

**PROGRAM REVIEW
Of 1999-2000
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
Submitted September, 2000**

PART I – DELIVERY OF CURRENT SERVICES

A: MISSION

The mission of the Office of Institutional Research is to provide verifiable data and information to improve the quality of decision-making at USCA. In addition, the Office seeks to disseminate accurate information about USCA to both on-and off-campus entities and to provide data services to the University, the community and to the State. To this end, the Office conducts surveys, provides data and assistance, offers a variety of on-line services, and undertakes studies for the university and its constituents.

B: OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH GOALS

Specific Goals for the Office of Institutional Research are:

1. To provide studies and reports, both routine and special, to on- and off-campus units/constituents to assist with their efficiency and knowledge about USCA students, faculty, staff and constituents. (Linked to USCA Goal 2, Strategy B)
2. To provide accurate and timely performance funding information and data to the S.C. Commission on Higher Education, to on-campus and off-campus constituents as appropriate. (Linked to USCA Goal 3)
3. To serve on committee's both on- and off-campus to further the visibility and use of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, and to act as a resource for the institution. (Linked to USCA Goals 2,4)
4. To conduct, process, analyze, report and disseminate information from scannable and electronic surveys, or non-survey methods used at USCA in a timely, user-friendly fashion. (Linked to USCA Goal 1, Strategy C)
5. To respond to requests for information from outside agencies, e.g., CHE, SACS, IPEDS, USC Columbia, etc. with timely and accurate data, as well as to review such data for accuracy when prepared by others. (Linked to USCA Goal 3)
6. To provide training in order for others to be able to use USCA data more effectively in their own areas.
7. To seek, secure and support grant efforts for the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and for USCA. (Linked to USCA Goal 5, Strategies A,D)

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN 1999-00

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment is particularly proud of its accomplishments for the 1999-2000 year that are related to its personnel as well as to its activities. The Office received the Chancellor's Entrepreneurial Award for 1999-2000 for its work in electronic surveys. The Office continued with its efficiency measures in 99-00 and most surveys are now in either Bubble Scannable formats or Web-Based Format and those survey services are offered now at large throughout the campus by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. This will allow other offices that use their own surveys to become more efficient and cost effective. Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong completed her 2nd year as head of the Office, and continued as Assistant Director of the Statewide FIPSE Grant to assess the effect of performance funding on the

institutions and as the Local Researcher for the Pew Healthy Communities Grant for the City of Aiken. Ms. Jodi Herrin won the Classified Employee of the Year Award, and completed several special studies for upper administration including faculty equity, release time, and national and institutional retention studies. Ms. Maureen Bergstrom served as President of the Classified Employees Assembly and took on a more enhanced role in Assessment by representing USCA at the national American Association of Higher Education Assessment Conference and by implementing the testing for the new General Education Assessment Exam (the CAAP) as well as coordinating testing for the Biology and Psychology departments and the School of Business who use Major Field Test Examinations. The Office replaced Ms. Lisa Peterson with Mr. Myles Black as a Statistical and Research Analyst II. Myles completed a contract with the CSRA – Education and Training Center, continued to support USCA RATE Grant’s Evaluation activities as well as to head up all on-campus Web Based Surveys from the Office. The office operated at full staff for the first time in over a year.

Additionally, the Office provided many of the reports required for AACSB, NCATE and SACS accreditation efforts and is continuing in this effort. Lastly, the Office has devoted a great deal of time to electronic access of reports, surveys, and documents by uploading all public releases of the office onto the Institutional Research and Assessment Homepage. **The total number of “Web hits” to the Office of Research and Assessment server for this program review period was 79,501 with a high in April of 13,358 (see attached chart). Approximately 63% of those were from “outside the institution” and 37% of those were from within USCA. Efforts will be made in 2000-01 to increase the usage from on-campus constituents through the Assessment Newsletter and “Did You Know” Email releases.**

Following is a listing of the objectives outlined as "Future Objectives" cited in last year’s Program Review and a report on their status. *Objectives are marked as Achieved, Ongoing, or Discontinued as appropriate to the planning process of this office.* **For ease of tracking and to cite the use of assessment it has been incorporated into this section of the report.**

