

STAFF ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

September 10, 2014

CAMPUS CENTER BALLROOM 108.4

Present – A. Bretch, S. Carter, D. Curley, M. Davis, J. Etheredge, Z. Green, K. Ballard, J. Lambert, D. Liverman, N. Lott, M. Miller, S. Pitts, H. Roberts, S. Robinson, J. Robinson, E. Shooks, A. Skinner, B. Smith, A. Udin, K. Willingham, A. Wright, E. Brannon, A. Lewis, M. Parham, M. Ertzberger

Absent – T. Christman, K. Hemphill, J. Morgan, T. Morris, T. Puckett, D. Richards, R. Smith, E. Smith, S. Young

1. Call to order by Erin Brannon - Meetings are generally run by having the guest speaker present first and then council business will follow.

2. Special Guests

Dr. Cathi Jenks, AVP, Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment

Provided an update on where the KPI team is with identifying a new list of Peers & Aspirants for the University of West Georgia.

Peers & Aspirants

Dr. Jenks made a previous presentation at the Faculty Senate, but we were given the new presentation. Changes were made by Dr. Marrero and the list was approved. Peers & Aspirants list helps to identify us against other institutions with similar qualities (processes, policies, and procedures). Dr. Marrero felt that the old list was off because it should have been equal peers vs. Aspirants. In reviewing at others web sites they found that they tended to only have peers that they benchmarked to, no aspirants. New list was provided. The old list can be found on their website, but they will be replacing list and hyper linking to the institutions Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment departments.

How we got to that list – Methodology – looked at it from both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Used the IPEDs database where 7000 institutions of higher learning are listed and by using numerous filters the list was reduced down to what you see in front of you. Looked at Core variables, only included public universities, had 4 year programs, current in IPEDS, were degree granting, enrollment size (because UWG was on the cuff between categories, we looked at those just above us and those just below us), non-military, offering undergrad and graduate programs, etc. They looked at institutions much like us.

Once we had the main filters, we started looking at other variables: what are their admissions criteria's, are they open access, etc. We also realized that our mission had strengthened since the last list was created. In the quantitative analysis we looked at why they should stay on the list; asked Dean's, departments and divisions to provide their insight. For suggestions that were not on the list they were considered as a group. It was then narrowed down to 16 peers, 4 aspirants and 3 sector institutions. The final list is what we see here. It was an interesting process. Share the list with people in your area.

KPI's – Key Performance Indicators Update:

President Marrero established the KPI team was established to take on two tasks: 1) develop a new list of peers and aspirants and 2) establish key performance indicators to go with our new strategic plan. The key performance indicators come in to help evaluate how you are measuring against your strategic plan. There are currently 72 items but not all of them are necessarily key (some are higher than others). We will track the progress on all the strategic imperatives. The committee came up with a draft list (huge) that was then narrowed down with the departments affected and is still being tweaked. Most have been approved by the departments, just a little tweaking still taking place. One issue was raised regarding the composition of the KPI team – University Advancement was not represented, so they went around and talked to various people to find out what was important in their area and how they track things like gifts & scholarships.

There was one heated debate about including the win/loss record of our athletic team in the KPI's – pro's we have a winning team and they bring in people, con's – not an institutional priority = tie among the team. So the issue was brought to Dr. Marrero. He said it is important but does it rise to the level of institutional priority. It's not really a KPI but Advancement should track and we will keep our eyes on it.

The various areas impacted were consulted. The list was presented at the Faculty Senate, where a few errors were identified, so please let them know if you see any errors. According to the recent release from US News, UWG went from a ranking of 89 to 92, but there are several tied at 92 so we have really stayed the same. Again this is just a measure to help us track how we are progressing with our goals in the strategic plan.

Dr. Jenks is going to provide a digital copy of the lists to Erin for distribution so that the representatives can provide information back to their groups. It was listed on the President's website but it is very difficult to read. KPI group will also provide a dashboard for KPI monitoring once a simple format can be developed.

