

University Planning Committee  
Friday, October 16, 2015  
1:45 PM  
Provost's Conference Room

**Attending:** Leigh Anne Clark, Anatoliy Volkov, Janis Brickey, Lesley Craig-Unkefer, Michael Fleming, Marva Lucas, Steve Wright, Michelle Fields, Tina Johnson, Alan Thomas, Tom Wallace, Jack Ross, Danny Kelley, Pat Branam, Tricia Farwell, Terry Whiteside, Bruce Petryshak, Deb Sells, David Gotcher, Bonnie Allen, Chris Brewer, Faye Johnson, Philip Phillips, Dianna Rust

Brad Bartel, Chair

**I. Welcome and Introductions – Brad Bartel**

**II. THEC and TBR Strategic Planning Cycles – Faye Johnson and Chris Brewer**

Both entities are zeroing in on assessment and accountability. TBR and THEC use the same definitions, and we have created dashboards aligned with their definitions.

2010-2015 THEC Performance Funding Cycle: MTSU scored 90.5 points for 2014-15. THEC has renamed Performance Funding initiative. Now called Quality Assurance Funding, Assessment Implementation was eliminated as a component and Adult Learner Success was added. It is defined both qualitatively (self-study to form an action plan to better serve adult students) and quantitatively (completion rate for adult learners). We have always led the state in this area, so this is good for MTSU. We have already started with Veterans and have identified 900,000 people with some credit hours to contact and entice them back to the University.

[THEC \(Quality Assurance Funding\)](#)

- 2015-20 Outcomes Based Funding Formula:  
[https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/thec/attachments/2015-2020\\_Outcomes-based\\_Funding\\_Formula\\_Final\\_Website\\_-\\_101615.xlsx](https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/thec/attachments/2015-2020_Outcomes-based_Funding_Formula_Final_Website_-_101615.xlsx)
- 2015-20 Outcomes Based Funding Formula Overview:  
[https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/thec/attachments/2015-2020\\_Formula\\_Review\\_Website\\_101615.docx](https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/thec/attachments/2015-2020_Formula_Review_Website_101615.docx)

TBR Strategic Planning (*ATTACHMENTS*)

- [Strategic Plan 2015-2025 Key Priorities Narrative](#) (Access, Student Success, Quality, Resourcefulness and Efficiency)
- [Strategic Plan Indicators: 2015-2025](#)
- [Strategic Plan Indicators: 2015-2025 Definitions and Methodology](#)
- [Trajectory for Undergraduate Degrees, Certificates and Diplomas Awarded](#)

**III. Institutional Effectiveness – Brewer and Johnson**

Institutional Effectiveness is a huge piece of Quality Assurance and includes:

Student Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes

Division Outcomes

All about the quality of outcomes and assessment - Please look at your institutional effectiveness/continuous improvement processes and continue to evaluate relative to quality of assessment processes.

Reminder: Substantive Change proposals must always be processed according to [Substantive Change policy](#) to keep the University College and SACSCOC liaison in the loop—including proposals

related to off-site programs. Program Reviews: Lisa Bass will contact the six programs undergoing review this year. Program reviews are very important for Quality Assurance Funding and SACSCOC. Be aware of timeline for reviews.

Documentation: Always document your meetings re: institutional effectiveness. Keep minutes. If you don't have minutes, then the meeting didn't happen.

**IV. Academic Master Plan – Philip Phillips [ATTACHMENT]**

*The Reach to Distinction, Academic Master Plan, 2015-2025*, has been completed.

President charged the committee to address new strategies aligned with the goals of the AMP already in place. The process was inclusive and long-term.

Results: Identified three interrelated strategic initiatives to move us forward with specific objectives and distilled the theme: *The Reach to Distinction*

Final plan is on its way to production and will be distributed widely.

An [implementation chart](#) will accompany the plan in the online publication of the plan with annual updates provided regarding implementation progress

The work of the Committee and subcommittees was stellar.

**V. SACSCOC Reaffirmation – Johnson**

The role of the planning committee during the SACSCOC on-site visit discussed: Members will be convened to discuss planning. Please review [Core Requirement 2.5, Institutional Effectiveness \[ATTACHMENT\]](#). Our SACSCOC offsite review will be done in November 2015. We will submit the focus report in mid-to end of February 2016, and the on-site visit will be March 29-31, 2016.

Some standards are reviewed by both on-site and off-site reviewers.

Federal Requirements (4.1 – 4.9) are tied to federal reporting and ultimately financial aid.

Compliance report reflects our past and present and the QEP focus is the future.

QEP requires time, intellectual commitment, resources.

We think we are strong with regard to fiscal standards/viability and learning outcomes/standards, and faculty credentials (but we need to continue to work hard to document the credentials of non-terminally degree faculty for specialty programs).

**VI. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), MT Engage – Dianna Rust [ATTACHMENTS]**

Draft report will be about 75 pages. Please be aware of the MT Engage slogan and logo developed by our students. Reviewers will be asking various constituencies on campus about the QEP so it is important that the plan be shared broadly with the campus and that all campus groups are involved in its implementation. This is a five-year plan and our progress will be reviewed after five years on implementation and assessment findings and their use to improve student learning.

The MT Engage student learning outcome: *Students will use integrative thinking and reflection to demonstrate the ability to make connections across multiple contexts and educational experiences.*

Five indicators adapted from the AACU Value Rubric for Integrative Thinking, will be used to assess students' integrative/reflective thinking.

The plan has faculty development initiatives including faculty support for enhancing existing lower division courses.

Note: high impact practices are also part of the THEC and TBR strategic plans.

MT Engage has a six-year \$1 million budget with an ultimate outcome of a more well-rounded and better educated student.

## **VII. Announcements**

MTSU Planning Committee Webpage - <http://www.mtsu.edu/provost/usc/PlanningCommittee.php> includes Composition, Charge, Meeting Minutes, Institutional Effectiveness Planning Cycle Linked to Budget, Institutional Effectiveness Achievement Reports (IEAR) Annual Timeline, and University Planning Calendar



# **Tennessee Board of Regents**

## **Strategic Plan 2015 – 2025**

### **Key Priorities**

#### **ACCESS**

To fulfill its mission of service and outreach to all Tennesseans, the Tennessee Board of Regents System strives to increase the number and diversity of students it serves. The TBR System will broaden opportunities for those who wish to develop their professional skills, enrich their lives and engage in the workforce of the future. It will engage those who have been historically underrepresented and underserved in their pursuit of post-secondary credentials at all levels. The TBR System will seek to ensure that every prospective student has the opportunity to enroll in its universities, community colleges or colleges of applied technology.

To meet the capacity requirements of this growing number of award-seeking students, TBR institutions will optimize gateways to higher learning through the effective use of technology, the promotion of learning partnerships within TBR and across the state, and the development of campus sites.

#### **STUDENT SUCCESS**

Increasing the number of citizens with diplomas, certificates, and degrees is a critical focus area for the TBR System and the state. Fostering student persistence to completion enhances the growth of existing businesses, the ability to attract high paying industries, the enrichment of strong communities and the future quality of life for each student. The TBR System will structure credential and degree programs so that students may successfully graduate in a timely and cost-effective manner. TBR will build and nurture partnerships with Tennessee secondary schools to enhance student preparedness and early college credit opportunities. The TBR System will focus on student persistence through intrusive personal advisement and technology-based architected choice systems that lead to an experience of community and inclusion. Undergraduate and graduate students will be provided with guided research and real world learning opportunities. By aligning degree pathways within and between TBR institutions as well as awarding credit for life experience, the time to degree will be accelerated for all learners, especially returning students and those seeking advanced degrees. To further foster student success, the TBR System will explore, develop and apply new technologies and technology-based delivery methods to enhance teaching, research, service and student achievement.

## **QUALITY**

To achieve excellence in all areas of our collective mission, the TBR System must provide high quality academic programs, faculty, services and facilities at all levels. The TBR System will sustain academic rigor and be committed to continuous quality improvement processes to help students acquire and retain the knowledge, skills and abilities they need to become creative employees, dynamic leaders and conscientious citizens. Recognizing the quality expectations of a global marketplace and society, TBR System institutions, their faculty and their students will cultivate forward-looking research, explore creative expression in the arts and engage in public service activities that aspire to world-class standards.