REVIEW OF THE 1999-2000 INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES, OUTCOMES AND ADJUSTMENTS MADE TO PROGRAM STATUS OF OBJECTIVE ACHIEVEMENT: Annotated as Ongoing, Achieved or Not Achieved

Obj.1: Assist the university in having a satisfactory SACS visit (Supports USCA Goal 1- Support Strategies A,C,G; Linked to Assm. Goals 1-6; IR Goals 1-7,) Ongoing

Activities to reach Objective 1 :

- *Two staff members of the Office currently serve on the SACS Steering Committee.*
- *Over 512 document, reports, charts, data requests, or surveys directly connected with SACS study were generated by this Office in 1999-2000*

Assessment:

Assessment Method #1: Two office members serving on SACS Steering Committee which consists of only 14 members in the University.

Assessment Method #2: Data and report requests have been filled within 30 days for SACS Library. Those SACS Committee members who had to wait longer than this were given detailed written email explanations as to why there was a delay.

Use of Outcomes: Continued support to the institution. In response to a SACS suggestion, an outside entity has been hired to evaluate this office in October 2000. A subsequent goal will be to use the recommendations of the report to evaluate the efficiency of this Office.

Obj. 2: Continue to maintain the current workload in a timely manner. (Supports USCA Goal 2- Strategy G; Linked to Assm Goals 1-6; IR Goals 1-5). Ongoing.

Activities to reach Objective 2:

- *Reports are generally completed within the three-week turnaround window; however, some large reports still take several months from start to finish to complete because of high office workload. After SACS is finished, this will be our next area to target.*
- *Finished all past reports: It was not until September 2000 that this Office for the first time since Dr. Hayes left in 1997, got caught up on ALL institutional reports that were backlogged during that period.*
- *Provided timely and accurate data to assist in successful AACSB Accreditation for the School of Business Administration.*
- *The Office continues to assist the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs in producing faculty salary reports, terminal degree information, credit hour production reports, advising reports and other reports on request.*
- *The IR Office submitted accurate and timely data which reflected the work of the institution and supported USCA's Performance Funding "Exceeds" Rating; the 2nd Place ranking in U.S. News & World Report for regional public liberal arts colleges in the South; and produced non-fined IPEDS reports to the Federal Government.*
- *Generated simplified reports for use as highly usable information for others to use. Generally this is by reformatting reports and grouping 10 strengths and 10 weaknesses in the report. This combined with the use of charts and graphs produce more easier to read reports.*
- *Reports are now issued on the web for easy accessibility approximately two weeks after public written release.*

Assessment:

Assessment Method #1: Faculty Survey: USCA faculty who responded to the 1999 Faculty Survey rated the Office with a 69.4% satisfaction rate in effectiveness of response time. Ideally, the Office would like to reach a 90% rating in this area. In addition, 62.1% of the respondents were satisfied with the quality of service provided (n=36). The IR/A staff received a satisfaction rating of 72.2%
Assessment Method #2: User Survey sent to each IR/A user with each job finished, only 23 surveys returned for the year all recorded satisfaction. Two dissatisfied respondents were personally contacted by the Director.

Use of Outcomes: 1) Maintain turn around time to three-weeks for normal requests. Continue to explore a "que" line approach with electronic request forms. 2) Continue to monitor faculty survey for satisfaction trend to strengthen relationship with faculty and assure no downward trend. 3) Any further change in survey layouts will be delayed until sufficient feedback is gathered through assessment.

Obj. 3. Increase the use of on-line services and visibility of the Office throughout the campus (Supports USCA Goal 4; Linked to Assm. Goal 1,2,5; IR Goal 4) Achieved and Ongoing

Activities to reach Objective 3:

- *All public reports are now uploaded to the WEB within 2 weeks of paper release.*
- *Continued to monitor Web use in "hits" to server*
- *Upgraded the MakeSurvey Program to make it more user-friendly*

Assessment:

Assessment method #1: Tracking Use. The use of electronic surveys continue to rise with more than a total of 1025 persons responding to a Web survey that the Office administered this past year.

