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1. ABSTRACT

The three independently accredited institutions under the Troy State University (TSU) System propose a merger into one institution to be effective August 1, 2005. This action will mark the culmination of over four years of dialogue and direction provided by the TSU Board of Trustees to enable the system to better serve students in Alabama, the nation, and the world. The rationale for this decision and the impacts on the participating institutions are described in this document.

On April 23, 2004, Dr. Jack Hawkins, Jr., Chancellor of the Troy State University System, officially notified Dr. James Rogers, Executive Director of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, that the Troy State University campuses were ready to proceed with final plans for the merger. Dr. Cameron Martindale, Senior Vice Chancellor for Advancement and President of Troy State University Montgomery, and Dr. Barbara Alford, President of Troy State University Dothan, joined in this communication. (See letters to Dr. Rogers, Appendix A-1.) Dr. Rogers’ response dated May 11, 2004, outlined the requirements for requesting a substantive change and set a deadline of September 22, 2004, for receipt of the Prospectus by the Commission. (See letter from Dr. Rogers, Appendix A-2.) On April 9, 2003, Troy State University obtained approval to proceed with merger planning from the Alabama courts monitoring the Knight v. Alabama consent and remedial decrees. (See Court Order, Appendix A-3.) University administrators also have met with officials of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE) and are on-track to obtain ACHE approval for the merger following the review by the Commission on Colleges.

A multi-campus team of professionals met with members of the Commission on Colleges staff on July 22, 2004, to review the proposed outline for the Prospectus. In accordance with Procedure Three, Appendix B, of Substantive Change For Accredited Institutions of the Commission on Colleges, this Prospectus is submitted for Commission review and consideration.

The merged institution (to be named Troy University) will enroll over 24,000 students worldwide. Campuses will include the traditional main campus in Troy, Alabama, with a residential student population, campuses in Dothan, Montgomery, and Phenix City, Alabama, focusing primarily (but not solely) on non-traditional, adult markets, and fifty-eight (58) University College sites serving national and international adult learners. While retaining the flexibility required to meet the needs of these diverse student populations, the merger will insure uniform quality in programs and services to all Troy University students, regardless of base campus location or instructional delivery method. The merger also will dramatically increase accessibility and portability of higher education for Troy University students around the world. The merged institutions will define a new model of higher education for the 21st century.
Provide a clear statement of the nature and purpose of the change in the context of the institutions’ mission and goals.

Troy State University (TSU) traces its origin to the Troy State Normal School established on February 26, 1887, by an act of the Alabama Legislature. In 1929, it became Troy State Teachers College, and the college granted its first baccalaureate degree in 1931.

Continued growth in the college’s programs prompted the Alabama Legislature to change the name to Troy State College in 1957. In the same year, the State Board of Education authorized the master’s degree program. On December 14, 1967, the college’s name was changed once more to Troy State University. Since that time, Troy State University has established a branch campus at Phenix City, Alabama, and has developed an international presence through University College—initiated to serve the higher education needs of American military personnel and their families around the globe.

Also in the 1960’s, Troy State University responded to the needs of people in southeast Alabama by establishing degree completion centers at Fort Rucker (west of Dothan) and at Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base in Montgomery. Both centers became degree granting locations in 1966. As the student service missions of these branches became more clearly defined, the Troy State Board of Trustees authorized both sites to seek independent regional accreditation, and both were successful—Troy State University Montgomery in 1983, and Troy State University Dothan in 1985. Since that time, all three entities (Troy, Montgomery,
and Dothan) have been separately accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to award associates, bachelor's, master's, and education specialist degrees.

The confederation of three independent campuses was a logical configuration in the 1980's. State financial support of higher education in Alabama was over 90% of the regional average, and the absence of distance learning created environments where community universities were not only commonplace but were preferred. This situation began to change as economic conditions, politics, and the advent of technologically-delivered instruction altered the expectations of students and of taxpayers.

During this period, the three separately accredited institutions continued to share one authorizing structure and upper-level administration. The Troy State System, all campuses and locations, has always been under the direction of one Board of Trustees which retained ultimate authority for policies in Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery. Through the Board, most of the administrative responsibilities are and always have been delegated to the Chancellor, who in turn has delegated authority to the Presidents at Dothan and Montgomery. Fundraising has been directed by one TSU Foundation Board, with individual accounts (for Dothan and Montgomery initiatives) made available under one foundation umbrella. Capital campaigns included the active involvement of each campus chief executive officer, but were always managed as joint operations with shared goals and costs. In addition, certain functions for all three institutions (i.e. administrative computing, payroll) have always been centralized, and others (i.e.
financial aid) have been highly coordinated to serve the needs of mobile students. The three institutions, though now separately accredited, were only fifty miles apart, and the common name of “Troy State University” fostered a reasonable expectation in Alabama students of some parallelism in policies and procedures.

In the 1980’s each institution developed its own mission statement, approved by the single Board of Trustees. These statements were revisited regularly, assessed during self-studies and at other times between reaffirmations, and reviewed by SACS Visiting Teams. In the mid-1990’s, the campuses were still operating under the philosophy of a system of complementary parts. The campus in Troy was the traditional, residential institution. Montgomery was (by court decree) an evening institution focusing on working adult students. Dothan was a day and evening commuter institution also focused primarily on adults. However, by the late 1990’s, the increasing popularity of distance learning, coupled with an intensifying competition for college students in general and the drastic reduction in state support of higher education, brought a new set of expectations to the Troy State System. As detailed in the next section of this Prospectus, it was no longer acceptable to maintain three separately accredited institutions, operating independently with different programs, policies, procedures, and marketing strategies, all within the same 100-mile corridor of southeast Alabama. In February, 2000, the Board of Trustees instructed the Chancellor to begin bringing all campuses together.
Although much work was necessary to accomplish this goal, two critical components of an institution are its brand identity and its mission. A systemwide management team for advancement began a two-year process to identify the multiple images that applied to Troy State University. (Although the process is too lengthy to detail in this Prospectus, all documents relating to this endeavor will be made available to the Visiting Team in Fall 2005.) Through comprehensive surveys of various internal and external constituencies, the management team was able to discover the positive attributes associated with the University. Unfortunately, the team also determined that there was a lack of consistency in philosophy and image from one TSU location to another. Their work led to a list of recommendations to develop a brand identity for the University. This, in turn, led to a relationship and contract with STAMATS, a nationally renowned higher-education marketing firm, to assist the University in solidifying its image. As part of this endeavor, the Chancellor asked the consultants to study the name of “Troy State University” to determine if it was appropriate to the emerging institution. The conclusion by STAMATS was revealing, yet not surprising to many in leadership at Troy State University. The University had rapidly become a major participant in delivery of quality higher education around the world. It also was continuing its leadership in distance learning within the state and now (with Internet capabilities) nationwide and worldwide. The University also continued to strengthen its core programs and to experience rapid, sustained enrollment increases within the state of Alabama. STAMATS determined that universities whose names contained the word “state”
but did not also include the name of the state in which they were located were often viewed as regional institutions—an identity that no longer matched the vision of Troy State University. Their recommendation that the institution change its name to Troy University was discussed and tested with various internal and external constituent groups and was met with overwhelming support. On April 16, 2004, the Board of Trustees officially changed the name of the institution to Troy University. (See Board Resolution, Appendix A-4.) The change was effective immediately, with recognition that legal and regulatory steps would need to be taken to make the change official for some functions (i.e. federal financial aid, contracts). All changes would be completed no later than August 1, 2005. A thorough, institution-wide marketing plan also has been developed and is being implemented to promote the consistency of name, brand, and promise that is now and will be “Troy University”. This plan and the documents that support and advance the initiatives will be available to the Visiting Team.