The quality of academic programs will be measured by student performance and assessment as well as accreditation and formal review procedures. Quality assurance will be sustained through ongoing professional growth opportunities, integrated institutional effectiveness activities, and regular satisfaction responses from TBR graduates and employers. Together these processes will promote initiatives for continuous quality improvement of learning objectives, teaching and assessment of student achievement.

## **RESOURCEFULNESS & EFFICIENCY**

The Tennessee Board of Regents Systems seeks to achieve its mission through innovation and judicious use of resources. The Tennessee state government has placed higher education in the spotlight through the Complete College Tennessee Act, the TN Promise Act and the governor's Drive to 55 agenda. The TBR seeks to elevate the priority of higher education so that there will be full support of the funding formula and increases in state appropriations. TBR institutions will seek to identify alternate revenue enhancements and efficiently use their resources in order to sustain quality and provide access for a growing number of students.

The TBR System and its institutions are committed to continuously identifying additional financial resources through alumni giving, endowments, foundations and private fund-raising. Other external sources such as federal, state, and local governments plus business and community partnerships will also be targeted to provide further financial support for operations, research, equipment and construction.

Priority Strategies such as the community college statewide marketing effort, the community college business process model, the TCAT capacity project and the systemwide common data repository initiative all promote cost-effectiveness and proficiency. As such, the TBR System is dedicated to improving operational efficiencies such as those, which are key elements of its completion initiative.

Tennessee Board of Regents  
Strategic Plan Indicators: 2015-2025

### Vital Statistics

- Degrees, certificates, and diplomas awarded, disaggregated by award level.
- Awards per 100 full-time equivalent students.

### Access

- Headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment, by full-time/part-time status.
- Headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment of enrolled high school students.

### Student Success

- Success in courses most critical to student success, as determined by the percentage of students achieving an A, B, or C grade in a particular course.
- Students progressing to credit hour benchmarks.
- Graduation rates.
- Number of credit hours accumulated beyond needed hours for degree, measured from the time that the student last enters the degree-awarding institution.

### Quality

- Licensure and certification pass rates and performance on national subject examinations.
- Enrollment in high impact practices.
- Percentage of faculty involved in career furthering activities.
- Percentage of creditable programs that are currently accredited or seeking accreditation.
- Current aggregate score of non-creditable programs calculated from program reviews and academic audits.

### Resourcefulness and Efficiency

- Total amount of funds raised through sources other than state appropriations and student tuition and fees.
- Post-award progression of graduates.
- Development of an instructional index that is disaggregated by academic discipline.
- Composite financial index score.

Note: Where possible, student data will be disaggregated by Pell, underrepresented minority, and adult subpopulations.

**Tennessee Board of Regents**  
 Strategic Planning Indicators: 2015-2025  
**Definitions and Methodology**

**Vital Statistics**

<b>Degrees, certificates and diplomas awarded, disaggregated by award level.</b>
<i>Includes universities, community colleges, and Tennessee Colleges of Applied Technology (TCAT).</i>
<p>Degrees, certificates, and diplomas are reported on an annual basis, including the summer, fall, and spring terms. The summer included is the preceding summer. For example, the 2014-15 cycle includes summer 2014, fall 2014, and spring 2015. The Tennessee Colleges of Applied Technology will report data fall, spring, and summer to coincide with their accreditation agency.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The award levels include: TCAT certificates and diplomas, community college certificates, associates, bachelors, and graduate awards.</li> <li>2. For community colleges, TBR will be tracking what can be deemed as “terminal” certificates.       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. For one to two year certificates (award level = 22), all certificates will be counted with the exception of certificates with the CIP code '16.24.0101.01'. This matches the outcomes based formula.</li> <li>b. For less than one year certificates (award level = 21), only technical certificates (award = C1) will be counted.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<p><b>Proposed Goal Methodology:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Undergraduate:</u> TBR institutions will grant 43,202 undergraduate awards in the year 2025. This goal will be broken out by institution using the current proportion of system awards generated by the institution. The goals per award level will also be based on current proportions.</li> <li>• <u>Graduate:</u> TBR will review historic trends for graduate awards and aim to meet or exceed that trajectory going forward.</li> </ul>
<b>Awards per 100 full-time equivalent students.</b>
<i>Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.</i>
<p>The TBR Metric will use the same definition as the THEC Funding Formula Metric, with the exception that full-time equivalent enrollment will be calculated using degree seeking students only.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The combined total of associate's and bachelor's degrees (associate's and long-term certificates for community colleges) conferred during an academic year for every 100 year-round, end-of-term, undergraduate full-time equivalent (FTE) students generated during the same academic year. For this purpose, undergraduate full-time equivalent enrollment is defined as 30 semester credit hours.</li> <li>2. Full-year FTE enrollment includes the summer, fall, and spring terms for an academic cycle for the community colleges and universities. The Tennessee Colleges of Applied Technology will report data fall, spring, and summer to coincide with their accreditation agency.</li> <li>3. Only undergraduate degree seeking students will be used in the FTE enrollment calculation. The technical specification to be used by institution research is students with a student level in ('01', '02', '03', '04', '05').</li> <li>4. For TCAT's, TBR will include certificates and diplomas as awards, using the TCAT academic year of fall, spring, and the trailing summer.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Proposed goal Methodology:</b></p> <p>TBR will create a minimum threshold ratio that TBR will monitor. If the calculated value falls below that threshold, an institution will be asked for insight as to why the ratio has fallen. TBR will set a separate threshold ratio for universities, community colleges, and TCAT's. Setting the threshold will require a review of historical data.</p>

## Access

### Headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment, disaggregated by full-time/part-time status.

*Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.*

TBR will track headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment for both the fall and spring terms of an academic year. Each term will be tracked separately. For TCAT, TBR will track annual headcount and full-time equivalent totals.

1. All students in the end of term file will be counted.
2. Only students attempting degree, certificate, or diploma credits will be counted. This includes students with credit hours in the credit types of ('0','1','2','5','B','D','R','S','T','U').
3. Headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment will be disaggregated by undergraduate and graduate students.
4. Full-time equivalent enrollment is calculated as 15 hours for undergraduate students and 12 hours for graduate students. TCAT full-time equivalent enrollment is calculated as 300 clock hours per term.
5. For universities and community colleges, full-time students are students enrolled in at least 12 credit hours at the undergraduate level and at least 9 credit hours at the graduate level. Any TCAT student is considered full-time if enrolled in a full-time preparatory program.

#### **Proposed Goal Methodology:**

- Undergraduate: An initial analysis indicates that undergraduate enrollment must increase by approximately 10% by 2025, along with increased student success, for TBR to reach its award goal. The final goal will take into account that approximately half of increase in undergraduate awards granted by 2025 at universities and community colleges must be derived from increased enrollment. For TCAT's enrollment must increase sufficiently to match the needed increase in credentials.
- Graduate: Since increased efficiency in graduate programs is not a strategic goal, all future increases in granting graduate awards must be generated by increased enrollment. Thus, the graduate enrollment goal will be based on the graduate award goal once it is established.

### Headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment of enrolled high school students.

*Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.*

The headcount and full-time equivalent enrollment calculation for enrolled high school students will follow standard TBR fall "end of term" reporting guidelines.

1. All students in the fall "end of term" generated for THEC will be counted. This differs from THEC as they use a full academic year.
2. Enrolled high school students will be determined using the student's previous registration type in the enrollment collection. Pre-college students have a previous registration type of '4'.
3. Full-time equivalent enrollment is calculated as 15 credit hours for undergraduate students or 300 clock hours for TCAT.

**Proposed Goal Methodology:** To be determined.

## Student Success

### Success in courses most critical to student success, as determined by the percentage of students achieving an A, B, or C grade in a particular course.

*Currently includes universities and community colleges only. TCAT could be added at later date.*

The courses most critical to student success system-wide will be determined by Bayesian analysis of course grades for graduating students from 2005 to 2014. This analysis model makes it possible to identify courses that most often significantly affect students' ability to graduate. Most likely, these courses will also be high enrollment courses across the system.

