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- UT Austin (1980’s and 90’s)
  - Faculty workload system
  - Compacts: integrated management, planning, and budgeting involving the individual colleges and schools and the Provost’s Office
  - PBIS framework
    - Departments and schools plan their instructional offerings at both the undergraduate and graduate level in an integrated fashion and on an annual basis
    - Performance is evaluated on a departmental rather than an individual basis
- UT Regents and UT System (2002-03)
  - Created accountability system designed to:
    - Improve institutional performance and strategic planning
    - Foster sound management, transparency of operations, and communication with the public
  - Compacts between component campuses and System [since discontinued and replaced by strategic planning and policy research]
ACADEMIC ACCOUNTABILITY

- Governor Perry’s Executive Order RP 31 (January 22, 2004)
  - Provide “the information necessary to determine the effectiveness and quality of the education students receive at individual institutions” also to provide “… the basis to evaluate the institutions’ use of state resources.”
- Commission on Higher Education (Draft Report July 14, 2006) – “We recommend …
  - the creation of a robust culture of accountability and transparency throughout higher education.”
  - America’s colleges and universities embrace a culture of continuous innovation and quality improvement.”

ACADEMIC ACCOUNTABILITY

  - The University of Texas must create a disciplined culture of excellence that will enable it to realize its constitutional mandate
    - Develop a new undergraduate core curriculum to better prepare students for lives of accomplishment.
    - Establish a more demanding standard for leadership of academic departments and research centers, and give those leaders the authority and resources to succeed.
  - What is “disciplined culture of excellence”?
    - Excellence in all University endeavors
    - Characterized by strong leadership and an engaged intellectual community
    - Combined with individual and institutional accountability
ACCOUNTABILITY TOPICS

- **Department Level**
  - HB 2504 Posting of course syllabi and CVs
  - Faculty Workload Exception Analysis
  - Course and Instructor Evaluations

- **School/College Level**
  - DPAC (Dean/Provost Academic Core Process)
  - Doctoral Programs Review
  - SB 1414 Camps for Minors

- **University Level**
  - SACSCOC Reaffirmation of Accreditation & Fifth Year Report (includes program assessment at department and school levels) and Substantive Changes
  - Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) & Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA)
  - Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment
  - HB 33 Textbook Affordability

ACCOUNTABILITY TOPICS

- **University of Texas System**
  - System Accountability and Performance Reports
  - Chancellor’s Dashboards: Faculty & Students
  - Chancellor’s Framework for Excellence
  - Faculty Workload Report
  - Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment

- **THECB**
  - New General Education Program (assessments periodically)
  - Low Producing Programs
  - Accountability System
  - Strategic Plan for Research (HB 51)
ACCOUNTABILITY CONTEXT
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Core Curriculum
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POSTING OF SYLLABI AND CVS

- HB 2504 (2009) requires public posting of the following each semester:
  - Undergraduate classroom course syllabi
  - CV of instructor of record
  - Instructor evaluation
  - Departmental budget
  - Within three links of main page
- Must show compliance each January 1 of odd-numbered years

POSTING OF SYLLABI AND CVS

- Syllabi and CVs uploaded by departments starting first day of classes, but no later than 7 days after first day of classes in:
  - Fall & Spring semesters
  - Summer sessions
- Instructor evaluations provided by Center for Teaching and Learning
- Departmental budget posted by Chief Financial Officer
- Began August 15, 2010 and entering 5th year (at >95% compliance)
ACCOUNTABILITY CONTEXT

- Instructor Evaluations
- Faculty Workload
- Textbook Affordability
- Course Evaluations
- Program Assessment
- Program Accreditation
- Posting of Syllabi and CVs
- Doctoral Program Review
- School/College DPAC
- SACSCOC Accreditation
- CLA & VSA
- Accountability
- "Closing the Gaps"
- Core Curriculum