As the brand identity was being forged, the Executive Vice Chancellor, Dr. Ed Roach, led a parallel effort to develop a single statement of philosophy applicable to the university as a whole. The process began with system leadership reviewing the missions of the three independent institutions to determine areas of commonality and to identify statements that might no longer be consistent with the emerging, single institution. A first edition of the combined statements was reviewed and discussed by the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and a drafted mission statement was then distributed throughout the institutions, primarily through electronic means, to all faculty, staff, students, alumni, and
members of the Board of Trustees. Response to the new statement was favorable. Suggestions were received and compiled by the Executive Vice Chancellor, who worked with the Senior Vice Chancellors to incorporate these as appropriate. On April 6, 2004, the Chancellor’s Cabinet voted approval of the new Troy University Mission Statement. (Documentation of the full process along with minutes of the April 6th meeting will be available for the Visiting Team.) On April 16th, the Board of Trustees received a review of the rationale for the change and an overview of the process undertaken to create the new statement from Executive Vice President Roach. The Board approved the new statement (see Board Resolution, Appendix A-5) which reads:

"Troy University is a public institution comprised of campuses throughout Alabama and worldwide. International in scope, Troy University provides a variety of educational programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels for a diverse student body in traditional and nontraditional and emerging electronic formats. Academic programs are supported by a variety of student services, which promote the welfare of the individual student. Troy University’s dedicated faculty and staff promote discovery and exploration of knowledge dedicated to life-long success through effective teaching, creative partnerships, scholarship and research."

(Approved by the Board of Trustees April 16, 2004. The mission will be reviewed every five years.)

The statement was widely distributed through University websites (which will be consolidated into a single web presence by August 2005), and the statement will appear in graduate and undergraduate Bulletins (catalogs) scheduled to be printed in January 2005.
Evidence of the legal authority for the change.

Troy State University (now Troy University) at all of its campuses and throughout all of its history has been governed by a single Board of Trustees. The institution was officially established by The Code of Alabama 1975, Title 16-56-3, and the Board of Trustees was given governing authority under that same legislation.

The University Board of Trustees is presently comprised of twelve voting members. Nine members represent specific geographic districts within the state and one member is appointed at-large. The Governor of the State of Alabama serves as president of the Board in an ex-officio capacity. The State Superintendent of Education also serves in as a member by virtue of his position as leader of the public elementary and secondary schools within the state. A student representative, the presiding president of the Student Government Association, also participates as a non-voting member. The members, and the expiration dates for their terms, are listed, below:

His Excellency, Bob Riley, Governor of the State of Alabama  
Dr. Joseph B. Morton, State Superintendent of Education  
Senator Gerald O. Dial 2003  
Mr. John D. Harrison 2007  
Mr. Allen Tucker 2003  
Mr. Allen E. Owen, III 2011  
Mr. Milton McGregor 2011  
Dr. James R. Andrews 2007  
Mr. Roy Henry Drinkard 2011  
Mr. Lamar P. Higgins 2007  
Mr. C. Charles Nailen 2009
The composition and authority of the Board of Trustees has been reviewed during self-studies and by peer review teams for regional accreditation and reaffirmations for Troy University as recently as 2003 (and for the Dothan and Montgomery campuses during their most recent reaffirmations, 2000 and 1999 respectively) and have been found to be in compliance with expectations of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

**Whether the proposed degree program or similar program is offered on the main campus or at other off-campus sites.**

This particular statement in Appendix B of the *Substantive Change* document is not directly relevant to institutional mergers. However, Troy University wishes to summarize the approach that is being taken to determine program distribution. The merged Troy University will have one set of programs that may be offered at any of the three campuses, but will not necessarily be offered at all three. All five colleges within the university will have one dean who will be based in Troy, Alabama. All will report to a single Provost, also based in Troy. Decisions regarding which programs are offered where (Troy, Dothan, Montgomery or at any of the sites worldwide) will be determined by the student market in/near each city, the availability of faculty and learning resources, the adequacy of fiscal support, and an assessment of community development requirements. Programs, wherever offered, will contain the same curricula, measure the same outcomes, have the same expectations for faculty
qualifications, and be wholly transferable throughout Troy University locations.

Troy University also will follow Alabama Commission on Higher Education policies on programmatic issues related to merging universities.
3. ASSESSMENT OF NEED AND PROGRAM PLANNING/APPROVAL
(CR 2.5, CS 3.4.1.)

Discuss the rationale for the change, including an assessment of need.

In the 1990's as state resources became more constrained, colleges and universities (in Alabama and nationwide) came under closer scrutiny regarding unnecessary duplication of programs and services. In Alabama, although there was little argument about the need for higher education in cities like Montgomery and Dothan, duplication of the administrative structures managing the various academic and support operations was often criticized.

Students as well as parents, alumni, government and community leaders frequently questioned the negative impacts of separate accreditation on higher education access, matriculation, and cost. One programmatic example within the Troy State System clarifies the problem as it relates to academics. All three institutions within Troy University offered Masters of Business Administration degrees, yet the coursework accepted for each was not transferable among campuses. Students often had to repeat coursework or add new courses to obtain the same degree, from within the same system, at a site only miles away from where they had begun their education. The same was true for other programs offered by the three institutions within the system. This was not the result of intentional differentiation. The underlying philosophies of the faculty who had developed these curricula over periods of years were different, and there had been no attempt to collaborate with colleagues at the sister institutions. Students attending Troy University in Troy during the school year who desired to take a course at Dothan during a summer term were actually considered
transient students, and had to obtain authorization to take the class from the base campus. Students transferring within the three institutions had to reapply for admission to the new site and often found that coursework accepted for the major at one institution was now counted only as elective credit at another Troy campus.

Similar differences existed in student policies for admission, progression, dean's and president's honors, advancement into capstone courses and/or internships, and graduation. Variations in registration procedures and deadlines, drop/add requirements, refunds, and withdrawal dates confused students and often resulted in penalties assessed at one campus that would not have applied at another. And despite the close geographic proximity of the three institutions, tuition was not the same. As institutions were forced to raise their tuitions almost annually and often by double-digit percentages, it was difficult to justify a different tuition being charged for similar courses, at similar levels, with similar course titles at various campuses within the same Troy System. Substantial economic and political pressures were being felt across the Alabama campuses of Troy University.