1. TBR will provide the list of courses most critical to student success. If sufficient differences exist, the course list will be different for universities and community colleges.
2. Course success data will be disaggregated by whether a section of the critical course is delivered on-ground or on-line, to see how the delivery method impacts student success.
3. The analysis of student success in the course will be performed on an annual basis using enrollment and grades from the fall term.
4. Course enrollment and student grades are pulled using an already existing .sql script. The script is run at the institution at the end of the fall term, and the resulting file is sent to TBR.
5. If the final course grade for a student is between A+ and C- the student is considered a success for that course.

#### **Proposed Goal Methodology:**

TBR will set a threshold success rate, and institutions will reduce the number of courses that fall below that threshold. The initial suggested threshold success rate is 70%, but a more detailed analysis can be undertaken once the critical courses are identified.

### Students progressing to credit hour benchmarks.

*Includes universities and community colleges only.*

The TBR Metric will use the same definition as the THEC Funding Formula Metric:

1. "The number of full-time and part-time students whose cumulative credits earned at the beginning of a semester are less than the established credit hour threshold benchmarks of 30, 60, or 90 student credit hours for Universities or 12, 24, or 36 student credit hours for Community Colleges and whose cumulative credit hours earned at the end of the semester are equal to or greater than the credit hour threshold benchmarks during the academic year."

#### **Proposed Goal Methodology:**

Progression metrics must increase along with expected increases in enrollment and graduation rates. Once goals for those metrics have been set, it will be possible to determine goals for progression.

**Graduation rates.**

*Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.*

For all institution levels, it is proposed that the IPEDS 150% definition and reporting be used.

1. For universities, 150% is equal to six years. For community colleges, 150% is equal to three years. For TCAT, TBR has traditionally defined two years as 150%.
2. IPEDS tracks the completion rate of a fall cohort of degree seeking first-time, full-time freshmen.
3. The completion rate is for the home institution only, and does not include students who transfer to another institution and then are granted an award.
4. TBR will also follow 300%, or six year, graduation rates for the community colleges using the same cohort criteria listed above.
5. The National Association of System Heads is currently developing the “Student Achievement Measure” (SAM), which tracks graduation, transfer, and continued enrollment for various student cohorts. TBR will investigate the use of SAM when more information is available.

**Proposed Goal Methodology:**

In order to achieve TBR’s completion goal, it is estimated that graduation rates must increase by approximately 10 percent by 2025. Furthermore, graduation rates for vital subpopulations must increase at least as quickly as graduation rates for traditional students.

Each TCAT program at each institution will achieve or exceed a 60% completion level in accordance with the accreditation agency.

**Number of credit hours accumulated beyond needed hours for degree, measured from the time that the student last enters the degree-awarding institution.**

*Includes universities and community colleges only.*

The proposed methodology would, at the time of graduation, measure how many credit hours the student had taken at the graduating institution, since their last enrollment at that institution, that are not being counted towards the awarded credential.

1. The metric will only be calculated for associate and bachelor degrees.
2. If a student stops-out at the institution and then re-enters, the last entry date will serve as the beginning of the metric calculation period.

**Proposed Goal Methodology:**

The initial goal is to program existing degree audit software at the institutions so that the calculation and reporting process can be automated. Once the reporting process is developed and baseline data has been established, a new goal will be established.

## Quality

<b>Licensure and certification pass rates and performance on national subject examinations.</b>
<i>Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.</i>
<p>For the universities and community colleges, this metric will continue to track teaching, engineering, and nursing examinations. For the TCAT, the metric will track all programs which require a state or national certification to work in the chosen field.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Nursing and engineering pass rates come directly from the institution's performance funding file. The Teaching Pass Rate is calculated from the pass rates that are included in Title II data reported by the state department of education to the website: <a href="https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp">https://title2.ed.gov/default.asp</a>.</li><li>2. All benchmarks are for the most recent year reported. The numerator is equal to the number of test passers from the most recent year, while the denominator is equal to the number of test takes from the most recent year.</li><li>3. If a community college does not have a nursing program, it will not have any data reported under this metric.</li></ol>
<p><b>Proposed Goal Methodology:</b></p> <p>As pass rates are very high, the goal is to keep pass rates high. A minimum pass rate threshold will be set for each examination by reviewing historical data. TBR will monitor pass rates to ensure that the minimum pass rate is being met. Moving from a three year average pass rate to a one year pass rate will ensure that programs can be monitored more effectively. TBR will review of pass rates submitted in performance funding files to determine in additional examinations should be included in this metric.</p>
<b>Enrollment in high impact practices.</b>
<i>Includes universities and community colleges only.</i>
<p>High impact practices currently include undergraduate research, service learning, study abroad, internships, badging, and learning communities, though more may be added in the future. TBR will convene groups of faculty to work on defining and developing a nomenclature for each of these high impact practices and potentially others in the future. From there, Banner attributes will be developed so that course sections can be tagged as including a specific high impact practice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The percentage of students enrolled in high impact practices can be derived using same .sql script that will also be used for the "critical course" metric once the institutions begin to flag high impact practices as an attribute in Banner. It is possible that a survey will be needed to gather data prior to the development of attributes.</li><li>2. The percentage of students enrolling will be reported separately for each high impact practice. An unduplicated percentage will also be reported as a total participation rate in high impact practices.</li></ol>
<p><b>Proposed Goal Methodology:</b></p> <p>In order to establish a goal TBR must first go through the process of developing definitions for each high impact practices, and also begin to code and track these course sections. Furthermore, baseline participation rates must be developed. Thus, the initial goal for this metric is to develop common nomenclature and a methodology for Banner tracking. The ultimate goal will be to see incremental increases in the percentage of students participating in high impact practices that are demonstrated to contribute to student success.</p>

**Percentage of faculty involved in career furthering activities.**

*Includes universities and community colleges only.*

For this metric, institutions will develop a list of what constitutes a career furthering activity for use at that institution. Furthermore, an institution could possibly disaggregate the list even further if deemed appropriate, such as to the departmental level. TBR will work with institution faculty groups as well as the faculty sub-council to provide some basic guidelines for determining career furthering activities, however the final decision will remain with the institution.

1. Data will be reported to TBR on an annual basis following completion of the academic year.
2. The numerator is the number of full-time faculty completing a career furthering activity in that academic year (summer, fall, spring).
3. The denominator is the number of full-time faculty including all tenure statuses, though this could be disaggregated.

**Proposed Goal Methodology:**

The initial goal is to develop institution lists for what constitutes a career furthering activity and a reporting structure. Once the reporting structure has been developed and used for a number of years, a new goal may be established.

**Percentage of creditable programs that are currently accredited or seeking accreditation.**

*Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.*

For universities and community colleges, this metric will use the same criteria currently used for quality assurance funding. The TCAT will set benchmarks for the state, national and industry certified programs.

1. The denominator is the number of programs currently eligible for accreditation at the institution.
2. The numerator is the number of programs accredited plus the number of programs currently seeking accreditation.
3. This information will be gathered from the performance funding reports sent to THEC and TBR.

**Proposed Goal Methodology:**

The proposed goal is that 100% of programs currently eligible for accreditation will be either accredited or currently seeking accreditation.

**Current aggregate score of non-creditable programs calculated from program reviews and academic audits.**

*Includes universities and community colleges only.*

This metric will use data reported in performance funding to determine the percentage of reviewed or audited programs that are achieving a satisfactory overall score on the respective quality assurance funding rubric.

1. For universities, undergraduate programs and graduate programs will be reported separately.
2. The denominator is the number of programs in the 5-year cycle.
3. The numerator is the number of programs in the 5-year cycle that have met a satisfactory percentage of standards.
4. The percentage that will become the threshold for "satisfactory" has not been determined. TBR will undertake a historical analysis of performance funding data to make this determination.
5. This information will be gathered from the performance funding reports sent to THEC and TBR.

**Proposed Goal Methodology:**

TBR will set a minimum threshold once the revision process for program review and academic audit criteria is completed.