Assessment method #2: Tracking Use. The total number of "Web hits" to the Office of Research and Assessment server was 79,501 for 1999-2000 with a high in April of 13,358 (see attached chart). Approximately 63% of those were from "outside the institution" and 37% of those were from within USCA.

Use of Outcomes:

Strengthen use of web based documents, surveys and access and increase on-line functions.

Obj. 4. Educate more faculty and staff regarding their role in performance funding. (Supports USCA Goal 3; Linked to IR Goal 2) Achieving and Ongoing**Activities to reach Objective 4:**

- *No less than two presentations per year to Academic Council*
- *At least every two months (and more when necessary) updates to Dr. Hallman and Dr. Premo-Hopkins*

Assessment:

Assessment Method #1: Track the number of respondents to FISPE surveys from USCA

Assessment Method #2: The 1999 Faculty Survey indicated that about one-half of respondents were satisfied with the assistance received and 81.8% were satisfied with the information provided about performance funding.)

Assessment Method #3: 360 degree evaluation

Assessment Method #4: Outside review feedback

Use of Outcomes:

Continue to strengthen USCA involvement in Performance Funding.

Obj. 5 Increase the visibility of the quality of USCA outside of the campus. (Supports USCA Goal 3; Linked to Assm. Goal, IR Goal 2,7) Achieving and Ongoing.**Activities to reach Objective 5:****A. Providing leadership in performance funding**

- *In the statewide conversations regarding Performance Funding the USCA IR Office created and maintains a Sector LISTSERV so that information can be shared and discussed immediately by all nine teaching colleges. This listserv is heavily used.*
- *Dr. Ulmer-Sottong continues to serve as a leading member of the Sector Committee, and she continues to serve on the Statewide Executive Board for FIPSE as one of three executive members and as Assistant Director to the FIPSE Grant representing USCA and SC. She presented at four conferences in 1999-2000 regarding performance funding.*
- *The IR Office submitted accurate and timely data which reflected the work of the institution and supported USCA's Performance Funding "Exceeds" Rating; the 2nd Place ranking in U.S. News & World Report for regional public liberal arts colleges in the South; and produced non-fined IPEDS reports to the Federal Government.*

B. Maintain outside "grants" to assist the State and the CSRA.

- *Contract completed satisfactorily in 1999 for CSRA Education to Career Transitions.*
- *Contract for Pew: Healthy Communities*
 - *Successful SWOT Analysis and successful interim report*
 - *Represented Aiken in 2 National Pew Meetings with 18 other national researchers*
- *Contract renewed for FIPSE Performance Funding Grant,*
 - *Successful interim report submitted to Washington, DC.*

- Two successful surveys (1 state & 1 national) administered to all SC administrators and department chairs
- Conference planner and co-host for 2000 FISPE Conference
- Continued research support for FISPE grant
- Four presentations of performance funding at national, regional, and state conferences

Assessment:

Assessment Method #1: 360 degree evaluation
 Assessment Method #2: User evaluation
 Assessment Method #3: Comments from grantor on quality of projects

Use of Outcomes: Maintain satisfactory relationship with CHE and improve performance funding by appropriate input.

Obj. 6. Continue a program of staff development and training (Linked to Assm. Goal 5; IR Goal 4) Achieving and Ongoing.

Activity to reach Objective 6:

- Statistical analysts attended 12 professional development workshops (on and off-campus), most related to federal and state reporting protocols.
- Administrative assistant attended 1 national conference and 1 - 10 hour web-based training workshop.
- The Director attended 4 development workshops, 3 on campus and 1 off-campus.

Assessment:

Assessment Method #1: 360 degree evaluation
 Assessment Method #2: Periodic staff meetings

Use of Outcomes:

Maintain high quality and satisfied staff

C. 1999- 00 STAFFING

The demands placed on the institutional research function have dramatically increased over the past several years particularly with the implementation of performance funding in South Carolina. In addition, there is continued demands on campus which are not being met in the area of assessment. For example, monthly meetings on a rotational basis should be instituted with chairs to assist them with their ongoing assessment activities, currently there is no time for this type of supportive activity.