However, the increasing complaints to the Board of Trustees, the system Chancellor, and to officials on various campuses were not the sole rationale for the decision to merge the three institutions. Increasing popularity of distance learning had forever changed the access to and expectations by students with regard to higher education. Institutions no longer needed to have a physical presence in a state to offer courses to its residents. Although neither Troy
University nor this Prospectus suggests that distance learning is the perfect delivery system for all programs, to all students, at all times, there is little doubt that it has provided student-consumers with a wide variety of educational options. Troy University was already a leader in distance delivery, an established provider of quality educational programs through a variety of instructional modalities, and experienced at designing and delivering services to the adult student market. The Board and the system administration realized it was time to merge these strengths, and the supporting resources and expertise across the system, into an innovative institution responsive to this changed world environment. To quote directly from the University publication, A Case for Alabama's 21st Century University:

“The Twenty-first Century has brought drastic changes that have forced many education institutions to rethink visions and redesign strategies. Changing societal demands, intense competition, advances in technology, and declining trends in the economy and state funding challenge universities the same as business and industry. Those who refuse to risk change will be left behind. That will not be the case for The Troy State University System.” (The full Case document is provided in Appendix A-6.)

In 2000, the Board of Trustees tasked Chancellor Jack Hawkins, Jr., with two primary responsibilities: bring together the various components of the system into a fully-functioning, collaborative whole, and develop a new model of higher education to meet the markets and challenges of the 21st century. (See Board minutes from December 13, 2000, Appendix A-7.)

System personnel from all campuses, both within Alabama and outside the state through University College, began a concerted effort to merge the
system institutions into a new concept in higher education. In Spring 2003, the Board of Trustees requested a comprehensive briefing on the progress of implementing the strategic plan objectives and bringing the universities together. Following that briefing, at the March 1, 2003 meeting, the Board reaffirmed its commitment to one university and emphasized their intent that the merger shall be completed by August 2005. (See Board Resolution, Appendix A-8.)

Evidence of inclusion of the change in the institution's ongoing planning and evaluation processes.

As a first step toward bringing the three institutions closer together, the Chancellor directed the institutions to coordinate their strategic planning processes for the first time since the mid-1980's. Although the three institutions (Troy, Dothan and Montgomery) created and published their own strategic plans for the years 2001-2005, these were all tied to system initiatives developed by cross-campus leadership teams. The primary categories for institutional planning were academics, student services, advancement, and administration—the precursors to the major organizational divisions now in place at the new Troy University. The collaborative planning document, "The Troy State University System: A Unified Strategic Plan 2001-2005" is included in Appendix A-9. This plan clearly articulates the vision of the University for 2005 and Beyond, "To become the model higher education delivery network of the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century."

Eleven strategic initiatives clearly outlined the direction and philosophy, promulgated by the Board of Trustees, which would guide the development of a new, unified institution.
1. Develop and implement a coordinated marketing program to build System identify and strengthen brand awareness.
2. Develop and implement a coordinated system of transferability and articulation across the campuses for undergraduate and graduate academic programs.
3. Create a comprehensive student-centered environment across the TSU System.
4. Create new programs, options, and concentrations.
5. Develop and expand strong continuing education programs.
6. Create an environment in which students and faculty share a commitment to strive for excellence.
7. Establish a process for program and service evaluation to provide continuous system improvement.
8. Develop and implement academic and administrative procedures to ensure effective/efficient student access to educational resources among campuses.
9. Develop and implement standards in the classroom and total campus environment (co-curricular) that foster personal and professional growth and development by enhancing the values of integrity, accountability, responsibility and mutual respect.
10. Build strategic partnerships that cultivate cultural, social and economic development that leverage the unique and adaptive nature of the Troy State University System to address the changing needs in the marketplace.
11. Establish a dynamic System-wide internal and external communication system that integrates and generate timely information about the actions and impact of the Troy State University System.

The individual campus strategic plans and correspondence between and among campus leaders involved in coordinating these plans will be available to the Visiting Team.

The Troy State University leadership retreats, usually held in the summer, also took on a different focus. The theme of the retreat in Summer 2001 was, "Coming Together as a System" and the participant list was expanded to include not only directors and deans from the various campuses but the academic leadership—in the form of the department chairs—from each campus as well.

Over 150 faculty and staff professionals worked in teams to identify the strengths
of the individual campuses that aided unification and the differences that created barriers to student access and institutional development. In Summer 2002, work continued on strengths and challenges, and concentrated effort was directed at two key systemwide initiatives—implementation of strategic planning across campuses, and development of a single, virtual university to comprise the distance learning capacities of the whole system.

By Summer 2003, merger planning moved forward in earnest, with retreat topics turning specifically to identification and prioritization of tasks that needed to be accomplished within defined organizational units. Chancellor Hawkins reorganized the University into four defined divisions: academics, student services, advancement, and administration. Three divisions (advancement, student services, and administration) would be led by Senior Vice Chancellors. The fourth area, academics, would be led by a Provost who would also serve as Executive Vice Chancellor to coordinate the efforts of all four divisions. The four senior administrators for Troy University are:

Dr. Ed Roach, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost  
Dr. John Schmidt, Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs  
Dr. Cameron Martindale, Senior Vice Chancellor for Advancement  
Dr. Douglas Patterson, Senior Vice Chancellor for Administration

An organizational chart for top administration, accurate as of the printing of this Prospectus, is included in Appendix A-10. It is noted that as the merged institution evolves, the reporting and coordinating lines below these levels will shift. Therefore, detailed organizational charts for levels below campus top
administrators are not provided with this document, but will be provided for the Visiting Team.

(* Dr. Cameron Martindale currently serves a dual role as President of Troy State University Montgomery, but will relinquish this role as of December 2004 to concentrate solely on Senior Vice Chancellor responsibilities.)

The leadership retreat of Summer 2004 continued with the work within the four divisions, reporting on accomplishments and outlining essential tasks for completion prior to the August 2005 deadline. Each of the four division administrators formed a leadership team, with membership from the three Alabama institutions, the Phenix City branch campus, and University College. These teams established timelines for various activities, set benchmarks, and assigned and assumed responsibilities. Tasks within each division are continually monitored, recorded and maintained on an electronic database that is available to all Troy University department heads, and reported to the Chancellor and his Cabinet on a monthly basis. Faculty, staff, students and alumni are kept informed of progress toward one university through electronic and print newsletters, TSU2, the Wednesday Report, and Troy Today. (See sample editions, Appendix A-11.) Editions of both publications will be available to the Visiting Team in Fall 2005.

In his capacity as Executive Vice Chancellor, Dr. Roach developed a timeline for the formation of one university that was presented to the Board of Trustees and approved on September 9, 2004. (See Board Resolution, Appendix A-12.) A key component of this timeline is the review and approval of the proposed merger by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern
Association of Colleges and Schools. The final review by the Alabama Commission on Higher Education and the final authorization by the Board of Trustees also are pivotal benchmarks. The timeline and its prerequisite activities are closely monitored by the Chancellor's Cabinet.

The involvement of personnel from Dothan and Montgomery has been extensive, as indicated in the next section of this Prospectus. However, the planning and evaluative efforts at the two independent institutions have remained in full force. Although many of the annual objectives for campus divisions and departments have included movement toward one university, efforts to serve students, enhance programs, increase enrollments, and provide service to respective campus communities have not wavered. As sample indications, enrollment at Montgomery has increased by approximately 10% per year during these last four years of merger planning, and Dothan has successfully completed a reaffirmation of its education programs by the National Association of Councils of Teacher Education (NCATE.) The full set of annual institutional planning and assessment documents for years 2000 through 2005 will be available to the Visiting Team on both the Montgomery and Dothan campuses.