## Resourcefulness and Efficiency

### **Total amount of funds raised through sources other than state appropriations and student tuition and fees.**

*Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.*

For the purposes of this metric, revenue will be limited to unrestricted education and general funds. Unlike last the last planning cycle, restricted funds will not be included. The following education and general revenue streams are included:

1. Federal Appropriations, Grants, and Contracts
2. State Grants and Contracts
3. Local Appropriations, Grants, and Contracts
4. Private Contracts and Gifts
5. Endowment Income
6. Sales and Services
7. Other Sources of Education and General Revenue

#### **Proposed Goal Methodology:**

Institutions will be asked to set a goal for increasing outside revenue.

### **Development of an instructional index that is disaggregated by academic discipline.**

*Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.*

The initial metric is the development of a comprehensive instructional index which allows for modeling instructional cost for an academic discipline as well as the cost of delivery for an instructional program. Once the initial metric has been completed, and the index has been vetted and used for a number of years, a new metric may replace the current metric.

The proposed methodology would use BANNER data to calculate the instructional cost of delivery of each course at a campus. The cost of a program will then be calculated using degree maps. TCAT will use their campus evaluation plan yearly to review the programs at each institution.

#### **Proposed Goal Methodology:**

The initial goal is to develop and evaluate an instructional index. Once the index has been developed and used for a number of years, a new goal may be established.

**Post-award progression of graduates.**

*Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.*

The metric will review the post-award activity of graduates by calculating a graduate unemployment rate based on data available from the Tennessee Longitudinal Data System and the National Student Clearinghouse. Using this data, TBR will be able identify one of four possible outcomes for graduates as they progress beyond the TBR institution. For this metric, a graduate is defined as somebody receiving a technical certificate, applied associate, or bachelor award.

1. The graduate has enrolled in an institution to further his or her education.
2. The graduate is gainfully employed in the state of Tennessee.
3. The graduate has filed for unemployment in the state of Tennessee.
4. The graduate cannot be located in either data source.
  - a. Some possible reasons include self-employment or working out-of-state.

This information will allow TBR to calculate an unemployment rate for TBR institution graduates. The numerator is the number of graduates filing for unemployment. The denominator is the number of graduates that are enrolled in an institution, gainfully employed, or filing for unemployment.

1. This methodology removes students that cannot be located from the analysis.
2. The status of graduates will be reviewed approximately 2 years from the graduation date. For instance, summer 2012- spring 2013 graduates would be reviewed in May 2015.
3. The data is a snapshot, not historical. A graduate must be receiving unemployment as of the review date to be counted in the numerator.

**Proposed Goal Methodology:**

In order to develop a goal, TBR must first receive data from the Clearinghouse and the TLDS. Once data has been analyzed and a baseline has been set, TBR will seek to reduce the number of graduates filing for unemployment.

**Composite financial index score.**

*Includes universities, community colleges, and TCAT.*

The use of the composite financial index has been agreed upon for use by the institutions' financial officers. Budget data submitted to TBR is used to calculate four ratios: Return on Net Assets, Net Operating Revenues, Primary Reserve, and Viability. From these four ratios, the Office of Business and Finance calculates and overall composite financial index score.

1. Each of the four ratios will be reported separately in addition to the overall index score.
2. This data will be calculated in the Office of Business and Finance on an annual basis.

**Proposed Goal Methodology:**

The expected performance standards for the composite financial index and ratios are published in Board Policy 4:01:00:02: Institutional Financial Performance Review.

<https://policies.tbr.edu/policies/institutional-financial-performance-review>

## Subpopulations

### Where possible, student data will be disaggregated by Pell, underrepresented minority, and adult subpopulations.

When possible, data will be disaggregated to understand how vital subpopulations are being affected by system and institution actions. The metrics below will NOT include subpopulation reporting.

1. Awards per 100 full-time equivalent students.
2. Licensure and certification pass rates and performance on national subject examinations.
3. Number of faculty involved in career furthering activities.
4. Percentage of creditable programs that are currently accredited or seeking accreditation.
5. Current aggregate score of non-creditable programs calculated from program reviews and academic audits.
6. Total amount of funds raised through sources other than state appropriations and student tuition and fees.
7. Development of an instructional index that is disaggregated by academic discipline.
8. Composite financial index score.

All other metrics will eventually have subpopulation reporting, though not all will be available immediately.

#### Pell:

1. Award and Graduation Metrics: A student who receives a Pell Grant at any point at the institution awarding the degree or certificate would be identified as a Pell award or graduate.
2. Enrollment and Progression Metrics: A student must be receiving a Pell Grant during the term or academic year in question to be identified as a Pell recipient.
3. Pell data is not currently collected at the system level for the TCAT's.

#### Underrepresented Minority:

1. Includes Hispanic, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Black, and Alaskan Native or American Indian. Asian and Multiple Races are NOT considered underrepresented minorities.
2. For all metrics, the student's race is determined using the data reported in the most recent term's data reported to TBR.

#### Adult:

1. Adults are students that are 25 or older at the time of graduation. The student's age is calculated by subtracting the year of birth from the award year.
2. For all metrics, the student's age is determined using the data reported in the most recent term's data reported to TBR.

**Tennessee Board of Regents**  
Trajectory for Undergraduate Degrees, Certificates and Diplomas Awarded

**Annual Credentials by Award Level**

	Actual							Targets									Goal
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
TCAT Awards	6,762	8,018	8,140	7,436	7,204	7,159	7,071	7,328	7,511	7,694	7,877	8,060	8,243	8,426	8,609	8,792	8,976
CC "Terminal" Certificates	1,592	2,213	2,731	3,398	3,380	3,264	3,511	3,492	3,599	3,706	3,813	3,920	4,027	4,134	4,241	4,348	4,457
Associate Degrees	7,049	7,735	8,677	9,497	9,718	9,858	9,908	10,103	10,378	10,653	10,928	11,203	11,478	11,753	12,028	12,303	12,577
Bachelor Degrees	12,079	11,892	12,584	12,961	13,747	13,665	13,543	14,006	14,360	14,714	15,068	15,422	15,776	16,130	16,484	16,838	17,192
<b>Total</b>	<b>27,482</b>	<b>29,858</b>	<b>32,132</b>	<b>33,292</b>	<b>34,049</b>	<b>33,946</b>	<b>34,033</b>	<b>34,929</b>	<b>35,848</b>	<b>36,767</b>	<b>37,686</b>	<b>38,605</b>	<b>39,524</b>	<b>40,443</b>	<b>41,362</b>	<b>42,281</b>	<b>43,202</b>

**Annual Credentials by Institution**

	Actual							Targets									Goal
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
APSU	1,338	1,293	1,479	1,565	1,734	1,804	1,767	1,815	1,861	1,908	1,954	2,001	2,047	2,094	2,140	2,187	2,233
ETSU	1,917	1,927	2,080	2,202	2,361	2,364	2,276	2,394	2,455	2,515	2,576	2,636	2,697	2,757	2,818	2,878	2,939
MTSU	3,825	3,650	3,892	3,953	4,202	4,056	4,086	4,221	4,328	4,435	4,541	4,648	4,755	4,861	4,968	5,075	5,182
TSU	1,064	1,098	1,087	1,102	1,071	916	988	1,018	1,044	1,069	1,095	1,121	1,147	1,173	1,199	1,225	1,251
TTU	1,535	1,535	1,626	1,716	1,849	1,809	1,866	1,889	1,937	1,985	2,032	2,080	2,128	2,176	2,223	2,271	2,319
UM	2,670	2,636	2,761	2,804	2,970	3,076	2,974	3,085	3,163	3,241	3,319	3,397	3,475	3,553	3,630	3,708	3,786
ChSCC	737	930	1,170	1,311	1,466	1,487	1,274	1,452	1,493	1,534	1,575	1,616	1,657	1,698	1,739	1,780	1,821
CISCC	357	503	580	772	606	804	634	703	723	743	763	783	804	824	844	864	884
CoSCC	554	606	593	658	651	755	842	770	792	813	834	856	877	898	920	941	962
DSCC	228	227	298	332	347	378	374	377	387	398	408	418	429	439	450	460	471
JSCC	505	569	603	605	571	542	565	575	591	607	623	639	655	671	687	703	719
MSCC	460	556	584	647	638	661	708	687	706	725	744	763	782	801	820	839	858
NaSCC	650	636	716	892	782	791	888	843	867	890	914	937	961	984	1,008	1,032	1,055
NeSCC	816	917	866	968	1,199	1,095	1,109	1,168	1,201	1,234	1,267	1,300	1,333	1,366	1,399	1,432	1,465
PSCC	673	793	1,367	1,619	1,810	1,707	1,953	1,874	1,927	1,980	2,033	2,086	2,139	2,192	2,244	2,297	2,350
RSCC	682	778	912	917	885	926	980	956	983	1,009	1,036	1,062	1,089	1,115	1,142	1,168	1,195
STCC	1,006	1,124	1,283	1,320	1,351	1,253	1,111	1,276	1,312	1,348	1,385	1,421	1,457	1,493	1,529	1,566	1,602
VSCC	893	1,033	1,033	1,360	1,203	1,139	1,289	1,245	1,281	1,316	1,351	1,387	1,422	1,457	1,493	1,528	1,563
WSCC	810	1,029	1,062	1,113	1,149	1,224	1,278	1,252	1,287	1,322	1,358	1,393	1,429	1,464	1,499	1,535	1,570
TCAT	6,762	8,018	8,140	7,436	7,204	7,159	7,071	7,328	7,511	7,694	7,877	8,060	8,243	8,426	8,609	8,792	8,976
<b>Total</b>	<b>27,482</b>	<b>29,858</b>	<b>32,132</b>	<b>33,292</b>	<b>34,049</b>	<b>33,946</b>	<b>34,033</b>	<b>34,929</b>	<b>35,848</b>	<b>36,767</b>	<b>37,686</b>	<b>38,605</b>	<b>39,524</b>	<b>40,443</b>	<b>41,362</b>	<b>42,281</b>	<b>43,202</b>