SACSCOC ACCREDITATION

- Accredited by
  - Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
  - Accreditation entities for professional programs on campus (e.g., Architecture, Business, Education, Engineering, etc.)
- Major Components
    - Demonstrate institutional compliance with ~83 standards
  - Focus Areas for Departmental Chairs:
    - Institutional Effectiveness (academic programs, support programs, and core curriculum)
    - Faculty Credentialing
  - Off-Site Review of Report and initial determination of compliance with standards (November 2017)
Major Components (Cont’d)
- Self-Study Document: Focused Report with response to non-compliant standards, if any (February 2018)
- Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) (February 2018)
- On-Site Visit and updated determination of compliance (March or April 2018)
- Final response to non-compliant standards, if any (September 2018)
- Final determination of accreditation status (December 2018)
- Follow-up through December 2020 for any non-compliant standards
  - First Monitoring Report (if needed) Due September 2019
  - Second Monitoring Report (if needed) Due September 2020
WE WERE HERE!

Commission on Colleges Review & Decision
SACSCOC Response to Off-site Review Due
Quality Enhancement Plan Due
On-site Review
Off-site Review
Compliance Certification Report Due
Leadership Team Orientation
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SACSCOC
Possible C&R Committee Review
SACSCOC Review & Decision
Off-site Review
Fifth Year Report Due
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**ASSESSMENT PLANS**

- SACSCOC standards CS 3.3.1 and CS.3.5.1 require outcomes-based assessment
  - CS 3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas (Institutional Effectiveness):
    - 3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes
    - 3.3.1.2 administrative support services
    - 3.3.1.3 academic and student support services
    - 3.3.1.4 research within its mission, if appropriate
    - 3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate
ASSESSMENT PLANS

- CS 3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them. (College-level competencies)

- These two standards:
  - Require an assessment plan for each undergraduate and graduate program and an assessment plan for the general education requirement (i.e., UT's BER)
  - Demonstrate the extent to which students achieve outcomes and [demonstrate program improvement]

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

Undergraduate Program

- 4-yr Curriculum
  - Core Curriculum
    - Courses in Major (w/ Learning Outcomes)
    - Signature Crs., Flags
- Co-Curricular Activities

General Education Outcomes:

- Objective: Educated citizen
- Outcomes: UT outcomes, college-level competencies (SACSCOC), THECB requirements

Program Outcomes (KSAAA at graduation) (POs)

Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)

- Stakeholders/Constituents
  - Administrators and Educational Support
  - Co-Curricular Activities
  - 4-yr Curriculum
  - Core Curriculum
    - Courses in Major (w/ Learning Outcomes)
    - Signature Crs., Flags
  - Co-Curricular Activities

KSAAA = knowledge, skills, abilities, attitudes, and attributes

Assessment Plan: Show extent to which PEOs and POs are being achieved and demonstrate that program is being continually improved
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

- Accreditation focuses on outcomes-based assessment
  - Key elements for each academic program
    - Establish Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)
    - Establish Program Outcomes (POs)
    - Develop curriculum and co-curricular activities to achieve both
    - Demonstrate through assessment that PEOs and POs are being achieved by continuous improvement of the curriculum and related activities (i.e., “closing the loop”)
  - Applies to undergraduate and graduate programs

CLOSING THE LOOP

- What is “closing the loop”?
  - It means demonstrating through a cycle of data gathering and evaluation that outcomes (program, general education, or administrative unit objectives) are achieved at desired levels of proficiencies, and, if not, then making changes to the educational programs or units over time so that the desired level of proficiencies are achieved.
    - Program outcomes and the desired levels of proficiency for each are set by the faculty and similarly for administrative units
    - Demonstration of proficiency is achieved through evaluation of data gathered through assessment
    - Changes made to improve educational programs are made by the faculty and similarly for administrative units
    - A “closing the loop” cycle in an academic program takes one to two years to complete and less time in administrative units
  - The ultimate focus is assuring that students graduating from a program perform at the levels desired by the faculty and that programs are continually improved in the process
**NEXT STEPS**