Documentation that faculty and other groups were involved in the review and approval.

The level of faculty and staff involvement in merger planning is unprecedented and can only be summarized within this document. Two of the first tasks requiring coordination across the Alabama campuses were a common calendar and a common tuition rate. These were not simple issues to resolve.
Semester and annual calendars for Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery varied by as much as three weeks for start and end dates. Representatives from all three institutions worked for three years to begin moving these dates closer together, and since Fall 2003 the three campuses have achieved a common calendar that still provides flexibility (within parameters) to serve distinct student markets. The new structure will enable students to move between and among campuses once the institutions are completely merged. A similar disparity existed for tuition, which varied by hundreds of dollars for a full-semester course load from one Alabama campus to another. A multi-campus committee began moving these rates closer together in 2002, and all three institutions had the same undergraduate and graduate tuition beginning Fall 2004.

Running parallel with this effort, several inter-departmental groups have been meeting since 2001 to coordinate activities (i.e. all financial aid directors developed common practices and calendars for awards; all campus registrars are meeting to merge transcripts; etc.) The initiative for many of these activities has come from within the departments themselves, as individuals in these areas recognized things that needed to be done to be able to function across-campuses, and began working on these tasks without specific administrative directive. The grassroots culture that exists at all three Troy University institutions facilitates the freedom to self-assign responsibilities to move departments and offices toward a common goal.

The primary leadership team for all merger initiatives consists of approximately 150 faculty and staff professionals from across the Troy System
who have participated in the summer retreats (described earlier) and have
continued working on task forces and implementation committees to accomplish
the objectives established at the retreats. The participant list for the Summer
2004 Retreat is included in Appendix A-13. The objectives developed during
annual retreats require many subcommittees and work groups that are assigned
specific responsibilities associated with the merger. Faculty and staff from
Dothan, Montgomery, and from the Troy campuses have representatives working
on committees dealing with the following major issues:

Staff Handbook
Faculty Handbook
Student Handbook
Common Bulletin (catalog)
Faculty workload, course load, and incentive policies
Distance education and the development of the electronic campus
Undergraduate and graduate admissions
Institutional effectiveness
Institutional research
A common website
Technological support and administrative computing
Finance and facilities
Unit (vs. campus) budget models
Common fee structures
Contracting policies and contract consolidation
Advancement (fundraising)
Governmental relations
Public relations
Institutional marketing and advertising
Scholarships

Representatives from these work teams report progress regularly at
Management Team meetings held by the Senior Vice Chancellors for each
organizational division. Minutes of these meetings are maintained and are
distributed to all members of the respective teams and to the Chancellor's
Cabinet. A sample of these minutes from an Administrative Affairs Management Team meeting is included in Appendix A-14. Membership lists and minutes from all team meetings will be available to the Visiting Team.

In addition, academic councils and committees with representation from all three institutions have led the redesign of common course numbers, common course titles, and common curricula. The three institutions jointly designed a new general studies core curriculum that will serve as the foundation for all Troy University undergraduate programs and also resulted in a critical evaluation and subsequent enhancement of the liberal arts and sciences platform at Troy University. Additional involvement of faculty in academic affairs issues is described later in this Prospectus.

Continual communication of all matters related to the move toward one university is being accomplished through a variety of means. Minutes of key meetings and of the leadership retreats are widely circulated. Electronic newsletters (TSU2U, Troy Today) include regular updates of major changes/decisions impacting the move toward one university. The Chancellor and the Senior Vice Chancellors have made concerted efforts to work with the Student Government Association (the SGA President serves as a non-voting member of the Board of Trustees), and regularly answer questions for and provide information for the university newspaper, the Tropolitan. (See sample Tropolitan issue, Appendix A-15.) The achievement of e-mail accounts for all faculty, staff, students, and alumni has made it possible to share news with all constituents or with any subgroups as needed throughout this dynamic merger
process. Perhaps most importantly, the Troy University Chancellor and his
senior team (Senior Vice Chancellors and Deans) made presentations to faculty
and staff during opening Fall Term 2004 institutional convocations and
participated in campus planning events at both Dothan and Montgomery.
4. DESCRIPTION OF THE CHANGE  
(CR2.7.2, CS 3.3, CS 3.4, CS 3.5, CS 3.6)

Provide a description of the proposed change, including the specific outcomes and learning objectives of the program a schedule of proposed course offerings for the first year, and a copy of course syllabi.

The transition of Troy State University (now Troy University) from three separately accredited institutions to a single, multi-campus unit began in February, 2000, with discussions by the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and the Presidents at Dothan and Montgomery. Central to these discussions were the following considerations: (1) the maintenance and enhancement of academic quality throughout the unit; (2) simplification of academic processes such as transfer credit; (3) achieving a common course numbering and course description system for all disciplines taught at more than one campus; (4) reducing unnecessary course and program duplication; (5) cost reduction; and (6) enhancing the university's academic attractiveness and marketability by placing the entire system under common governance with one identify and one common name.

To insure that quality and integrity remained the primary factors in merger planning, some administrative reorganization of academic affairs was necessary. The post of Executive Vice Chancellor was created in 2001, combined with the existing position of University Provost, to oversee all aspects of the academic program and to supervise the various steps necessary to achieve academic uniformity throughout Troy University. (See job description for the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, Appendix A-16.)
The new Troy University also will include Associate Provosts at each of the formerly independent institutions (Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery.) A comprehensive nationwide search was conducted to fill this position in Troy, and the position of Associate Provost was filled and formally confirmed in August, 2004. (See advertisement, Associate Provost, Appendix A-17.) Due to the volume of academic coordination required at the Troy campus, the present Dean of Graduate Studies and Research was also named to the position of Associate Provost to deal primarily with graduate programs. Effective August 1, 2005, the current Vice President for Academic Affairs in Montgomery will assume the Associate Provost's role at that campus. Due to personnel changes in Dothan, the campus Associate Provosts role is being managed through an interim appointment, with a nationwide search to begin in September 2005.

On the heels of this reorganization came a corresponding restructuring of the administration within the colleges. Two existing divisions, the College of Communication and Fine Arts and the College of Health and Human Services, have programs only at the Troy campus. To the extent that individual courses are offered at Dothan or Montgomery, or should there be market demands to expand programs to these locations at future dates, the existing deans (based in Troy) are already in place to administer and manage these processes. The Colleges of Business, Education, and Arts and Sciences, however, had academic structures with deans at each of the three institutions. To insure continuity of programs, policies and practices, the decision was made to employ one dean for each of these three colleges. (The deans for these colleges at
Dothan and Montgomery will assume the titles of Associate Deans beginning Fall Term 2005.) National searches for each of these three positions were initiated in late 2003 and completed in the summer of 2004. Faculty from all three institutions, and Phenix City and University College, served as members of the search committees for these positions, and faculty from all campuses were invited to hear presentations from final candidates for all three positions. The deans were named in August, 2004. (See deans' job descriptions, Appendix A-18.)