NUMBER AND TYPE OF STAFF SUPPORT

****WORKLOAD HEADCOUNT (FTE)**

	<u>1995</u>	<u>1995-96</u>	<u>1996-97</u>	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>	<u>1999-00</u>
Full-time	3 (2.0)	3 (2.0)	3 (2.0)	4 (3.0)	4(3.0)	4(2.0) lus counted also on Assm. side see note
Part-time Temporary (FIPSE grant funds)	0	0	0	1 (.5)	1(.5)	1(.25) contracted services
FWS Student	1 (.0626)	1 (.0626)	1 (.0626)	1 (.06)	0	0
ISE Student	-----	-----	1(.0626)	1 (.06)	1(.5)	1(.5)
TOTAL	4 (2.06)	4 (2.06)	4(2.06)	6 (3.62)	6(3.5)	6(3.75)

**This chart reflects workload not budget. Currently the Director of IR/Assm. and 1 FWS student are being paid from Assm. funds. All other employees are being paid from IR funds.

D. OFFICE ACTIVITY/TRANSACTIONS: TOTAL TRANSACTIONS FY 1999-2000

Although it is important for both Institutional Research and Assessment to track the production for each area, it is just as important to reflect the "total load" for the Office itself, thereby giving the reader an idea of the **total production** of both functions of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Total production of the three professional staff members is reflected below (Detailed breakdown available on Appendix A).

PRODUCTION BREAKDOWN

1. The breakdown of special requests from USCA Departments is: Admissions 31%; Business 6%; Records 11%; Education 5%; Student Org. 5%; Public Relations 7%.
2. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment generated approximately 9,997 separate total activities during the 1998-99 year.

WORK TRANSACTIONS

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>AY</u> <u>1995</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1995-96</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1996-97</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1997-98</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1998-</u> <u>1999</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1999-</u> <u>2000</u>
SURVEYS (Distrib & Processed)						
Total Survey Load.....IR	3753	1697	3222	6549	6062	6586
Total Survey Load.....Assm.	375	482	322	522	389	363
Total Load.....Combined	4128	2179	3544	7071	6451	6949
TESTS/ TRANSCRIPTS/ REPORTS						
Total Load.....IR	367	370	1171	1631	1112	723
Total Load.....Assm.	917	1084	950	940	1404	1479
Total LoadCombined	1284	1454	2121	2571	2516	2202
REQUESTS/CONSULTATIONS/ PRESENTATIONS						
Total Load.....IR	149	484	522	308	329	774
Total Load.....Assm.	44	59	59	25	92	72
Total Load.....Combined	193	543	581	333	421	846
NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT IN MEETINGS/WORKSHOPS						
Total Hours.....IR	209	423	1016	724 est.	653.5	813
Total Hours.....Assm.	155	149	166	300 est.	260.5	315
Total Hours.....Combined	364	572	1182	1024 est.	914	1128
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH OFFICE AS EVIDENCED BY SURVEY OF FACULTY AND/OR STAFF						
	<u>AY</u> 1994	<u>FY</u> 1997-98	<u>FY</u> 1999-2000			
	CLASSIFIED	CLASSIFIED	CLASSIFIED			
	50% Satisfied	72% Satisfied	unknown			
	48% did not know	29% did not know	until spring 2001			
	FACULTY	FACULTY	FACULTY			
	57% Satisfied	51% Satisfied	62.1% Satisfied			
	25% did not know	38% did not know	33% did not know			

FUTURE PLANS

This office intends to strengthen even further the six objectives outlined above. Given the enormous changes instituted by this office in areas of administrative efficiency, Web based services, grant involvement, streamline reporting production, etc. and until this office goes through both the SACS review and the "outside" peer review in late October, the Director does not believe it to be good assessment practice to initiate any new objectives for this office at this time.

