

ANNUAL REPORT

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

**University of North Alabama
Florence, Alabama**

Lorie Johnson

Committee Chair

7/13/26

Date submitted

Submitted to: Dr. Lauren Killen
Chair, Shared Governance Executive Committee

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH ALABAMA

ANNUAL REPORT

2025-2026

I. Executive Summary

As a part of our charge, the UNA Institutional Effectiveness Committee met regularly during the 2025-2026 academic year and reviewed institutional effectiveness processes, conducted a meta-analysis of assessment reports submitted by all academic and non-academic programs, analyzed data collected across all programs and units, and reviewed actions for continuous improvement in the form of program modifications across the institution.

II. The Committee's Charge (from the Shared Governance Document)

1. To recommend and develop procedures for planning and evaluating institutional effectiveness based on university goals, priorities, and the Strategic Plan
2. To review and evaluate the use of assessment by institutional units and recommend improvement in the assessment process where necessary
3. To review and evaluate the effectiveness of the institution's responses to assessment and evaluation in the form of budgetary or programmatic modifications
4. To review and evaluate the use of benchmarking by individual units for purposes of continual improvement of programs and/or services
5. To communicate activities to the university community
6. To handle any proposals the committee may make affecting university policy according to section C.2 "Shared Governance Procedure for Policy Change Recommendations"
7. To submit a final written report electronically by the first day of the fall semester to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs with a copy sent to the Chair of the SGEC

III. The Committee met on the following dates:

8/27/25; 10/30/25; 1/23/26; 1/30/26; 2/13/26; 3/2/26; 4/20/26

IV. What were the Committee's actions and accomplishments this year relative to each of the items of the charge?

1. **To recommend and develop procedures for planning and evaluating institutional effectiveness based on university goals, priorities, and the Strategic Plan:** The Committee ensured that going forward all annual plans will align with the UNA strategic plan and any related goals. This alignment has been added to Watermark Planning and Self-Study. The Committee updated the Institutional Effectiveness Handbook to reflect current practice in assessment and institutional effectiveness policy.
2. **To review and evaluate the use of assessment by institutional units and recommend improvement in the assessment process where necessary:** The Committee conducted a meta-analysis of all academic and non-academic program annual assessment reports.
3. **To review and evaluate the effectiveness of the institution's responses to assessment and evaluation in the form of budgetary or programmatic modifications:** The Committee provided feedback to programs on programmatic modifications designed in response to data analysis. The Committee did not review or make recommendations related to budgets.
4. **To review and evaluate the use of benchmarking by individual units for purposes of continual improvement of programs and/or services:** The Committee offered feedback to programs through the meta-analysis results.
5. **To communicate activities to the university community:** The meta-assessment results were shared with COAD and individual departments. Assessment requirements and guidelines and supportive resources were shared with each unit, department, etc.
6. **To handle any proposals the committee may make affecting university policy according to section C.2 "Shared Governance Procedure for Policy Change Recommendations":** The Committee offered feedback as requested on the structure of the committee.
7. **To submit a final written report electronically by the first day of the fall semester to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs with a copy sent to the Chair of the SGEC:** Submitted 7/13/26

V. What were the Committee's formal recommendations?

The Committee made recommendations to programs and units regarding assessment quality and data-driven continuous improvement plans. The Committee updated the Institutional Effectiveness Handbook to reflect current practice in assessment and institutional effectiveness policy.

VI. What does the Committee plan to accomplish?

A. In the coming year?

The Committee charge needs to be revisited. The work of this committee does not reflect its actual charge. The Committee should either restructure and address the current charge or the charge should be adjusted to reflect the practice of this committee. From a SACSCOC perspective, this committee should fulfil its stated charge and document its ongoing and regular review and oversight of university goals, priorities and the strategic plan, etc. This will be important evidence to submit in the next Decennial Review.

B. In future years?

See above.

VII. What are the Committee's weaknesses?

The primary role of this committee had evolved into that of conducting a meta-analysis of program assessment reports. Some of the committee members do not have an assessment background and have never written an assessment report, making the meta-analysis challenging for some. Perhaps an Assessment Committee could be created to do this work, and the Institutional Effectiveness Committee can focus on its stated charge.

A. What can the Shared Governance Committee help you do to address the weaknesses?

VIII. Comments