Dr. Denise Overfield – Barrier's Team

There are still people that do not know that there is a barriers team. This team was created as part of the Engage West initiative. The groups charge is to identify, assess and provide recommendations for improving operational processes, policies, and practices with the goal of eliminating barriers of inefficiency. With a culture and mantra of problem solving, this team must align identified barriers with efficient solutions through the lens of mandated statutes, governing policies, and system shared services.

The teams' job is to eliminate the things that get in the way of you doing our job. This is a very big charge. We were given charge and were told to go for it. Our charge to take the four strategic imperatives (20 team members) and we wrote down on large sheets of paper things that get in the way of achieving those imperatives. We agreed to a lot of the barriers and started looking at patterns.

The first 2 barriers and recommendations were approved and were formerly awarded sledgehammers.

Dr. Marrero plans to hang the sledgehammers up in the lobby of Sanford Hall. They have a plaque on them that identifies the barrier and the date. The first two are:

1) *Faculty Toolkit*: a website that was created to provide a “one stop shop” for means to report a student issue (academic dishonesty, student housing issue, financial aid problem, etc.). It is open to faculty & staff. This is to eliminate the need for having to go to multiple places to find help/assistance for a student. You can go to the UWG website, then use the search bar and type “toolkit” and it will come right up. Regardless of your role on campus you probably have interaction with a student that has an “issue”.

2) *Extended leave replacement (not a policy)*: When a person goes on leave, how do we cover their work? EX: If a person has to go on leave for 6 weeks, their work gets put on someone else to cover. The person covering is a nice person and does the work without any additional compensation or resources. This is a barrier that is being eliminated. This has been approved by PAC and is in place. If an employee is out for more than 15 days, the unit that employs that person may request funds to compensate the staff or faculty person that is taking on the extra work or they may request a temporary employee to take on that work. The pool is being developed with the assistance of Melanie McClellan. The funds are coming out of the emergency funds for the University. PAC has approved it and is committed to it. The requesting forms are still being created and once complete the information will be posted.

Two other barriers that have been approved (but not sledgehammers have been received yet) are:

A) *To get E-tuition dollars* (dollars from students who take on-line courses that are more than 95% on-line pay additional funds for tuition. The dollars are divided up between Distance Ed & the department that houses the course) *distributed earlier to units that need to get funds needed to budget better*. This was developed in conjunction with the Provost office. This is approved and this is going to happen. Money can be used to support a classroom – say a classroom needs more computers, needs updating. Money came very late last year and it contributed to the frenzy of year end spending and made it hard to prioritize and budget. By moving this up departments can be more strategic about it. Money goes to academic departments and some really generate a lot.

B) *There are 27 steps involved to hire a faculty member* – we are looking at ways to streamline the process. We are getting a system (Core integrator). Idea behind it is that the hiring process will be much more efficient because instead of thinking in terms of forms we will think of the information. It will be a more holistic system. A sub-committee is taking this on because we lose a lot of potential faculty members because of the chunkiness of our system. PAC has approved the formation of a working group to look at the integration of the Core integrator process. The system level is also looking at something like this but it is going to take them several years so Dr. Marrero has agreed to move forward with this.

Barriers that are in process:

C) *Dual career assistance for Partners*: An office wants to hire somebody and that person has a partner that would also need employment – How can we assist them in finding employment for their partner. They are looking at two careers if one accepts employment at UWG. We lose great candidates at times because of this. We are looking at a module that UGA had. They had a person to act as a point of

contact for the trailing partner. The trailing partner could contact this point person and get assistance with things like a resume critique, information on industries or companies in the region, or a career assessment. We are not recommending that UWG become an employment agency. But we think this could really send the message that we are reaching out to the new employee in the most comprehensive way possible. Dr. Melanie McClellan is our liaison with the community (has office at the Chamber of Commerce) and she could provide resources to the point person. This could be a plus for those looking to come here. We are doing research to see how widely this service is used at other institutions.