- As of September 30 each year, all degree programs and administrative units must have entered all assessment results for the just completed AY into TracDat in preparation for transition to the next AY
- All degree programs must implement their assessment plans and “close the loop” at least once every two years
- These plans and evidence of their implementation are to be entered into our database, TracDat, each year

---

**SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE**

- CS 3.12.1 The institution notifies the Commission of changes in accordance with the Commission’s substantive change policy and, when required, seeks approval prior to the initiation of changes. *(Substantive change)*
  - Usually must notify or obtain permission before implementation
  - Deans and department chairs must help identify substantive changes in progress or planned
SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

- Program/Course Level
  - Expanding at current degree level
  - Initiating certificate programs
  - Initiating joint or dual degrees with another institution
  - Initiating degree completion programs
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SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

- School/College/Department Level (most common for UT Austin)
  - Initiating off-campus sites or expanding program offerings at previously approved off-campus sites
  - Closing an off-campus site
  - Closing a program with teach-out programs
  - Initiating dual or joint degrees
  - Initiating or expanding distance learning
  - Initiating programs or courses offered through contractual agreement or consortium
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SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

- Institutional Level
  - Moving an off-campus instructional site (serving the same geographical area)
  - Acquiring any program or site from another institution

FACULTY CREDENTIALING

- SACSCOC Standard CR 3.7.1 - Faculty
  - The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline in accordance with the guidelines listed below. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty.
  - Faculty Roster with credentials to be provided to SACSCOC
FACULTY CREDENTIALING

- Credentialing Process
  - Credential highest degree earned
    - All new faculty provide a transcript of coursework leading to their highest degree
  - Match credentialed degree to courses teaching
    - Where match exists, no further credentialing needed
    - Where match does not exist, further credentialing needed
      - Related work experiences in the field,
      - Professional licensure and certifications,
      - Honors and awards,
      - Continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes

FACULTY CREDENTIALING

- Implications for current faculty
  - Be sure T/TT faculty who are asked to teach courses outside degree area have the credentials to do so
  - Be sure non-tenure track faculty are credentialed
- Implications for future faculty hires
  - Hire with teaching responsibilities in mind
ACCOUNTABILITY CONTEXT

- Instructor Evaluations
- Faculty Workload
- Textbook Affordability
- Course Evaluations
- Program Assessment
- Program Accreditation
- Posting of Syllabi and CVs
- Doctoral Program Review
- School/College DPAC
- SACSCOC Accreditation
- CLA & VSA
- Accountability
- “Closing the Gaps”
- Core Curriculum

WORKLOAD POLICY

- Effective fall 2006:
  - Department chairs, in conjunction with their faculty and with the review and approval of their dean, develop workload guidelines to permit each department and/or program to best deploy its faculty resources to accomplish its combined instructional, research, and service missions.
  - Guidelines to account for:
    - Tenured and tenure-track faculty who have active and productive research/scholarly programs
    - Tenured faculty who are no longer active in research/scholarly work
    - Full-time non-tenure track faculty
WORKLOAD POLICY

- Ensure courses offered for majors and non-majors are adequate and sufficient to meet anticipated demand consistent with available resources
- Work with dean to determine appropriate level and mix of SCH production using current level and mix as baseline
- Ensure that tenured and tenure-track faculty continue to provide significant instructional service in undergraduate and lower-division courses
- Each year, the Provost’s Office will discuss with the appropriate deans those faculty whose earned TLCs fall significantly below their minimum

August 18-19, 2014 Neal E. Armstrong, Vice Provost New Academic Administrators Workshop Slide No. 33