Once the decision was made to create one University, various committees worked to assure a smooth transition regarding the various academic programs. The main academic issues centered around programs that were offered at all three independent institutions. These were in Business, Education, and Arts and Sciences. For each discipline within these areas, committees were formed consisting of faculty representatives from Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery. Although programs were already closely coordinated between the Troy main campus and its branch campus in Phenix City, Alabama and at University College sites, faculty from these locations also were involved in curriculum discussions to insure that decisions served the populations at all Troy University locations. Committee chairs were selected from throughout the system.

Teams began initially to rework course numbers and course titles so that the same identifiers were not assigned to different courses on different campuses. Teams also began the process of removing from active inventories any courses that were no longer offered at a particular institution. This was
accomplished by fall term 2002. The committees then moved to the more difficult tasks: to develop common program outcomes; arrive at common majors and minors (number of courses and credit hours); write common course descriptions; and determine a common set of courses for each program, major, and option/concentration. These committees are scheduled to complete their work in Spring Term 2005, but some have already finalized their work and are ready to submit materials to transitional Academic and Graduate Councils (referenced below) for approval. Appendix A-19a, b, c, and d contains information on one discipline, history, which has completed its work. The appendices detail: (a) the committee members and their institutions; (b) the agreed-upon program outcomes; (c) the new programs of study; and (d) the rewritten course descriptions. The same materials for all Troy University disciplines will be available for review by the substantive change team during their visit in fall 2005. (NOTE: course syllabi for those courses that were reviewed and adopted as they presently exist will not change from their present form at Troy, Dothan, and/or Montgomery. Course syllabi for newly designed common courses have not yet been assigned to specific faculty for fall term, 2005, and therefore have not yet been developed. These will be completed and available for the Visiting Team.)

Concurrent with the discipline committees, a system-wide General Studies Council was created to devise a common General Studies program. This council began meeting in the fall of 2003 and met frequently in a careful effort to produce a quality General Studies program. The final program was completed and approved in the summer of 2004 and will be implemented throughout Troy
University in August 2005. The General Studies Council has worked closely with the Alabama General Studies Committee (ASGC) throughout this process. This curriculum has already been approved by the Transitional Academic Council and the Academic Steering Committee. Appendix A-20 contains: (a) the names of the committee members and their base campus; (b) the original general studies programs at Troy; (c) the original general studied program at Dothan; (d) the original general studied program at Montgomery; and (e) the new Troy University general studies curriculum.

For the remaining year of transition, 2004-05, Graduate Councils and Academic Councils will continue to function at each of the three institutions to approve and oversee new and revised courses and programs at each specific location, and to hear student academic appeals. To lead Troy University into its first year as one institution, Transitional Academic and Graduate Councils (comprised of tenured faculty Council members from the three institutions as well as from Phenix City and University College) will review all new materials intended for Troy University academics after August 1, 2005. A multi-campus Academic Steering Committee chaired by the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost will monitor the work of these councils to assure quality control, prevent unnecessary duplication, and provide an "academic clearing house" for the entire University. Each campus is represented on this Academic Steering Committee, and the Chancellor's Cabinet will approve academic decisions made by this Committee to help insure these are in keeping with the Board directive to move toward a seamless, single institution to serve Troy University students worldwide. (See
membership of the Transitional Academic Council, Appendix A-21, membership of the Transitional Graduate Council, Appendix A-22, and membership of the Academic Steering Committee, Appendix A-23.)

The faculty committees working on common curricula did not take the approach of simply combining programs or compromising on courses to expedite their work. Student outcomes were and are continuing to be debated; courses are being redesigned and updated; the resident expertise of a larger combined faculty pool is being tapped. Recognizing that some of the resultant programs will be different from those presently in the Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery inventories, on September 9, 2004, the Troy University Board of Trustees passed a resolution on the degree requirements under one university that protects students who are presently in progress in degree programs. Current students will have up to seven (7) years from the date of their initial entry into Troy University institutions to complete their programs without being required to retake courses or add new courses to their programs of study. (See Board Resolution, Appendix A-24.)

Describe any differences in admission, curriculum, or graduation requirements for students enrolled at the new site(s), or any special arrangements for grading, transcripts, or transfer policies.

The most obvious academic goal of Troy University is to standardize these and other procedures throughout the University system. To that end, committees have worked to achieve uniform admission requirements in keeping with the existing federal consent decree, and to make certain that graduation requirements for all multi-campus programs are the same. In every case, the
goal of a seamless transition within the University system has been uppermost, especially in the areas of transfer courses, grading, and compilation of transcripts. Montgomery campus admissions requirements will continue to conform to the expectations set forth in the federal consent decree.

Work also continues on the system-wide consolidation of grading and transcript compilation, and especially the modification and use of the Datatel system to accommodate these needs. The transitional Registration and Admissions Committee, like all the transitional committees referenced in this report, is composed of representatives from the three campuses.

**Describe administrative oversight to ensure the quality of the program or services to be offered.**

The chief academic authority at Troy University is vested in the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost, who is headquartered at the Troy campus. Two Associate Provosts at the Troy campus, one primarily responsible for graduate programs and the other for undergraduate programs, assist him. A search will soon be conducted for Associate Provost at Dothan, and the present Vice President for Academic Affairs at the Montgomery campus will assume the role and title of Associate Provost effective August 1, 2005. These officials will also report to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost.

Each of the five colleges within the new Troy University will be led by a dean who will have authority over and responsibility for the academic programs of that College wherever and however offered within the University, worldwide. Troy University will operate from five academic colleges, all of which are
approved within their role and scope as submitted to accrediting bodies and to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education that coordinates college and university programs within the state. These Colleges are:

The College of Arts and Sciences
The Sorrell College of Business
The College of Communication and Fine Arts
The College of Education
The College of Health and Human Services

Associate Deans have been or will be named for each campus in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education. At the Dothan and Montgomery campuses, the former campus Deans of the colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Education will continue with the title of Associate Dean, reporting to the deans. Interim Associate Deans at the Troy campus will soon be appointed, and nationwide searches will be conducted for these positions on a full-time, permanent basis, with each to be filled by August 2005.

Department chairs at each campus will continue in their current roles and responsibilities, reporting first to the appropriate Associate Dean, who will in turn report to his/her dean. The delineation of duties on each campus relative to the associate deans and the department chairs is being determined as this Prospectus goes to print. The job descriptions, reporting lines, and actual individual appointments will be available for review by the Visiting Team in Fall 2005.
5. FACULTY
(CR 2.8, CS 3.7)

Provide a complete roster (using the Roster of Instructional Staff form) of those faculty employed to teach in the program(s), including a description of those faculty members' academic qualifications and course load in the new program as well as course work taught in other programs currently offered.

Troy University has provided rosters for the Spring 2004 semester, the most recently completed full term for all three institutions involved in the merger. Based on guidance from the SACS staff (Dr. Rogers, Dr. Luthman, and Dr. Hollins) during a meeting on July 22, 2004, only Rosters of Instructional Staff for those Troy University campuses not evaluated during the 2003 SACS Reaffirmation of Troy State University are included in this Prospectus. Therefore, only the rosters for Troy State University Dothan and Troy State University Montgomery, plus four new University College international sites, are included in a separately bound edition, Appendix B. All Troy University Rosters of Instructional Staff will be available for review by the Substantive Change Visiting Committee in 2005. In addition, complete information for each faculty member listed on these rosters is included in faculty files. These will be made available to Visiting Team members during the substantive change visit anticipated in Fall 2005.