The Barriers team does not address issues related to interpersonal conflict, discrimination, misconduct, supervisor/employee disputes, instructor/student issues, or faculty/staff issues. WE DEAL WITH PROCESSES. If you have any of these issues contact the Ombud or HR, they are your resources for these.

The barriers team was told that the beginning that this was a 3 yr commitment. There are 20 people on the team, meet every two weeks for about 2hrs each time. Others outside the committee are asked to participate in sub-committees.

Working on a website where we can post information. If you have suggestions, email Dr. Overfield (dooverfi@westga.edu). Please send your ideas or thoughts.

3. **SAC Business:**

All Members introduced themselves

Role of the SAC Representative

How staff were assigned to you:

HR provides a list of all staff on campus, and then Erin took the list and divided it up. She looked at the divisions represented and the number of representatives that we have. Tried to give each of you the department that you are in, but some had to have more/less because each representative represents 30 staff. If your department had less than 30 we tried to put you with others that you may work closely with.

Your Role on the Staff Advisory Council (SAC):

The UWG staff is divided among the SAC representatives every 2 years and people tend to come and go. So contact your staff representatives by email, phone or department meeting – you decide how. Just let them know how you are and that you represent them - you are the voice of the staff. You don't need to meet with them and go over all the notes from our meetings, you can direct them to our website and all the notes, upcoming meetings, etc will be there. There is also an anonymous feedback form if they don't feel comfortable talking about the issue they have. Make sure everyone is in the know.

There are some issues that will be coming up (holiday calendar again for one) that you might have to poll your group. We want to keep transparency. All staff are invited to the SAC meetings but they are not open meetings, they cannot participate. At the ALL-Staff meetings in the fall and spring they can speak. The fall meeting has been set for October 10th.

We are looking for topics that could be presented for the October meeting and other meetings. The meetings have grown with Dr. Marrero and will continue to get bigger and get better.

Representative question: Can we ask all speakers to provide a summary/digital copy of materials because things can get lost in translation? Yes we can, but you can also refer your group to the website where the official minutes will be; Use the official minutes.

The SAC meetings are where you can ask questions, the All-Staff are where everyone can ask questions. Erin always ends with “Questions, Concerns & Rumors”

Committees – Ashley Lewis

Last year the committees were not as active as they probably should have been. The committees we have are:

Benefits – works closely with Human Resources; has a table at the benefits fair in October. We do concern/comment boxes and generate questions/answers related to concerns. Benefits committee shall address staff members’ concerns regarding benefits and either make a recommendation or refer them to the appropriate area of expertise. Make sure the people in your area are connected to the resources they need for benefit issues.

Bylaws - review bylaws on occasion (1 time a year); changing a few things with the Engage West Survey.

Elections - elections committee is on hold right now. The elections are held every two years, and elections were just made, so this committee is not needed right now.

Public relations – Works on the Toy Drive that is coming up – Ashley usually helps with that; anything related to public relations that you want to see our council initiate on campus.

Staff Development – shall consider options for career and professional development, orientation/mentoring, diversity in the workplace, and basic skills development. The committee shall work closely with the Human Resources Department in enhancing and developing Staff Development programs. What are areas that we can enhance to help staff that we currently have in place. Things are offered on campus but people don’t always know that its available, we need to education staff on what already exists.

Ad Hoc – will be as needed

Do you have any questions about committees? Some work more than others.

Sign-up sheets were made available. The committees will elect a chair for their individual committee; they will operate outside of these SAC committees. One possible ad hoc committee - Ashley received an email about the concern about campus safety and the walkways. One example listed was in the square they the 20 second timers for you to walk. They thought this might be something of interest in certain areas of our campus. So a committee can investigate this to see if it might be helpful for our campus. This could be a possible ad hoc committee to investigate: talk to the city or other institutions to see what they might be doing. Several signed up for this ad hoc committee on pedestrian safety.