PART III: IDENTIFIED NEEDS TO MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN SIX OBJECTIVES

IR Need: Web support

Although this is not intended to be specific to this office, with the increasing need for a full-time Webmaster on this campus we would like to request that this need be recognized and funded as soon as possible in some office on campus. With almost 80,000 "hits" to the IR/A Server alone with over 60% of them coming from outside campus, it is vital that USCA supports an overall Web design and upkeep for this institution. Expertise and support is needed in this area to maintain in a overall fashion all web-based home pages/institutional information pages to monitor time sensitive matter and assist with overall design issues. \$1500.

Assessment Program Review includes the below stated Need:

The office requests one quarter-time faculty member (released time) assigned to assist with assessment. This would allow the current focus on assessment to be maintained and to regain strength lost as data demands placed in IR continue to grow. Regardless of whether SACS is finished, cycles of accreditation of professional schools, CHE program reviews, ratings and rankings for national publications, and performance funding will continue to place increased data demands on this office which far outstrip its capacity to increase assessment support to the departments. \$1500.

PART III - STATISTICAL DATA

APPENDIX A: Chart 1- Surveys

**COMPLETE BREAKDOWN OF SURVEYS, DISTRIBUTED AND PROCESSED,
RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT**

SURVEYS	<u>AY</u> <u>1995</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1995-96</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1996-97</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1997-98</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1998-99</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1999-2000</u>
# of surveys distributed(D)/processed(P) for on-campus needs	2075D/ 1678P	661D/ 1036P	1939D/ 1283P	4472D/ 2077P	*2295D/ 3767P	2771D/ 3815P
Total activities for IR	3753	1697	3222	6549	6062	6586
Academic Department Interviews and Surveys Required Under Academic Assessment:						
# of surveys/interviews conducted/analyzed with seniors for departments/schools	235	175	150	162	389	363
Total activities for assessment	375	482	322	522	389	363
Grand Total Survey Load Distributed and Processed for Office	4128	2179	3544	7071	6451	6949

*Some surveys distributed by other offices but processed by IR & Assessment (Advisement, Library, etc.)

APPENDIX A: Chart 2 –Tests and Reports

COMPLETE BREAKDOWN OF TESTS, TRANSCRIPTS ANALYZED, AND REPORTS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT

TESTS ADMINISTERED TRANSCRIPTS ANALYZED REPORTS PREPARED	<u>AY 1995</u>	<u>FY 1995-96</u>	<u>FY 1996-97</u>	<u>FY 1997-98</u>	<u>FY 1998-99</u>	<u>FY 1999-2000</u>
# Tests given (General Education and Major Field Tests)	855	884	751	744	1148	1273
# Reports generated for internal use	19	34	31	24	25	23
Written reports prepared (counted in assessment)	43	166	168	172	200(individual faculty reports – advising/teaching/ exit surveys)	174 (advising survey reports, paper and on-line reports)
On-Line Assessment Surveys					31	9
Total activities for Assessment	917	1084	950	940	1404	1479

# Transcripts analyzed	360	360	1139	1431	300	22
On-Campus Reports					135	30*
# Off-campus data reports received for review and verification (all data points per page checked, counted as one report)	7	10	32	200	600 PF/Columbia/ CHEMIS/Feds/ other	425
On-Line IR Reports/Info					77	246
Total activities for IR	367	370	1171	1631	1112	723
Grand Total Tests, Transcripts Analyzed, Reports for Office	1284	1454	2121	2571	2516	2202

*have not completed several semesters of grade distributions yet. They are in the process of being completed.

APPENDIX A: Chart 3- Meetings with Faculty, Presentations

**COMPLETE BREAKDOWN OF REQUESTS, CONSULTATIONS, AND PRESENTATIONS
RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT**

REQUESTS/CONSULTATIONS/ PRESENTATIONS	<u>AY</u> <u>1995</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1995-96</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1996-97</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1997-98</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1998-99</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1999-00</u>
# Consultations with departments or faculty on Assm.	39	53	52	20 (3 mo. only)	55 Lovely 15 Jodi 12 Lisa	47 Lovely 15 Jodi 6 Myles
# Presentations/workshops/ attendance at professional Assm conferences	5	6	7	5	12*	1Lovely 1 Jodi 1Myles 1 Maureen
Total activities for Assessment	44	59	59	25	94	72