All programs at Troy State University (Troy) and at Troy State University Dothan meet or exceed the minimum 25% rule (Comprehensive Standards 3.7.1.d) for faculty holding the terminal degree. At Troy State University Montgomery, three disciplines do not satisfy the rule at this time: accounting,
business administration, and mathematics. This is due primarily to an extraordinary and sustained increase in enrollment at that location beginning in 2000 and continuing through the present Fall Term 2004. (Enrollment has increased by 38% at TSUM in the last four years.) Efforts are currently underway to hire additional terminally-degreed faculty at the Montgomery campus to resolve this problem. However, as a single university, the faculty within departments from all three institutions will be working together to schedule and deliver instruction, particularly within the state of Alabama. As the accounting, business administration, and mathematics departments merge across campuses, the combined percentage of courses taught by terminally degreed faculty will be above 25% for all disciplines. All three institutions will plan the scheduling and delivery of courses, both live and via distance learning, through one academic administration (one dean) who will be able to use the faculty resources and expertise from all campuses (particularly within the state of Alabama) more effectively. All three institutions are equipped with V-tel and microwave interactive technology; all utilize Tegrity on-line learning systems; and all use Blackboard as a common means of course enhancement. These distance technologies can be used not only for instruction but for student conferencing and advising as well. And all three campuses are within a 100-mile corridor which makes physical travel within a given semester quite manageable.
Evidence that adequate faculty members are assigned to support the program; and the impact of the new initiative on faculty workload.

The proposed merger does not involve the initiation of any new programs or other changes that would directly impact faculty workload. Rather, this merger simply involves the combination of three separately accredited entities, within the same system, for purposes of efficiency and significant cost benefits. The existing faculty workload will not be negatively affected by the merger. The merger may in fact have a positive impact on faculty workload. A centralized curriculum assessment and planning system, common academic functions, and centralized administration will provide additional resources for carrying out preferred academic activities presently beyond the range of smaller, independent academic departments. With the addition of common curricula and courses, the ability to share full-time faculty among campuses increases significantly. As of the printing date for this Prospectus, a system-wide committee of faculty and academic administrators is working on policies for faculty workload, course load, and incentives. While this work is not expected to be completed until February 2005, the committee recommendations to-date for faculty workload will not increase full-time teaching requirements on any of the three campuses.

A key issue for consideration by Troy University academic administration is whether the number of full-time faculty members under one university will be adequate to support the mission of the institution. During their reaffirmation visits (Troy 2003, Dothan 2000, and Montgomery 1999) all three institutions were found to have adequate numbers of full time faculty to fulfill their stated missions. These situations have not changed and will not change under the new single
university as no new programs, majors, or concentrations are proposed as part of this merger. A summary of the faculty availability by campus location is provided in the following chart.

**FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY**
**SPRING SEMESTER 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>NO. OF FULL-TIME FACULTY</th>
<th>NO. OF PART-TIME FACULTY</th>
<th>COURSE CREDIT HRS. TAUGHT BY FULL-TIME FACULTY (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TROY</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>4,748 (51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOTHAN</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>899 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTGOMERY</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>947 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTALS</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>6,594 (51%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are adequate faculty members, to include full-time faculty members, to support the merged program and mission of the institution. This Troy University position is evidenced by the very successful accomplishment of the missions by the separately accredited campuses and the affirmation of that fact, to include the full-time/part-time faculty mix, by the three prior SACS Reaffirmation Visiting Committees. The Montgomery campus, which enrolls the largest number and percentage of nighttime, non-traditional students, also has a number of part-time faculty. Such campuses, by their very nature, lend themselves to a higher part-time faculty mix. Again, this has been validated by prior SACS Visiting Committees. The Troy campus percentage also is affected by the number of part-time faculty employed at University College (contracted) sites around the world where permanent, full-time faculty are less likely to be
available. The on-campus percentage for courses taught by full-time faculty at Troy is 83%. It is important to note that the majority of part-time faculty are employed to teach lower-division and survey courses; the percentage of faculty teaching the graduate courses at both Dothan and Montgomery is a highly desirable 81%.

The bottom line for all Troy University campuses is that adequate faculty members, to include full-time faculty members, are assigned to support the programs now and will support the merged programs on August 1, 2005. This statement is further supported by two essential points. First, the faculty at all three institutions have been actively involved in the redesign of programs and courses for their disciplines in this transition to one university (faculty lists will be available to the Visiting Team.) In addition, the scholarship, research, and university/community service accomplished by faculty at all three institutions would not be possible if full-time faculty coverage was insufficient to provide faculty with the time and resources needed to participate fully as tenured or tenure-track professionals.

For distance learning programs, describe processes in place to ensure that students have structured access to faculty.

Troy University is in the process of unifying all of its distance learning (DL) offerings under one administrative unit. This initiative will be accomplished by August 1, 2005 and the new structure will be available for review by the Visiting Team. The distance learning options presently available at each of the three institutions differs, and therefore methods of providing structured access to
faculty for DL students also differs somewhat for the three institutions (Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery.) A summary of the present processes is provided in the following paragraphs.

**Troy University (Troy, Phenix City, University College)**

DL students are given student services equitable to those traditional students receive. The distance education program has dedicated student service representatives, advisers, and other staff members available to ensure the DL students have assistance with admissions, financial aid, academic advising, and delivery of course materials. Students who are admitted into the DL programs are counseled by their dedicated adviser who is a full-time faculty member. Upon admission into a degree program, the full-time faculty member adviser's information is given to the student and the full-time faculty adviser receives the student's information via e-mail. In all cases, the list of advisees is available to all full-time faculty members via Trojan Web Express. Thus, distance education students are treated just as traditional Troy University students. This includes access to the same channels for communication, as well as for resolving complaints, as traditional students. DL students also have access to placement and counseling services via web links to main campus online services (that can and do include live interactive links).

Faculty members teaching DL courses are subject to the same standards as the faculty of traditional courses. To help ensure these standards are maintained, the DL program provides instructional support to faculty via several available training workshops held throughout each academic year. These
workshops are designed both to teach additional skills and reinforce those which already exist. Additionally, all faculty who teach distance learning courses for Troy University undergo a faculty online orientation (operated within a BlackBoard course "shell") which provides them policy and procedural information, as well as development tips, guidelines, best practices and pedagogical foundation and instructions to help enhance faculty-to-student and student-to-student interaction within all DL courses. In this orientation, they also have the opportunity to post and share tips and information via a Discussion Board with mentoring professors who have experience in DL methodologies and established exemplary best practice techniques.

DL courses at Troy University are designed to provide for the timely and appropriate interaction between students and faculty, and among students, through the integration of BlackBoard Learning Management Systems into Online DL courses. All Online DL courses utilize BlackBoard. This system allows for mass email, Discussion (bulletin) Boards, and even live interactive chats. The use of this medium to construct interactive, multi-dimensional courses that can include timed and password-protected exams also helps to ensure the integrity of student work and the credibility of the degrees and credit that Troy University awards.