## 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness

2.5 The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. **(Institutional effectiveness)**

<b>X</b>	Compliance
	Conditional Compliance
	Non-Compliance

### Statement of Rationale for Judgment of Compliance

Middle Tennessee State University engages in ongoing, integrated, and institutional-wide data-based planning and evaluation that includes a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes that (a) results in continuing improvement and (b) demonstrates that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

### Mission: Review, Goals, and Outcomes

MTSU's mission statement acknowledges its role as a comprehensive university in the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) higher education system that aims to be “the destination of choice for Tennessee undergraduates while expanding its reach nationally and internationally through signature programs and select master’s and doctoral programs...(it) generates, preserves, and disseminates knowledge and innovation and uses scholarship to enhance teaching and public service...(and) is committed to preparing students to thrive in their chosen professions and a changing global society.” MTSU’s mission, goals, and outcomes are aligned with TBR’s mission and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission’s (THEC) mission, planning goals, and outcomes. See Planning Goals Integration Chart, 2010-2015.

The mission, as well as the University's strategic planning goals, are revisited, revised, and approved every five years in accordance with the strategic planning cycles of the TBR and the THEC. MTSU’s mission statement was revisited in 2010, the first year of the current cycle, through the University planning process and was approved by TBR March 25, 2011. See TBR minutes. MTSU’s strategic planning goals for this cycle were revised and approved by TBR March 25, 2011. MTSU is required to report its progress on its strategic planning goals to TBR annually. See MTSU Strategic Planning Goals Report. The University is also required to complete a THEC performance funding report annually. See MTSU Performance Funding Report. The TBR and THEC planning cycles also drive the institution’s annual and longer term internal institutional effectiveness (IE) processes which are directly linked to the University’s mission and the achievement of its goals.

### The Role of the University Planning Committee

The MTSU Planning Committee, a standing University Committee, serves as the link between MTSU’s external and internal planning and institutional effectiveness processes. The Committee is charged “to advise and assist the President in developing effective plans that will help the University carry out its mission. The committee should be concerned with setting University objectives and priorities that assure the identification and assessment of educational outcomes and outcomes for administrative and educational support services; assure continuous improvements in outcomes; identify relevant challenges, opportunities, and problems; develop immediate and long-range plans for allocation and effective use of human, financial, and physical resources; consider and recommend action on all issues affecting the organization of academic units, partnerships, centers, departments, schools, and colleges; and monitor the University's performance in achieving its goals.” The University Provost serves as Chair of the Committee.

The MTSU Planning Committee has oversight for the implementation and monitoring of all MTSU institutional effectiveness processes, including [THEC performance funding](#) benchmarks, i.e., program accreditation and external program review, and [TBR strategic planning](#) processes.

See University Planning Committee minutes [here](#). While institutional effectiveness processes ensure internal viability to planning and evaluation, performance funding and master planning processes provide external measures against which strategic goals are measured for improvement purposes. See [MTSU Performance Funding Report](#). See [MTSU Strategic Planning Report](#). Additional external performance reports include the [TBR Report Card](#) which is a comparison of quality indicators for all TBR institutions, and the [THEC Performance Funding Report Summary](#) which is an institutional and peer performance report on institutions related to a common set of standards.

## **The Role of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Research**

The [Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Research](#) (IEPR) coordinates strategic planning functions related to external benchmarks:

- coordinates activities required to meet THEC Performance Funding criteria and submits annual report, i.e., program accreditations and external program reviews for academic programs;
- tracks and reports the University's progress on TBR Strategic Planning Goals;
- tracks and reports the University's progress against other external measures, i.e., NSSE.

The IEPR also provides data support for IE processes to all units, from the department to the University level, for planning and decision-making and coordinates and tracks the University's internal IEAR process using TK20, a planning and evaluation software.

## **University Planning Processes/Initiatives**

MTSU engages in systematic, campus-wide strategic planning to further its mission.

### **Academic Master Plan**

MTSU has a long tradition in the development and implementation of an academic master plan (AMP) to ensure that the University consistently remains focused on furthering its mission. The AMP process—broad based, campus-wide, and data driven—incorporates a deliberate, concerted assessment of the University's strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities. A plan, once developed and approved by the President and TBR, becomes the University's roadmap for setting goals, defining objectives, and allocating resources.

Following on the *MTSU Academic Master Plan, Blueprint for Excellence 2002-2012*, MTSU's [Academic Master Plan: Building on the Blueprint for Excellence 2007-2017](#) was developed through widespread campus involvement and based on findings from internal and external scans conducted over a period of 18 months. The plan was approved by the President in August 2007 and accepted by the TBR on September 20, 2007. It commits the University to three goals as well as identifies strategic directions and objectives for each:

- Enhance academic quality
- Foster student-centered learning
- Leverage resources through partnerships

The plan notes that "To fulfill its mission, Middle Tennessee State University must document its successes and demonstrate the effectiveness of its programs."

The University conducts an annual AMP implementation update to ensure that the objectives identified in the plan are being met. [MTSU Academic Master Plan Updates](#) for each year, beginning 2007-2008 through 2014-2015, provide evidence of continuous improvement activities and budget commitments with respect to the implementation of the AMP. Each year's update is shared with the President, the vice presidents, the deans, and the University Planning Committee. As objectives are met, new objectives or adjustments to existing objectives are adopted.

MTSU began the process to develop a new AMP in fall 2013—six years into the current plan since many of the objectives identified in the current plan had been met. The [Academic Master Plan Committee](#), charged by the President to develop a new plan to provide strategic direction and set priorities while remaining committed to the goals already in place with the current plan, has completed its task (Spring 2015). The revised plan, [The Reach to Distinction, 2015-2025](#), once approved by the President and accepted by TBR, will be launched fall 2015 and is intended to set a course to further enhance the quality of the University's programs.

## Facilities Master Plan

MTSU has a well-established facilities master planning process. The University's facilities master plan (FMP) is revisited every ten years in accordance with the [TBR Guideline for Campus Facility Master Plans](#). The FMP is developed over a period of two years in a planning process facilitated by an external design team. The process includes significant input from University-wide constituencies representing all divisions and functions; reviews by the City of Murfreesboro, TBR, and THEC and review and final approval by the [State Building Commission \(SBC\) of Tennessee](#). The FMP is based on the goals and objectives of the AMP and includes a detailed space needs analysis, infrastructure assessment, and determination of long-term deferred maintenance needs and priorities. Capital projects (new buildings and renovations), infrastructure, and property purchases are defined and implemented as identified in the FMP process. See [MTSU 2007 Campus Master Plan Overview](#). The University is currently in the second year of the development of the MTSU 2015 Campus Master Plan which has been funded by MTSU and approved by TBR and the SBC. See [Campus Master Plan Status Report](#).