WORKLOAD POLICY

- Effective Spring 2013
  - New workload system accounts for:
    - Instructional TLCs determined from teaching assignments, supervisions, etc.
    - Presidential TLCs (part of Regents’ Rule 31006) and others
      - 21 Categories
      - Assumes PTLCs assigned by Chairs are justified and appropriate
    - Faculty must meet minimum TLC requirements
    - Provost Office will work with Chairs
- Will continue into AY2014-15?
ACCOUNTABILITY CONTEXT

- Faculty
- Department
- School/College
- University
- UT System
- THECB

Instructor Evaluations
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Textbook Affordability
Course Evaluations
Program Assessment
Program Accreditation
Posting of Syllabi and CVs
Doctoral Program Review
School/College DPAC
SACSCOC Accreditation
CLA & VSA
Accountability
“Closing the Gaps”
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COURSE INSTRUCTOR SURVEYS

- Purpose:
  - Summative teaching effectiveness information for faculty, administration, and students
  - Useful for annual reviews, post-tenure reviews, program assessment, etc.
- Scope:
  - Conducted by every faculty member for each organized class
  - Approximately 8,000 classes surveyed each long semester and 1,400 each summer
- Mode:
  - Paper and electronic (about 15% in AY2008-09)
- Results available at:
  http://www.utexas.edu/academic/mec/cis
**INSTRUCTOR SCORES**

Within 1 $\sigma$: 68.3%
Within 2 $\sigma$: 95.4%
Within 3 $\sigma$: 99.7%

**COURSE INSTRUCTOR SURVEYS CUSTODY**

- CIS will continue to be administered each semester
- Faculty members have access to all results for assessing and improving their classes
- CIS results, including students' handwritten comments, are official University records
- Faculty are responsible for retaining completed CIS forms secure for 10 years
- CIS results will be used for the administration for faculty reviews, including the promotion and tenure process; faculty will make results available for such reviews
- Handwritten comments not available to public
- Upon leaving the University, faculty give completed CIS forms to their department
- Guidelines retroactive to December 8, 2004

ACCOUNTABILITY CONTEXT

- Faculty
  - Department
  - School/College
    - University
      - UT System
      - THECB
    - Instructor Evaluations
      - Course Evaluations
      - Program Assessment
      - Program Accreditation
      - Posting of Syllabi and CVs
    - Doctoral Program Review
    - School/College DPAC
    - SACSCOC Accreditation
    - CLA & VSA
    - Accountability
      - "Closing the Gaps"
      - Core Curriculum

DPAC PROCESS

- What?
  - A process
    - Started at UT Austin in AY1994-95 (formerly Compact)
    - Integrates planning, management, and budgeting
    - Is between school/college and the Provost’s Office
    - Establishes school/college vision and priorities for 5 to 10 year time horizon
      - Recognizes increased school/college and department autonomy
    - Involves
      - A review and assessment of the school/college in spring (deans typically involve departments)
      - A long-term plan for strategic use of University/school/college resources to achieve vision
  - Annual cycle
  - Spring/summer meeting between dean and Provost to strategize
ACADEMIC ACCOUNTABILITY

- Voluntary System of Accountability
  - Promoted by AASCU and APLU
  - Demonstrate accountability and stewardship to public
  - Measure educational outcomes to identify effective educational practices

ACADEMIC ACCOUNTABILITY

- Doctoral Program Information
  - New THECB policy to:
    - Strengthen doctoral programs
    - Provide greater public access to information about them
  - Data collection began fall 2008
    - Students: graduation rates, time to degrees, …
    - Faculty: publications, grants, student/faculty ratio, teaching load, diversity, …
    - Program: last external review, …
ACCOUNTABILITY CONTEXT
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SYSTEM AND STATE

- UT System’s accountability work
- Higher education accountability
  - Governor’s Executive Order (January 2004)
  - THECB developed measures and targets for legislative and public review
  - System online December 17, 2004
  - http://www.txhigheredddata.org/Interactive/Accountability/
- “Closing the Gaps”
  - Provide workforce to meet State needs
  - THECB setting measures and targets
  - Target for increased enrollment by 2015 is 630,000
  - http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/ClosingtheGaps/
TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

On January 23, 2004, Governor Perry issued Executive Order RP-31 requiring the Coordinating Board and each institution and system work together to provide the information necessary to determine the effectiveness and quality of the education services receive at individual institutions and to provide the basis to evaluate the institutions' use of state resources.