At Troy's Phenix City branch, DL courses are offered via the Live Class on Tape (LCOT) format. LCOT classes are traditional live classes that are taped for viewing at a later time. Most LCOT students live within driving distance of the campus, and many students take a combination of LCOT classes and live
classes. LCOT students can and do take advantage of the on-campus faculty
office hours for meetings with their instructors. All students have access to
faculty via telephone and e-mail, and the BlackBoard system is also utilized to
facilitate communications. A toll-free telephone number is available for student
use, and faculty are assigned Troy e-mail addresses. All students are assigned
to a full-time faculty adviser.

During the SACS Reaffirmation Visit to Troy University in April 2003, the
Visiting Team recommended that two specific University College sites “provide
distance learning students with structured access to and interaction with full-time
faculty members.” In response, the Troy University Provost, in a September 1,
2003, policy memorandum to deans and department chairs (see Appendix A-25),
significantly broadened the recommendation and directed that all DL courses
taught by part-time faculty will provide contact information including office and
departmental telephone and fax numbers, office location and mailing address,
and the e-mail address of one or more full-time faculty members assigned to the
originating location in the academic discipline. As a result, students have
multiple modes of access to this faculty resource. This policy-directive promotes
interaction and sets the stage for open communication between students and
faculty as well as demonstrates a partnership between the part-time and full-time
faculty of the University. The success of this procedure is fully documented in
Troy University's Follow-up Report, submitted to the Commission on September

Troy University-Dothan Campus
The development of distance learning (DL) at Troy-Dothan was structured so that almost all of the courses were designed and delivered by full-time faculty. This has been the case since the introduction of telecourses in the mid-1990's (some of which remain popular on campus today) through the present delivery systems of on-line and CD (Tegrity) learning systems. The focus on development of quality programming has led all three colleges on the Dothan campus to limit the number of courses that can be offered, and to restrict such development to full-time faculty. In addition, nearly 100% of students who participate in Dothan's distance courses reside within a 25-mile radius. With courses taught by full-time faculty, all of whom have scheduled office hours, and with students living within easy commuter distance to the campus, access for students is not a problem. In addition to posting on-campus hours, each faculty member teaching via distance uses BlackBoard as a major communication tool. Threaded discussions, chatrooms, and postings provide significant opportunity for student/faculty interaction. Students are given both a telephone number and an e-mail address for distance faculty who are expected to respond to questions/concerns in a timely manner. Review of the student evaluations of all distance courses each term indicates that students are able to communicate with faculty about coursework and course management issues. Student evaluations are completed for each DL course, each term. These are compiled by the Coordinator for Distance Learning on the Dothan Campus, and are read/reviewed by the Department Chair, the campus Dean, and the President. Faculty are provided with summarized, compiled versions of these evaluations.
after grades are submitted. The evaluations for each term since the initiation of distance delivery at Troy-Dothan will be available for review by the Visiting Team.

**Troy University-Montgomery Campus**

At Troy-Montgomery, the Division of Distance Learning and Extended Academic Services manages and facilitates the adaptation and integration of the content and outcomes of traditional classroom-based instruction into DL experiences. The Division cooperates with the academic colleges to offer courses using Internet, public and cable television, and print (learning contracts). The Division subscribes to the Southern Regional Education Board’s Principles of Good Practice as developed by the Educational Technology Cooperative’s Electronic Common Market.

The online instructional method of delivery is Web-based instruction on the Internet, using the instructional software, BlackBoard, as the platform for instructional delivery and management. Structured interaction with faculty is monitored by DL administration and technical staff to assure that interaction between students and faculty occurs throughout the instruction cycle. Faculty are also required to complete EQUIP training to instruct faculty how to teach online, including the necessity for frequent faculty-to-student interaction. BlackBoard records and retains student-to-faculty and student-to-student contacts including the content of the interaction and permits the faculty and distance staff to monitor all interactions through the BlackBoard platform.
Students also are able to contact their instructors through various modes of communication using e-mail, telephone, fax, or regular mail.

Televised instruction is delivered through a local cable channel and therefore is a local closed system delivered to students within the viewing (and commuting) area. Examinations and other activities require students to interact with faculty, staff or identified monitors in order to complete their televised instruction. Students are required to come into contact with the instructor or the university DL staff via campus visits, e-mail, telephone and fax.

The Learning Contract method of instruction is a print-based, independent study version of residence courses. The Learning Contract method of delivery is available for most general studies and approved academic concentration courses. Structured interaction with students is facilitated through required contacts, as stated in the course syllabi, with contacts being made in a variety of methods including onsite meetings, e-mail, letters, telephone, and the internet.

At Montgomery, the methods of communication are listed in each syllabus, including required interaction.

For graduate programs, document scholarship and research capability of faculty.

The primary mission of the merged Troy University is teaching. A strong secondary focus is on scholarship rather than pure research or publication in refereed journals for graduate faculty. Much of the research conducted by Troy University faculty is considered “applied research” and is highly valued by community, state, regional, and national organizations. Graduate faculty at Troy
University are expected to be actively engaged in a wide range of scholarly and research activities and projects. These activities include pedagogical and critical textbooks, research articles in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters and reviews, and presentations at annual disciplinary conferences. Additionally, the faculty are actively engaged in the securing of sponsored research, generating over $10 million dollars in grants in 2003-2004. The scholarship productivity of these graduate faculty members is assessed annually and recorded as part of each graduate faculty member's annual review. Retention of graduate faculty status is determined, in part, by the faculty member's on-going scholarship activities. The scholarship requirements for graduate faculty status are specific and require a broad-based approach to research and scholarly activities. Troy University does provide funds for faculty development and scholarly activities, including travel for presentation at professional meetings. Selected examples are provided below for each major campus location to document the scholarship and research capability of the Troy University graduate faculty. More information on these examples and many more documented examples are available in individual faculty files.

Troy University-(Troy, Phenix City, University College)


- Dr. Anand Krishnamoorthy co-authored with Gideon Falk of Purdue University Calumet, “Global Business Knowledge: A Comparison of MBA vs. MSM Students at a U. S. University”, and presented at the 2004 International Management Development Association (IMDA) conference.


- Dr. James F. Rinehart, Associate Professor of International Relations and Chair, Department of Political Science.

- Dr. Michael Eskey and Dr. Tom O’Connor co-authored, “*Types of Scales and Indexes*”, which presents research and reference materials for social measurement, and was published in the “Encyclopedia of Social Measurement” and “Academic Press of Social Measurement”, 2004.

Sample Publications/Presentations:


- “Understanding Millenarianism as a Possible Definitional Component of Political Terrorism” – Paper presented at the 45th annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, March 2004.

Sample Professional Activities:
- Moderator, "Korea and American Foreign Policy," Global Access Program – Presented by Dr. John Merrill, Chief Northeast Asia Division, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, United States Department of State, Hosted by Troy University, February 27, 2004.
- Dr. Anita Heck recently presented a paper at the annual conference of the Academy of Management, which is the most prestigious academic/professional organization in this discipline.
- Saltiel, Iris (2004). When Faculty Collaborations Crumble: How to Know if the Benefits Outweigh the Costs. Presentation at the 29th Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Dr. John Hill (adjunct) presented a paper, "Racial Profiling: Just Say When", at the Utah Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, Annual Conference.