The foundation for the *MTSU 2007 Campus Master Plan* and the development of the *MTSU 2015 Campus Master Plan*, are the [Academic Master Plan: Building on the Blueprint for Excellence 2007-2017](#) and the [MTSU Academic Master Plan, The Reach to Distinction, 2015-2025](#), respectively. A flow chart showing the development of a building project, beginning with the AMP and development of the FMP, is shown [here](#). The most significant new facilities and renovations implemented as proposed in the *MTSU 2007 Campus Master Plan* serve as evidence of the integration of planning priorities and budget allocation and include a new Science Building (Biology and Chemistry); renovation of the Davis Science and Wisner Patten Buildings (College of Basic and Applied Sciences, Physics, Geosciences, Anthropology, Forensic Science), new Chiller Plant; new College of Education Building; new Student Union; new Student Services and Admissions Building (One Stop - Admissions, Records, Financial Aid, Bursar, Records, Student Advising, Visitors Tours); two new Parking Decks for 490 cars each; renovation of Bell Street Center (Jennings A. Jones College of Business, Graduate Studies, the University College, Center for Counseling and Psychological Services, classroom and training space); new Health Wellness and Student Recreation Addition (Health Clinic and Exercise Facilities); renovation of Housing Facilities; Parking and Transportation Improvements; Campus Lighting Improvements; underground electrical infrastructure; and a new MED Electrical Sub Station.

## Presidential Led Planning Initiatives

In addition to these institutionalized processes for planning, evaluation, and continuous improvement at the institutional level, the University engages in continuous internal and external scanning to ensure that MTSU remains mission driven in the context of oftentimes rapid changes in the educational, economic, and demographic environments. The President has led several major

University-wide planning initiatives over the course of the implementation of the current AMP in anticipation of the impact these changes might have on the University.

## University Leadership Council

The University Leadership Council (ULC) is a group of faculty, staff, and administrators who serve in an advisory capacity to the President and executive administration to identify and address issues important to the University. Convened in fall 2009 as an outgrowth of the Positioning the University for the Future initiative, the Council offers recommendations and perspectives on various issues and University policies and procedures, and it serves as a sounding board for new ideas and institutional initiatives that have the potential to impact the overall success and viability of MTSU, especially anticipated economic challenges. The Council meets minimally once each semester.

## Quest for Student Success

The impetus for the Quest for Student Success, 2013-2016, a comprehensive, strategic initiative designed to improve retention and completion rates, was a deliberate decision to address a challenging economic environment, dwindling annual budgets, and the Complete College Tennessee Act of 2010, which focused on educational outcomes, by recommitting to the University's core value: student success. Through its University Leadership Council, strategic enrollment planning process, and academic department, college, and division-based planning, the University identified educational improvements to be made and support gaps to be addressed to improve student success. The plan, implemented in 2013, is a working set of goals and strategies intended to result in increased progression, accomplishment, and graduation of MTSU students. The plan's Implementation Chart outlines actions to be taken with a timeline. See implementation status update. See example of "action implemented" results: Course Redesign Report. The University is in the second year of implementing the plan.

## University Institutional Effectiveness Processes

Results of the MTSU's planning and evaluation processes guide decision-making at all levels to support the continuous improvement of programs and services consistent with its mission. MTSU has a mature institutional effectiveness (IE) structure and process, embedded in its mission, which ensures continuous improvement.

## Institutional Effectiveness Structure

MTSU's internal IE structure permeates all levels of the University. The President is responsible for the oversight of the University's IE processes, and each divisional vice-president is responsible for continuous improvement processes within their division. Each administrative unit is required to develop a continuous improvement plan that identifies goals/objectives and, in the case of academic units, student learning outcomes for degree and certificate programs, for which measures are identified, assessment is performed, and based on assessment results, improvements are made. Learning outcomes assessment is student-centered, decentralized, and systematic and incorporates the use of multiple measures, i.e., major field tests, capstone learning experiences, reviews of professional examination results. Goals are likewise assessed—using quality improvement and service improvement standards.

This process is documented with an institutional effectiveness achievement report (IEAR) completed annually by the unit. See IEAR template. The mission of each unit is guided by the University's mission and the goals/objectives/outcomes it identifies are in alignment with the University's goals and outcomes. The goals of all units are also tied to divisional and/or college goals which in turn are derived from University goals. See Mission Purpose. See IEAR template—Section: Mission. See chart with administrative unit continuous improvement goals linked to University goals. See chart linking academic unit goals to University

goals. See [chart](#) linking academic degree learning outcomes with University outcomes. Each vice-president designates an assessment coordinator for their division to oversee the IE process and reporting. See [sample administrative unit IEAR](#). In the Division of Academic Affairs, an assessment coordinator is also designated for each college to ensure IEARs for academic departments include student learning outcomes assessment and use of assessment results to improve learning. See [sample academic IEAR](#). See all IEARs by division, unit, and/or degree program for the years 2012-2013, 2013-2014, and 2014-2015 [here](#).

## **Institutional Effectiveness Processes Linked to Budget**

Assessment results are used in making budget decisions, thus closing the assessment and budget loop to assure continuous improvement. See [Institutional Effectiveness Planning Cycle Linked to Budget \(IEPC/B\)](#). Institutional Effectiveness Achievement Reports are reviewed systematically and continuously as specified in the [IEAR Annual Timeline](#) to ensure that the University's [goals and student learning outcomes](#) are accomplished as defined in the mission. Academic deans, divisional vice presidents, and the University Planning Committee review the plans in accordance with annual IE and budget cycles. For examples of annual IE reviews see Deans' Council [minutes](#) and MTSU Planning Committee [minutes](#). For budget decision-making see sample [annual budget instructions](#); sample [academic department staffing profile](#); sample [college budget proposal](#) to University Provost and the President; sample [division budget proposal](#) to the President; [MTSU Budget Proposal, FY 2014-2015](#) submitted to TBR by the President; [TBR minutes approving budget](#); and [sample approved University unit operating budget](#). MTSU's academic program, research, creative activity, and public service achievements under the implementation of the current AMP provide further evidence of the integration of planning and evaluation processes with IE and budget processes to support its mission.

- MTSU has 100% accreditation of all its programs eligible for specialized program accreditation (53 programs). See specialized program accreditations list [here](#) and reports [here](#).
- MTSU's external program reviews (per a program review cycle required in lieu of program accreditation by the THEC Quality Assurance performance funding initiative) have been positive. See external program review list [here](#) and reports [here](#).
- MTSU's annual THEC Quality Assurance Performance Funding Score consistently ranks at the top when compared to its sister TBR institutions. For FY 2014-2015 MTSU's score of 98 (the highest among the TBR institutions) resulted in \$6.8M in performance funding to the University. See [THEC Performance Funding Calculations FY 2014-2015](#).
- MTSU's extramural funding efforts have demonstrated sustained awards to support research and service projects. See [Grants Awarded 2010-2014](#).
- MTSU holds the elective [Community Engagement and Partnership Carnegie Classification](#) (reaffirmed January, 2015).
- MTSU successfully developed, implemented, and institutionalized an [Experiential Learning Program](#) (EXL) to enhance student learning (MTSU's SACSCOC QEP).
- MTSU has added over 25 undergraduate and graduate degrees, including three new Ph.D. programs and an Ed.D. program.
- The University met its original \$60 million Centennial Campaign goal and extended it to \$80 million.

Specific IE processes for educational programs, including student learning outcomes, administrative support services, academic and student support services, research and creative activity, and community/public service are described in detail in Comprehensive Standards [3.3.3.1](#), [3.3.1.2](#), [3.3.1.3](#), [3.3.1.4](#), and [3.3.1.5](#) and Federal Mandate [4.1](#).

The President's annual [State of the University Address](#) to faculty and administrators at the First Fall Faculty Meeting of each academic year serves to provide the MTSU community an update on the achievements of the University over the past academic year and the [President's Newsletter](#) serve as the primary vehicle through which MTSU's success in meeting its goals is communicated to the public.