A suggestion was made to possibly look at ways to help staff when they are in a hardship.

Columbus State collects used toner cartridges and returns them for money to support their group. So any ideas that you have would be great to help us raise some funds because we really do not have a way to. The funds we raise could help benefit staff that may want to go back to school or something like that. Per Jason Robinson, we are currently recycling the toner cartridges to create a scholarship fund for our employees.

Find your niche in one of these committees; it will help to make SAC more active. Look at other universities to see what they are doing that we might be able to do at UWG.

4. Questions/Concerns/Rumors?

Erin, as the Chair of this council, is the liaison to the President, so there are concerns that we need to bring to him, she will. He is basically the one that we report to.

Question about the SAC All-Staff state meeting, is there money to send people? If you are going to be a Staff council person then you need to see how others perform in certain situations. Then maybe one day we could hold the state council meeting here one day. But I don't know if there is money.

If you would like to go to the All- staff state meeting and you need funds to do so, please let Misty Parham (Treasurer) know and she will talk to Tina in the President's office to see if funds are available. We do not have a budget, but what we do have is a foundation account with about \$1,000.00 in it. The only way that it could get replenished is with A-Day funds. So while you are giving, if you would like to give to the Staff Advisory Council then note it on there. Any other funds right now have to come from the President's office. The \$1,000.00 that is in the account was donated to us by Ann Richards and her husband. They wanted the money to be used for staff development.

She donated a portion of it and it has been increased with A-Day funds.

Misty has spoken with Tina and the President's office is very supportive of us, so if you need funds to go to the meeting and your department does not have it, let Misty know and she will present it to Tina. The meetings do rotate around the state and there are approximately 16 planned so far. UWG did host the meeting back in 2002. Note that the state meeting is streamlined so that you can see it.

It would be neat to hear/see the items that the barriers team has that pertains to us, that we might be able to start working on.

Have TJ come in October to the All-Staff meeting to speak about the Campus Center and what it has to offer.

Next meeting is the 2nd Wednesday in October (October 8th) and the All-Staff meeting is on Friday October 10th. Don't forget the committee sign-up sheets.

Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by Michelle Ertzberger

Peers and Aspirants
for the University of West Georgia

USG Sector Institutions

1. Georgia Southern University
2. Kennesaw State University
3. Valdosta State University

Peer Institutions

1. Central Washington University (WA)
2. Eastern Kentucky University (KY)
3. Sam Houston State University (TX)
4. Stephen F. Austin State University (TX)
5. University of Central Missouri (MO)
6. University of Colorado – Colorado Springs (CO)
7. University of Minnesota – Duluth (MN)
8. University of Northern Colorado (CO)
9. University of Tennessee – Chattanooga (TN)
10. Western Illinois University (IL)

Aspirational Institutions

1. Ball State University (IN)
2. Indiana University of Pennsylvania – Main Campus (PA)
3. James Madison University (VA)
4. University of North Carolina – Wilmington (NC)
5. University of Northern Iowa (IA)

