student Development, The Community College of Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD
- ❖ **Breakout Group 2**
Fay Rouseff-Baker, Executive Director, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Parkland College, Champaign, IL
- ❖ **Breakout Group 3**
Glen Rogers, Senior Research Association, Educational Research and Evaluation, Alverno College, Milwaukee, WI

❖ **Breakout Group 4**

Lettie Raab, Executive Director of University College, Prairie View A&M University, Prairie View, TX

❖ **Breakout Group 5**

Ellen Stevens, Director, Center for Faculty Development, University of Colorado at Denver, CO

4:30 p.m. Reports and discussion from breakouts

The facilitator or his/her designee will present a summary of the afternoon breakout discussion during this plenary session. A written copy of the summary report will be included in the *Proceedings* to be sent to all participants.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2005

8:00 a.m. Continental breakfast

8:30 a.m. Linking Accreditation, Quality Enhancement, and Student Learning

This panel will discuss the synergism that can occur when institutions strive to achieve maximum benefits from accreditation efforts. Linkages will be described between accreditation requirements and campus initiatives to promote student learning and quality enhancement.

❖ **Tallahassee Community College**

Sally P. Search, Interim Faculty Director, Center for Teaching Excellence, Tallahassee Community College, Tallahassee, FL

❖ **Georgia College and State University**

Jane A. Rose, Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Assessment, Georgia College and State University, Milledgeville, GA

❖ **Alabama A&M University**

Virginia Caples, Interim President, Alabama A&M University, Normal, AL

❖ **Louisiana State University and A&M College**

Teresa A. Summers, Spanier Alumni Professor, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Louisiana State University System, Baton Rouge, LA

10:00 a.m. Break

10:30 a.m. CLOSING SESSION

“Accreditation and Student Learning”

Jon Wergin, Professor, Educational Studies, Antioch University’s PhD program in Leadership and Change, Yellow Springs, OH

Calls for institutional “accountability” for student learning have become ever more strident, leaving accreditation in a difficult spot. The relationship between accrediting commissions and their member colleges, always ambivalent, has become even more so as commissions struggle to find the right balance between quality assurance and quality improvement. In this session Dr. Wergin will discuss the changing context for the assessment of student learning, the role of accreditation as a force for improvement, and key challenges regional accreditation must face if it is to carry out this delicate role effectively.

11:30 a.m. Wrap-up and evaluation

MYTH or FACT?

1. The Commission on Colleges is going to require institutions to submit Compliance Certifications and Quality Enhancement Plans electronically.

Myth: An institution should use a format that is efficient and cost effective for the institution and is reader friendly for evaluators. For some, that may mean submitting only print documents; for others, electronic documents or a mix of print and electronic. Whatever works best for the institution is the best way to submit the documents.

2. If an evaluator serves on an Off-Site Review Committee, then it is likely that the evaluator will not be invited to serve on an On-Site Review Committee.

Myth: In some cases, Commission staff members have asked Off-Site Review Committee members to serve on back-to-back off-site reviews in order to help train the many new evaluators who we are trying to include from our registry. In an effort to not overuse volunteers, we have not asked them to serve on On-Site Review Committees that same year. Now that evaluators are gaining more experience, those who have been used for two off-site reviews are now being asked to serve on On-Site Review Committees.

3. The institutions clustered together for review by one Off-Site Review Committee do not always match in governance and mission as was originally intended.

Fact: For each reaffirmation class, there are approximately 78–80 institutions. Of those institutions, usually half are classified and reviewed as Track A (offering only undergraduate programs) and half Track B (offering undergraduate and graduate programs). So there are about 40 institutions that need to be clustered for purposes of the off-site review for each of the two tracks. Usually a majority of the institutions in a cluster are similar in mission and governance, but the Commission's membership includes a number of specialized institutions. For a particular reaffirmation class and track, there may be no other similar institution, so a specialized institution or another type has to be placed with dissimilar institutions in order to be assessed by an Off-Site Review Committee.



PROCEEDINGS

Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of
Colleges and Schools
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, GA 30033-4097

Periodicals
POSTAGE
PAID
Decatur, Ga
Permit #187