## **Institutional Developments Related to Assessment**

Over the past ten years, MTSU's culture of assessment has been enhanced based on reviews of institutional assessment processes:

- Assessment Coordinators were named for all colleges and divisions charged with oversight (2010).
- New assessment and planning solutions software was implemented (2012).
- Professional development has been provided to all college assessment coordinators and the Academic Master Plan and QEP leadership teams.
- The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning expanded its staff to eight including a staff member designated to facilitate TK20 access for documenting annual IEAR reporting and program review support
- Program assessment processes were reviewed, updated, and codified by the SACSCOC leadership team.
- All planning documents were archived in the TK20 Planning and Evaluation System.

In summary, MTSU provides a portfolio of documentation to support its judgment of compliance with this core requirement.

## Portfolio of Documentation

- [MTSU Undergraduate Catalog: Mission Statement](#)
- [TBR mission](#)
- [THEC History and Mission](#)
- [Planning Goals Integration Chart](#)
- [MTSU Strategic Plan 2010-2015](#)
- [TBR Strategic Plan 2010-2015](#)
- [THEC 2010-2015 Performance Funding Quality Assurance](#)
- [TBR Regular Session Minutes March 25, 2011.](#)
- [MTSU Performance Funding Program 2010-2015 Cycle](#)
- [MTSU Planning Committee Charge and Composition](#)
- [MTSU Performance Funding 2010-15 Cycle](#)
- [The Public Agenda for Tennessee Higher Education 2010-2015](#)
- [Performance Funding Program Points Awarded per Year for the 2010-2015 Cycle](#)
- [TBR Strategic Planning](#)
- [THEC Performance Funding Calculations FY 2014-15](#)
- [Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning and Research](#)
- [Academic Master Plan: \*Building on the Blueprint for Excellence 2007-2017\*](#)
- [Academic Master Plan Update 2007 - 2017](#)
- [Academic Master Plan Committee Members](#)
- [Academic Master Plan Committee Charge](#)
- [TBR Guideline B-022, Campus Facility Master Plans](#)
- [State Building Commission \(SBC\) of Tennessee](#)
- [MTSU 2007 Campus Master Plan Overview](#)
- [MTSU Capital Project Analysis](#)
- [MTSU Academic Master Plan, \*The Reach to Distinction, 2015-2025\*](#)
- [University Leadership Council](#)
- [Positioning the University for the Future](#)
- [Quest for Student Success 2013-2016](#)
- [Strategic Recruitment and Retention Project](#)
- [Electronic Media Communication Retention Plans](#)
- [College of Liberal Arts Report on Advising and Retention](#)
- [Student Retention Plan: Advising](#)

- [Quest for Student Success Implementation Chart](#)
- [Student Success Implementation College Update](#)
- [Course Redesign Report](#)
- [IEAR Template](#)
- [Administrative Unit Goals Aligned with University Program Outcomes and Goals](#)
- [Academic Department Goals Aligned with University Program Outcomes and Goals](#)
- [Student Learning Outcomes by Degree Aligned with University Outcomes](#)
- [Institutional Effectiveness Achievement Report 2014-2015](#)
- [Institutional Effectiveness Achievement Report, Psychology](#)
- [Division of Academic Affairs, Institutional Effectiveness Achievement Reports \(2012 - 2015\)](#)
- [Annual Institutional Effectiveness Planning Cycle Linked to Budget](#)
- [IEAR Annual Timeline](#)
- [Deans' Cabinet Meeting, Wednesday, September 7, 2011](#)
- [University Planning Committee, Wednesday, April 9, 2014](#)
- [MTSU Budget Instructions](#)
- [MTSU Staffing Profile for AY 2014-15](#)
- [College of Education Budget Request 2015](#)
- [Academic Affairs Requests 2015](#)
- [July 14-15 Budget](#)
- [TBR minutes approving budget](#)
- [Sample University Unit Operating Budget](#)
- [Accredited Academic Programs](#)
- [Accredited Programs](#)
- [Seven-Year Program Review Calendar](#)
- [Program Review Documents](#)
- [THEC Performance Funding Calculations FY 2014-15](#)
- [Grants Awarded FY 2010-2014](#)
- [Carnegie Foundation: All Community Engagement Classified Institutions \(see Page 7\)](#)
- [Experiential Learning](#)
- [3.3.1.1, Institutional Effectiveness: Educational Programs](#)
- [3.3.1.2, Institutional Effectiveness: Administrative Support Services](#)
- [3.3.1.3, Institutional Effectiveness: Academic and Student Support Services](#)
- [3.3.1.4, Institutional Effectiveness: Research](#)
- [3.3.1.5, Institutional Effectiveness: Public Service](#)
- [4.1 Student Achievement](#)
- [2014 State of the University Address \(Video\)](#)
- [President's Newsletter](#)

---

## **MT Engage: Engage Academically, Learn Exponentially, Showcase Yourself**

---

The MT Engage QEP is focused on enhancing student academic engagement. This will be accomplished by:

1. Incorporating high impact pedagogies within the course and through beyond-the-classroom engagement activities / strategies:
  - High Impact Pedagogies: learning communities, problem-based learning, collaborative learning, project-based learning, etc.
  - Beyond-the-Classroom examples: service-learning, research, co-curricular activities, attending related campus events, attending off-campus events, etc.
2. Challenging students to use integrative thinking and reflection across multiple contexts and educational experiences. Students will develop an ePortfolio which will showcase the integration of the knowledge, skills, and abilities gained during their time at MTSU.

### **The student learning outcome for MT Engage is:**

*Students will use integrative thinking and reflection to demonstrate the ability to make connections across multiple contexts and educational experiences.*

The following five student indicators, adapted from the AACU Value Rubric for Integrative Thinking, will be used to assess students' integrative/reflective thinking.

- 1) The ability to connect relevant experiences and academic knowledge (connections to experience),
- 2) The ability to make connections across disciplines and perspectives (connections to discipline),
- 3) The ability to adapt and apply information to new situations (transfer),
- 4) The ability to use effective, appropriate, and various forms of communication to enhance the quality of their assignments (effective and integrated communication), and
- 5) The ability to demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts, especially as it relates to their personal and professional development (self-assessment and reflection).

### **Program Goals:**

- To foster a culture of engaged learning.
- To improve student retention, progression, & graduation.

In order to meet the Student Learning Outcome that students will use integrative thinking and reflection to demonstrate the ability to make connections across multiple contexts and educational experiences and the program goal of strengthening a culture of engagement at MTSU, MT Engage will focus on five initiatives--two curriculum initiatives and three support initiatives.

Two curriculum initiatives:

**1. MT Engage Foundation Pathway:** Support will be provided to faculty who teach lower-division courses to enhance existing courses through the use of high impact, engaging pedagogy, a co-curricular experience, and integrative/reflective thinking and/or writing assignments placed in an ePortfolio. Phase I involves a revision of the UNIV 1010 University Seminar and selected general education courses, such as English 1010 and English 1020.

**2. MT Engage Major Pathway:** Departments will be provided support to engage in curriculum development and redesign to incorporate MT Engage components into the major. Departments will have support to revise classes to incorporate high impact, engaging pedagogies and integrative/reflective thinking assignments, as well as assistance tailoring the ePortfolio to the major in order to showcase students' (a) engagement in their learning, (b) reflections about their experiences, and (c) personal and professional development.

Three initiatives will support these curricular pathways:

**3. MT Engage Faculty Development:** General workshops and learning communities will be held each semester through the Learning Teaching & Innovative Technologies Center which focus on high impact, engaging pedagogy and integrative/reflective thinking pedagogy. In addition, the Faculty Instructional Technology Center will provide faculty training in ePortfolio technology on a regular and one-on-one basis.

**4. MT Engage Experiences:** A searchable database consisting of high impact beyond-the-classroom experiences will be developed and maintained to provide students greater awareness of available beyond-the-classroom activities. This database will include a general list of academic and student affairs experiences (e.g., student organizations, student leadership, volunteering), as well as suggested activities for students by major (e.g., internships, research experiences, tutoring opportunities). Also, an MT Engage Week will be held each fall semester to provide focused attention on the many opportunities available to students.

**5. MT Engage Recognition Program:** A program will be developed to recognize students who complete various levels of these learning experiences both within the general education curriculum (i.e., the first two years) and beyond.