2014-2020 UWG Strategic Plan Key Performance Indicators								
	IPEDS Data Point?	Annual Analysis Period	2020 Goal	Goal	Actual	Directional Change from Prior Analysis Period	Definition	Source
Strategic Imperative 1: Student Success								
SI 1: Goal A: Student Persistence and Degree Attainment (n=10)								
Undergraduate Students								
First Year Retention Rates	Y	Fall 2013	82%	73%	70.76%	↑	IPEDS definition of retention of first-time, full-time freshmen - the percentage of a first-time, full-time in college (FTIC) undergraduate cohort (entering in fall term or summer continuing to fall) with fewer than 12 hours earned since high school graduation that is still enrolled or has graduated from the same institution in the following fall term. Data are based on counts as of ADM census date, which is set by the USG Board of Regents.	IEA
4 Year Graduation Rates	Y	FY2014	25%	17%	15.91%	↑	IPEDS. Four-year graduation rate of the FTIC entering cohort.	IEA
6 Year Graduation Rates	Y	FY2014	55%	42%	40.56%	↓	IPEDS. Six-year graduation rate of the FTIC entering cohort.	IEA
Degrees Conferred by Degree Level	Y	FY2014			Total: 2,338 / UG: 1,660 / G: 678	↑	Degrees conferred in the FY (summer, fall, spring). Does not include post-baccalaureate certificates.	IEA
Graduate Students								
Undergraduate GPA		Fall 2014			need baseline data		Average undergraduate GPA of new graduate students each enrolled Fall semester.	IEA
GRE Scores		Fall 2014			need baseline data		Average GRE scores of new graduate students enrolled each Fall semester.	IEA
GMAT Scores		Fall 2014			need baseline data		Average GMAT scores of new graduate students enrolled each Fall semester.	IEA
POST-GRADUATION SUCCESS -- COMPLETE COLLEGE GEORGIA METRICS								
Professional Licensure/Certification Exams		2013	98%	90%	NCLEX-RN: 92.08% Need data on others	↑	Pass rate for first time examinees for the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (Nursing), the CPA exam (Accounting), and the GACE Content (Education). Data available for CPA exam for \$150 per year. GACE data will be provided by the COE.	http://sps.sps.gov/PA/academic/Forms/398%20Refrance%20-%20Nursing%20Education%20Program%20Results%2042BNCLEX%20.pdf
Median Starting Salary		2013-2014			PayScale: \$40,100	Baseline 2013-2014	Median starting salary for recent graduates.	Alumni Survey, PayScale.com
Continued Education		2013-2014			need baseline data		Percent of baccalaureate graduates continuing their education in graduate programs. Tracked via National Student Clearinghouse	IEA
SI 1: Goal B: Attract Students with Characteristics Consistent with our Mission and Vision (n=5)								
Graduate Enrollment	Y	Fall 2013			1970	↑	Total number of enrolled graduate students at census date.	IEA
Undergraduate Enrollment	Y	Fall 2013			9959	↓	Total number of enrolled undergraduate students at census date.	IEA
HS GPA		Fall 2013			3.12	↑	Average HS GPA for FTIC cohort.	IEA
SAT Scores	Y	Fall 2013			Q/V: 963	↓	Mean Verbal and Math SAT score for all FTIC students who submit scores as part of the admissions process.	IEA
ACT Scores	Y	Fall 2013			20	Unchanged	ACT composite for all FTIC cohort for all FTIC students who submit scores as part of the admissions process.	IEA
SI 1: Goal C: Facilitate Students' Financial Access to UWG (n=7)								
Percent of Undergraduate Students Whose Financial Need is Not Met		2013-2014			need baseline data		Formula created by Philip Hawkins in Financial Aid. This will track both the average amount not met in dollars and the percentage not met.	Financial Aid
Percent of graduate students filing FAFSA or getting loans		2014			need baseline data		Indicator of financial need of graduate students not met by other sources.	Financial Aid