The Texas Accountability System for Public Higher Education was established to provide better information to students and their families regarding the performance of postsecondary education institutions. The system is designed to: (1) provide incentives for systemwide improvement, (2) support the definition of educational excellence, (3) improve the quality of postsecondary education, and (4) help to ensure the accountability of state and federal educational investments.

Key Accountability Measures:
- Graduation rates
- Full-time equivalent faculty
- Student retention rates
- Student-to-teacher ratio
- Tuition and fees
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SYSTEM AND STATE

- Core Curriculum
  - Review mandated by THECB and SACSCOC and recommended by Commission of 125
  - New Core Curriculum put into place
  - Signature Courses (Quality Enhancement Plan for SACSCOC)
  - THECB has created new core curriculum
  - UT Austin has modified its core curriculum which will be effective fall 2014
Contact Information

Neal E. Armstrong, PhD
Vice Provost for Institutional Accreditation (until August 31, 2014)
Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
FAC 424 (until August 31, 2014)
512-232-3305
512-232-8034 FAX
neal_armstrong@mail.utexas.edu

Linda N. Dickens, PhD
Senior Director, Institutional Accreditation and Effectiveness
Office of Institutional Accreditation and Program Assessment
512-232-2646
linda.dickens@austin.utexas.edu
# ACCOUNTABILITY ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Nature of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Instructor evaluations</td>
<td>End of each semester</td>
<td>Instructors evaluated by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Faculty workload</td>
<td>Each semester with summary at end of AY</td>
<td>Every instructor, fall &amp; spring, by Provost’s Office and dean/chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textbook affordability</td>
<td>Start of each semester (April 1 for fall and summer, October 31 for spring, no later than 30 days before start of semester)</td>
<td>Faculty provide textbook information to University Co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Course evaluations</td>
<td>End of each semester</td>
<td>Courses evaluated by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program assessment</td>
<td>Each year, but in some cases each semester or every two years</td>
<td>Every UG &amp; G program, assessed by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program accreditation</td>
<td>Every 5 to 10 years depending on accreditor</td>
<td>Professional UG/G programs assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posting of Syllabi &amp; CVs</td>
<td>Start of each semester</td>
<td>Every UG classroom course and instructor-of-record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/College</td>
<td>Doctoral program review</td>
<td>Every graduate program every seven years</td>
<td>Self-study plus review by external consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School/College DPAC</td>
<td>Every summer</td>
<td>Provost and dean per rolling 5-yr review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>SACSCOC institutional accreditation</td>
<td>Every 10 years w/ Five Year Interim Report in between</td>
<td>Compliance with standards, program and core assessment, and substantive change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLA &amp; VSA</td>
<td>CLA every fall and spring, VSA every year</td>
<td>CLA required by System and VSA by agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UT System</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Every year</td>
<td>UT System’s accountability system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THECB</td>
<td>“Closing the Gaps”</td>
<td>Every year</td>
<td>THECB accountability system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core curriculum</td>
<td>Every 10 years, linked to SACSCOC accreditation review</td>
<td>Assessment of Core Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Data requests</td>
<td>As requested</td>
<td>Analysis as needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SACSCOC = Southern Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges
CLA = Collegiate Learning Assessment (measures critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and effective communication)
VSA = Voluntary System of Accountability (information about University to stakeholders – prospective students, parents, agencies, and legislators)
Substantive Change = changes in degree programs, off-site locations, modes of delivery (especially distance learning), new campuses, level changes (e.g., UG college to UG/G university), and others that might apply.
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