## MTSU's New Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)



## Overview

- I. MT Engage Basics
- II. The Big Picture
- III. Next Steps

## I. MT ENGAGE BASICS

### WHAT IT IS

## What is a QEP?

- A Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is a core requirement for SACSCOC accreditation.
- The QEP is a 5 year initiative to improve student learning.
- **MT Engage** is MTSU's QEP for 2016-2021.

## What is MT Engage?

The **MT Engage** QEP is focused on enhancing students' academic engagement by:

1. Providing students with high impact pedagogies in and out of the classroom, and
2. Challenging students to use integrative thinking and reflection across multiple contexts and educational experiences.

## Academic Engagement (def.)

MTSU defines academic engagement as a student's active learning experiences as demonstrated through quality of effort, physical and psychological involvement, and participation in productive learning activities.

## 1. Providing High-Engagement Learning Opportunities

capstone courses/projects service learning  
 internships project based learning  
 first year seminars EXL  
 learning communities civic engagement  
 writing intensive courses flipped classrooms  
 collaborative assignments Reacting to the Past  
 undergraduate research study abroad  
 global learning common intellectual experiences

Expanded from Kuh, 2008 & AAC&U HIEPS

## 2. Challenging Students to Use Integrative Thinking & Reflection

Students will be assessed on their ability to:

- 1) Make connections to relevant experiences
- 2) Make connections across academic disciplines
- 3) Adapt and apply information to new situations
- 4) Communicate information effectively
- 5) Reflect and self-assess

Modified from the AAC&U Integrative Thinking Value Rubric

## The MT Engage Student Learning Outcome is:

### **Integrative Thinking and Reflection:**

Students will use integrative thinking and reflection to demonstrate the ability to make connections across multiple contexts and educational experiences.

## Why Integrative Thinking?

“Developing students’ capacity for integrative learning is central to personal success, social responsibility, and civic engagement...Students face a rapidly-changing and ever-more-interconnected world, in which integrative learning becomes not just a benefit...but a necessity.”

AACU, 2004

## Why Reflection?

“A growing number of cognitive researchers and educational theorists have studied the reflective process and concluded that it is key to enriched student learning.”

In *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience and School*, Bransford et al. identify and examine “research that demonstrated the benefits of reflection for student learning in topics as diverse as physics, writing and mathematics, as well as for increasing the degree to which students transfer their learning across disciplines and semesters.”

cited in Eynon, Gambino, & Torok, 2014

## Assessing & Documenting Integrative Thinking and Reflection

- ePortfolios: for showcasing student’ integration of the knowledge skills, and abilities gained at MTSU
- Rubrics: to assess integration and reflection in the classroom & the ePortfolio
- Surveys: to assess student engagement & perceptions of knowledge, skills, & abilities

## II. THE BIG PICTURE

MT ENGAGE: PROGRAM GOALS AND INITIATIVES

## MT Engage Program Goals

- **Goal 1: Foster a culture of engaged learning.**
- **Goal 2: Improve student retention, progression, & graduation**

## MT Engage Overview



## MT Engage Initiatives

Curriculum initiatives:

1. **MT Engage Foundation Pathway:** Faculty support for enhancing existing lower division courses with:
  - high impact, engaging pedagogy,
  - a beyond-the-course experience, and
  - integrative/reflective thinking assignments placed in an ePortfolio.
2. **MT Engage Major Pathway:** Departmental support for:
  - curriculum development and redesign to incorporate MT Engage components,
  - revising classes to incorporate high impact, engaging pedagogies and integrative/reflective thinking assignments, and
  - assistance tailoring the ePortfolio to the major.

## MT Engage Initiatives (Cont.)

These initiatives will support the curricular pathways:

3. **MT Engage Faculty Development:** Workshops, learning communities, and technology training opportunities will be offered.
4. **MT Engage Experiences:** A searchable database consisting of high impact beyond-the-classroom experiences will be developed and maintained for students. An MT Engage Week will be held each fall semester to provide focused attention on the many opportunities available to students.
5. **MT Engage Recognition Program:** A program will be developed to recognize students who complete various levels of these learning experiences both within the general education curriculum (i.e., the first two years) and beyond.

## MT Engage Components for Students

The components reflect the theme Engage Academically, Learn Exponentially, Showcase Yourself through

- **In-the-Classroom Experiences:** Students will complete two MTE courses as freshman; two MTE courses as sophomores; two MTE courses in their major.
- **Beyond-the-Classroom Experiences:** Students will complete at least one beyond the classroom experience in each MTE class and document in ePortfolio
- **ePortfolio** will be assessed at the end of the sophomore year, and scholarships for exemplary ones may be awarded; completed e-Portfolio will be assessed after the first semester of the senior year. Senior awards given.
- **End of the Program Interview** will be an option for students who have completed the final e-Portfolio and two additional courses in their major. Senior interview awards given.

## MT Engage Incentives for Students

The following are being considered:

- Early Registration Privileges
- Scholarship Opportunities
- Recognition at Certain Benchmarks
  - Freshmen: t-shirt, signed pledge card, MT Engage button, lanyard, etc.; spring recognition event
  - Sophomore & Junior: Eligible to become mentors & obtain class credit (MTE Seminar/Practicum); spring recognition event; scholarship(s) to be awarded at event
  - Senior: mentoring role, certificate of completion, spring recognition event; senior ePortfolio cash awards given at event

## Problem Being Addressed

**What primary problem is our QEP addressing?**

- Lack of student engagement within and beyond-the-classroom
- Lack of integrative thinking and reflection by students

**Additional problems this QEP can address:**

- Underdeveloped communication skills
- Lack of career and professional readiness
- Retention of students

## Significance

MT Engage is significant for students' learning and lives. Increased academic engagement and integrative thinking and reflection have been shown to increase student learning and student retention and contribute to lifelong learning.

## Significance

Our success will change our campus in these ways:

- MTSU will be known as a campus that values engaged learning.
- Students will be expected to actively contribute to their learning environment through class activities, collaborations, research, service, civic engagement, etc.
- Students will have a better understanding of themselves and their learning, as well as their skills and abilities, through integrative thinking and reflection.

## III. NEXT STEPS

... AND HOW YOU CAN GET INVOLVED

## MT Engage Timeline

Activity	Date
Gather campus feedback	Fall 2015
Draft of plan to campus for feedback	November 2015
Pilot aspects of project	Fall 2015 and Spring 2016
Determine ePortfolio tool	Fall 2015
Submit QEP to SACSCOC	February 2016
List MT Engage Courses on Fall 2016 Schedule	March 2016
SACSCOC on-site visit	March 29-31, 2016
Implement MT Engage	Fall 2016

## Next Steps: Getting Involved

1. Review information on the MT Engage website, provide feedback via email, and attend November open forums.
2. Submit an interest form to teach an MT Engage course.
3. Request more information from Dianna Rust ([Dianna.Rust@mtsu.edu](mailto:Dianna.Rust@mtsu.edu)).

## Questions and Comments?



Engage Academically. Learn Exponentially.  
Showcase Yourself.

## References

- American Association of Colleges and Universities. (2004). Statement on Integrative Learning. Retrieved from <http://evergreen.edu/washingtoncenter/docs/intlearning/statementintlearning.pdf>
- American Association of Colleges and Universities. (2009). Integrative and Applied Learning VALUE Rubric. Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/integrative-learning>
- Eynon, B., Gambino, L.M., & Torok, J. (2014). Reflective Learning. Retrieved from [http://www.c2i.menrc.org/DP\\_Reflection.pdf](http://www.c2i.menrc.org/DP_Reflection.pdf)
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Excerpted here: <http://www.aacu.org/learn/hips> and available in table format here: [http://www.aacu.org/learn/hips/documents/hips\\_tables.pdf](http://www.aacu.org/learn/hips/documents/hips_tables.pdf)
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual and empirical foundations. In R. M. Gonyea & G. D. Kuh (Eds.), *Using NSSE in institutional research* (pp. 5-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2015). High-impact practices. Retrieved from [http://nsse.indiana.edu/html/high\\_impact\\_practices.cfm](http://nsse.indiana.edu/html/high_impact_practices.cfm)