IPEDS Data Point?	Annual Analysis Period	2020 Goal	Goal	Actual	Directional Change from Prior Analysis Period	Definition	Source
Scholarships	2012-2013			\$2,679,565	↑	Category including a total of all scholarship monies: institutional (including study abroad), private, and public. Many private scholarships for college students are offered each year by a variety of corporate, professional, trade, government, civic, religious, social, and fraternal organizations. These scholarships can range in amount from small honorariums to thousands of dollars. To be considered, students must meet the eligibility criteria specified by the donor or sponsor and complete a scholarship application (if required). State funds awarded by Georgia Student Finance Commission http://www.gsfcc.org/getnew/SandG_regs_2013.cfm	Financial Aid
PELL Grant	2011-2012			5249 awards / \$20,811,559	↑/↓	Provides need-based grants to low-income undergraduate and certain postbaccalaureate students to promote access to postsecondary education	Financial Aid
HOPE Measures	Fall 2013			Lost - 40%, need additional baseline data	↑	% of students coming into UWG with HOPE, % losing HOPE, % able to get HOPE back	Financial Aid
Student Employment	2011-2012			FWS - 210 awards / \$291,797	↓/↓	Federal Work Study, SA, GA/GRA/GTA positions	Financial Aid, Career Services, HR
Student Default Rate - Federal Stafford Loans	FY 2010			9.20%	↑	3-year default rate will be used. Source: USDOE	IEA
SI 1: Goal D: Nurture the Development of the Whole Person through Student Engagement (n=3)							
Student Faculty Interactions	2013-2014	FY and Senior student averages sig. higher than peers with effect size ≥ .03		FY and Senior - Sig higher, < .03 effect size	N/A - new questionnaire in 2013	NSSE Indicators on Experiences with Faculty. These indicators include the following: talked about career plans with faculty member; worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework; discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with faculty member outside of class; discussed your academic performance with faculty member	IEA
Number and % of students involved in student organizations, intramurals, campus programs, leadership roles	Baseline 2014			need baseline data		New software tracking system (OrgSync) in SAEM will monitor	SAEM
Assess Quality of Campus Environment	Fall 2014	FY and Senior student averages sig. higher than peers with effect size ≥ .03		FY and Senior = need baseline data	N/A - new questionnaire in 2013	Improvement on NSSE Engagement Indicators: Campus Environment (broken down into quality of interactions with students, academic advisors, faculty, student services staff, and other administrative staff and offices, as well as supportive environment indicators). Improvement on EBI student campus climate survey benchmarked to national comparators.	IEA
Strategic Imperative 2: Academic Success							
SI 2: Goal A: Assure Academic Programs Have the Capacity to Transform Lives and Address the Needs of the Region, State, and Beyond (n=10)							
Number of graduates by program	3 year rolling average, reported yearly		Bachelor's: > 10, Master's: > 5, Ed Spec: > 5, Doctoral: > 3, First Professional: > 3			Three year rolling average of number of graduates of each of the 86 programs of study	IEA/Provost
US News Institutional Ranking	2013-2014			92nd	↓	Institutional ranking in US News and World Report	IEA - external surveys
Experiential Learning Activities	2014-2015			need baseline data		Number of students participating in in-class experiential learning (labs), service learning, internships, practicum placements, study abroad, capstone projects, and undergraduate/graduate level research	Annual Reports of Academic Deans, Department Chairs, Faculty, Staff
QEP - Improve Undergraduate Writing in the Core	2015-2016			need baseline data		Assessments based on macro level rubric and students hitting benchmark assessment scores (overall for the area of the core). Percent of students who meet or exceed the benchmark.	QEP Director, ENG 1101/1102 Assessment Rubric, NSSE
Student-to-Faculty Ratio	2013-2014			19:1	Unchanged	Capacity to provide quality programming.	IEA - common data set