# Consultations with departments or faculty on IR					10 accreditation - Lovely 25 accrd. Jodi	30 Jodi 12 Myles 20 Lovely
# Presentations/workshops/ attendance at professional conferences IR					12 Lovely 5 Jodi 2Lisa	1 Jodi 2 Myles 14 Lovely
# Requests for information responded to for on-campus data need IR	79	444	467	277	250	636
# Requests for information responded to for off-campus data needs IR	70	40	55	31	35	50
Total presentation/conference/ meeting activities for IR	149	484	522	308	339	774
Grand Total Requests/ Consultations/ Presentations for Office	193	543	581	333	433	846

*Includes 7 faculty members who attended SCHEA conference on Assm. Budget Monies. Office coordinated attendance.

APPENDIX A: Chart 3 Time on Tasks

COMPLETE BREAKDOWN OF NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS SPENT IN MEETINGS/WORKSHOPS

# OF CONTACT HOURS SPENT IN MEETINGS/ WORKSHOPS	<u>AY</u> <u>1995</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1995-96</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1996-97</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1997-98</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1998-99</u>	<u>FY</u> <u>1999-2000</u>
# Hours of interaction with various ON-CAMPUS groups and committees/ testing of students	IR 161 Assm 32	IR 328 Assm 48	IR 215 Assm 63	IR 53 (3 mo) 27.5 Jodi Assm 38 (3 mo)	IR Lovely 280 IR Jodi 40.5 IR Lisa 14 Assm. 65 Lovely 48 Maureen (testing, surveys, assm. co)	IR Lovely 220 IR Jodi 38 IR Myles 10 Assm. 172 Lovely 95 Maureen
# Hours of interaction with various OFF-CAMPUS groups and committees	IR 48 Assm 93	IR 95 Assm 81	IR 791 Assm 73	IR 68 (3 mo) 22.5 Jodi Assm 32 (3 mo)	IR 215 Lovely IR 85 Jodi IR 15 Lisa Assm. 127.5 Lovely	IR Lovely 583 IR Jodi 36 IR Myles 64 Assm. 30 Lovely
# Hours faculty workshops/ dept. meeting presentations provided (plus preparation)	IR ? Assm 30	IR ? Assm 20	IR 10 Assm 30	IR 10 (3 mo) Assm 5	IR 4 Lovely Assm. 20	IR Lovely 10 Assm. 18
Total hours spent in meetings & workshops for IR	209	423	1016	181 (3 mo)	653.5	813
Total Hours Spent in Meetings and Workshops for Assessment	155	149	166	75 (3 mo)	260.5	315
Grand Total hours spent in meetings and workshops	364	572	1182	256 (3 mo)	914	1128

NOTE: Remaining hours spent on generating reports, phone calls, in-office; the above time on tasks only includes meetings and workshops given.

APPENDIX B

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP OF IR/ASSM. STAFF

<i>Dr. Lovely Ulmer-Sottong</i>	<i>South Carolina Institutional Researchers Association AACSB Assessment Planning Committee Rate Committee S.C. National FIPSE Study, Co-Chair of SC Grant Campus Cabinet Enrollment Planning Team Enrollment Services Institutional Planning (ESIP) Institutional Planning Cabinet SACS Steering Committee Data Collection Committee, Chair PEW National Research Team Teaching Sector IR Committee, Chair or Co-chair of mtgs.</i>
<i>Ms. Jodi Herrin</i>	<i>S.C. Institutional Researchers Association SACS - Data Collection Committee</i>
<i>Mr. Myles Black</i>	<i>S.C. FIPSE Study S.C. Institutional Researchers Association RATE Committee S.C. FIPSE Study PEW Local Research Committee</i>
<i>Ms. Maureen Bergstrom</i>	<i>Classified Employees Assembly, Chair Institutional Planning Cabinet SACS Steering Committee Campus Cabinet Chancellor Search Committee</i>