IPEDS Data Point?	Annual Analysis Period	2020 Goal	Goal	Actual	Directional Change from Prior Analysis Period	Definition	Source
Percent of SCH taught by Faculty with Terminal Degree by Academic Unit	Fall 2013	75%	75%				VPAA, IEA
Percent of SCH Generated by Faculty Type and Rank	Fall 2013				↑	PT, FT ratio and headcount by faculty type and rank	VPAA, IEA
Fully Online Programs	Fall 2013					Disaggregated by level (B, M, D)	Distance Education
Number of students entering from formal degree completion articulation agreements	Fall 2014					Track the increase in the number of students transferring into UWG via formal degree completion articulation agreements	IEA
Academic Challenge	Spring 2014	Student average significantly higher than that of peers				Improvement on NSSE Engagement Theme of Academic Challenge for both FY and SR students	IEA
SI 2: Goal B: Recruit, Retain, Compensate, and Develop High-Quality Faculty From Diverse Backgrounds (n=2)							
UWG faculty average salary vs. CUPA median	2013-2014	100% of median		85% of median	↑	UWG faculty salaries compared to CUPA median	VPAA
Total Instructional Budget	2013-2014					Per credit hour generated	VPAA
SI 2: Goal C: Enhance the Support for and Recognition of Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activities Conducted by Faculty and Students (n=2)							
# of students involved in research projects						Need a definition for "project". Involvement in this activity would not fit under "experiential learning activities" as tracked in Z.A.	annual report
External Grant Activity						To include total dollars by fiscal year, number of proposals submitted, number of proposals funded	ORSP
SI 2: Goal D: Measure and Improve the Quality of Teaching in All Academic Programs (n=5)							
Faculty Participation in Activities to Improve Quality of Teaching	2013-2014				N/A	Number of faculty attending workshops or conferences directly related to pedagogy, student motivation/engagement, or assessment	CTL, Annual Report
Quality Matters Training	2013-2014			need baseline data		Number of faculty receiving Quality Matters certifications	CTL, Distance
Faculty Course Evaluations	2013-2014					Track aggregate scores for the entire university on two questions: (1) how well student engaged in the class, and (2) quality of instruction as rated by the student	ITS report to IEA for F2F classes & Distance Ed report to IEA for Online
Faculty presenting or publishing in "teaching and learning" in their respective disciplines	2013-2014					Number of faculty presenting and/or publishing teaching and learning related scholarship in their respective disciplines	annual reports
Faculty publishing or presenting at conferences on their Scholarship of Teaching and Learning	2013-2014				N/A	Number of faculty presenting and/or publishing their SoTL	CTL
Strategic Imperative 3: Valued Partnerships							
SI 3: Goal A: Develop, Assess, and Sustain a Network of Mutually Beneficial Partnerships (n=2)							
Regional Economic Impact	FY 2013	\$650 million	\$460 million	\$455 million	↑	Report produced by the USG and updated at the beginning of the fiscal year	IEA
Partnership Assessment	2014-2015		establish baseline			Impact and return on investment on student, academic, and operational success. [Tactics: 1) compile list of partnerships, 2) develop metric to assess strategic fit and success of partnerships, 3) develop survey for partner assessment of relationships, 4) cabinet-level determination of gaps to be filled. Examine strategic fit on an annual basis.] To include dollar allocation and time commitment dedicated to each partnership.	Unit Heads/Partnership Coordinators
SI 3: Goal B: Create and Cultivate New Partnerships to Support Strategic Initiatives (n=6)							
Number of educational partners	Annually					Formal 2+2 or 3+2 articulation agreements – associate degrees with technical schools/other USG institutions and formalized transfer-out agreements (i.e., GaTech engineering program)	Unit Heads/Partnership Coordinators
Articulated Degree Completion Programs	Fall 2013	15-20		2	↑		VPAA
Number of UWG students participating in educational partnership activities	Annually						chairs, directors, deans

IPEDS Data Point?	Annual Analysis Period	2020 Goal	Goal	Actual	Directional Change from Prior Analysis Period	Definition	Source
Number of co-curricular events open to public	Annually						SAEM, UCM
Number of attendees or participants at co-curricular events	Annually					number of attendees would be categorized - students, faculty/staff, community members. For events with tickets, the ticketing system would be the source of the data. For other events, card swipes could be used. Other methods may be used as well (sign-in sheets, etc.). Taskstream used here?	SAEM, UCM
Total Employee and Student Volunteer Hours	2014-2015	75,000 total hours				SAEM has new software that will be able to track this metric	Annual Report
SI 3: Goal C: Expand Community Awareness, Visibility, and Support of University Activities and Mutually Beneficial Partnerships (n=4)							
Marketing, Community Awareness, and Penetration	ongoing tracking					Comprehensive survey results concerning partnerships and community, alumni and market perceptions. Content analysis of number of news articles/news stories with quality indicator (positive or negative)	Advancement
Fair Market Value of Endowment	FY 2013			\$21,976,974			Advancement
Total Annual Contributions to Foundation							Advancement
Annual Alumni Giving Percentage							Advancement
SI 4: Goal A: Create a Workplace of Choice Distinguished by Talented, Engaged, and Diverse Employees (n=5)							
Staff Salary Equity	2014-2015					Monitor progress toward achieving goal.	VPBF
Staff Engagement in Professional Development	2013-2014				N/A	Staff successfully completing training, utilizing TAP, attending conferences, degree acquisition.	Annual Report
Staff Engagement Levels						Increase engagement of staff, Engage West Survey	VPBF
Turnover rate of staff						Disaggregated by staff types and by unit. IPEDS variable "FTE Staff by occupational category, 2012-2013 (New HR categories based on SOC 2010)"	IEA
Rate of FTE students to FTE staff	2013-2014						
SI 4: Goal B: Create a Built Environment That is Sustainable and Relevant (n=7)							
Facility Condition Index	2013-2014					Industry standard index that provides an assessment of the condition of every building on UWG campus.	VPBF
% of classrooms with wi-fi	2013-2014			20%		Measured by ITS annually	ITS
Space Utilization	2013-2014	5-7		0.48		Standardized metrics. Will use both the USC model and the FCM model. (http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/fcm/)	VPBF
Energy Density per FTE	2013-2014					Includes BTUs and water per FTE	VPBF
Waste Diversion	2013-2014					% of solid waste diverted to recycling	VPBF
UWG Carbon Footprint	2014-2015					Measurement of university's carbon footprint. Assessed annually	Sustainability Committee
Staffing vs. Service Levels	2013-2014					APPA measure. Standard metric indicating appropriate levels of staffing.	VPBF
SI 4: Goal C: Foster a Culture of Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (n=2)							
Assess the Assessment Process in order to cultivate and sustain a culture of assessment and continuous improvement	2014-2015	100% meets expectations or higher	80% meets expectations or higher	N/A	N/A	Assess all assessment plans and assessment results via standardized institutional effectiveness rubrics	IEA
Percentage of KPIs met	annually					Track institutional progress annually by way of percentage of on KPI goals met.	IEA
SI 4: Goal D: Ensure that Future Generation of Students will Have Access To the Best That UWG Has To Offer (n=2)							
Princeton Review's Green Colleges/AASHE Star Program	2014-2015	Establish baseline	One star above current ranking	N/A	N/A	Track institutional progress toward increasing score in Princeton Review and then transfer over to UWG Stars ranking by the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE).	Sustainability Committee and B&F
Percentage of money swept from budgeted units at end of FY	2013-2014	As close to zero as possible				The closer this amount is to zero, the more effective planning and budgeting will be.	VPBF

Staff Advisory Council

September 10, 2014

Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment

Dr. Cathi Jenks, Associate Vice President

Barriers Team

Dr. Denise Overfield, Chair

How were staff assigned a rep?

- In May 2014, a list of all active benefitted staff was pulled in Human Resources.
- The SAC Chair divided the staff up and assigned representatives by division and department.
- Representative home departments as well as departments they work closely with or are located near were considered in this process.
- Per the bylaws, representatives should have 1 – 30 staff to represent (some have a few more to avoid splitting a department).

How do I represent staff?

- Reach out to the staff you represent – via email, phone, departmental meetings, etc.
 - Make sure they are aware you are their representative and are open to receive their questions, comments and concerns.
 - Refer them to the SAC website for meeting notes, announcements and a place to submit anonymous feedback.
- Bring the voice/concerns of the staff with you to each SAC meeting.

SAC Committees

Benefits

Bylaws

Elections (won't be needed until spring 2016)

Public Relations

Staff Development

Ad Hoc (as needed)

Questions? Concerns? Rumors?