Troy University-Dothan Campus

- Fourteen (14) faculty participated in the week-long grant writing workshop held at Troy-Dothan in summer 2003 and summer 2004, and eight (8) have submitted applications for sponsored programs to either state or national agencies including: The State Department of Education; The U.S. Department of Education; NASA; the Alabama Commission on Higher Education; and other government or community agencies.
- Faculty provide professional services for state and community projects. For example: an interdisciplinary team conducted a comprehensive needs assessment for the Wiregrass United Way. Two College of Business Administration Faculty facilitated a survey and focus group effort to redesign the programs and services of the Dothan Area Chamber of Commerce. A team of two faculty conducted a profiling study for the Dothan Police Department.

• Seven (7) faculty participate on the Peer Review Board for The Journal of Education On-Line; three are associate editors.


• Dr. Rodney Davis, presentation at the Professional Development Schools National Conference, Orlando, FL, March 2004

• Dr. Sandra Lee Jones, Professor of Education: Editor of Curriculum Essentials: A Resource for Educators, 2nd ed. Wiles, Allyn, & Bacon (2005)

**Troy University-Montgomery Campus**

• Dr. Emrah Orhun, Professor of Computer Information Sciences, presented a paper which was included in the proceedings of the International Conference on Information Technology Based Higher Education, supported by UNESCO and IEEE in Istanbul, Turkey.

• Dr. Kirk Curnutt, Professor of English, assisted with the 7th International Fitzgerald Society in Vevey, Switzerland, but also co-directed the 11th Biennial Hemingway Society Conference in Key West, Florida and published A Historical Guide to F. Scott Fitzgerald to be released by Oxford University Press.

• Dr. Drew Harrington, Associate Professor of History, was the chair and commentator at the Ohio Valley History Conference at Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky.

• Dr. Sandra Harris, Assistant Professor, presented at the Association for Advancement of Educational Research Annual Meeting in Jacksonville, Florida.

• Eminent scholar, Dr. Mehmet Sahinoglu’s manuscript entitled An Empirical Bayesian Stopping Rule in Testing and Verification of Behavior Models was published in the journal IEEE Transaction on Instrumentation and Measurement (Vol. 52, No. 5, October, 2003).

• Conferences and presentations are sponsored by the university. For example, an annual computer technology conference is sponsored by the university’s computer science faculty. The conference draws experts from across the nation and provides faculty opportunities to conduct scholarly discussions with leaders in the field.
6. LIBRARY AND LEARNING RESOURCES
(CR 2.9, CS 3.4.14, CS 3.8)

Describe library and information resources, general as well as specific to the program and staffing and services that are in place to support the initiative.

Troy University libraries are located at each of the three independently accredited institutions—Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery. The libraries with their print, non-print and electronic resources serve as the primary learning resources for the students, faculty, and staff of Troy University students at those locations. Print and non-print resources are available to users at each site and electronic resources are available to all users wherever they are and whenever they wish to access them.

All three institutions have adequate personnel to provide the hours and services that are necessary for the resource needs of the library patrons. The Library Directors at the Dothan and Montgomery campuses report directly to the University Library Dean (located in Troy) for all library matters. Local campus reporting lines are still being established and will be clarified by the time the Visiting Team arrives in Fall 2005.

There are essential differences in some services provided by the different institutional libraries. For example, hours of "live" service vary from campus to campus based on the class schedules and the student needs (i.e. traditional/residential vs. commuter/adult). While Troy University unifies its programs and image, the institution fully intends that campuses will continue to serve the specific needs of their communities and student markets. Therefore
differences in hours of operation are likely to continue, though these will be regularly reviewed to insure that student needs at each location are being adequately addressed.

For the past decade, the three libraries have worked in close cooperation. The Librarians from Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery have always worked cooperatively with each other, helping with snags and trying to find solutions together. The move to one university has merely enabled them to formalize this process. The Library Leadership Team consists of the Dean of Library Sciences in Troy, and the two Library Directors in Dothan and Montgomery. Wherever possible (and allowed by the vendor), databases have been jointly reviewed, purchased, and shared. (See sample e-mail, Appendix A-26.) This has often resulted in savings that could be shifted to more needed library resource areas. The main on-line access system, WebCat, developed in 1999 was designed to link all three libraries and to provide assistance to students at other Troy University locations as well. For the last several years, the University has been a member of The National Association of Academic Libraries as one institution, with all three library administrators actively participating in that organization.

With the merger on the horizon, it is expected that even greater sharing of resources (limited only by vendor restrictions and costs) will enable Dothan and Montgomery to have access to new electronic databases due to their association as part of the larger, more comprehensive Troy University.

The development of a wholly cooperative library system has insured that students and faculty at any Troy University campus already have access
privileges at all campuses via remote access. The system also allows for the physical mailing of materials to any student or faculty member at a Troy University campus within the forty-eight contiguous United States. The same policies and procedures are followed for loaning and receiving materials at all three university libraries. The merger to one institution will not alter this arrangement, but should facilitate greater flexibility as resources are saved and reallocated across the system.

Because of years of history of cooperative operation, the move to one university will place no strain on the library services at the three campuses. The Dean of Libraries at Troy and the Directors of Library Services at Dothan and Montgomery are in agreement that the merger of the universities will actually greatly enhance services to clientele. The Library Leadership Team is working together on several initiatives to take advantage of this organizational synergy. Library policies will become more standard and less complicated at all sites. Bulk purchasing of books, electronic databases, equipment, etc. will make funds go farther, and the unit-based budgeting planned for Troy University will enable library administrators to allocate resources comprehensively. The faculty training programs at each institution are being shared and discussed with plans to develop a common program that draws on the strengths of each program. Two libraries are currently piloting CD and on-line orientation programs for students which also will be reviewed, shared, and tailored to the student populations at all Troy University locations. By 2006, the Dothan and Montgomery sites will be included in the biennial LibQual national evaluations currently used on the Troy
campus, and evaluation from the perspective of library clientele will be
standardized.

In short, there is no crisis in Library Services being brought about by the
merger to one institution. The Library Dean, Directors, and their staffs are
making the most of opportunities to formalize a structure that has been in place
for ten years, and to share opportunities and strengths across the three merged
institutions.

**If reliant upon other libraries, describe those collections and their
relevance to the proposed program; include a copy of the formal
agreement in the appendix.**

None of the three independently accredited institutions involved in the
merger is dependent upon external libraries to support academic programs. This
will not change under one university.

**Relative to electronic resources, describe how students and faculty will
access information, training for faculty and students in the use of online
resources, and staffing and services available to students and faculty.**

Troy University students, faculty and staff can access the library's
electronic resources both locally and remotely. Locally they simply access the
library homepage and click on “Remote Services.” Remotely they do the same
thing with the addition that they have to enter their SSN for identification
purposes and then are forwarded to the Remote Services page. The process is
very simple and all students are taught the procedure during orientation classes.
It is noted here that a college orientation was not previously required on the
Dothan and Montgomery campuses. The majority of these students were adults
and/or transfer students, and individual class instructors provided library orientations with the help of professional librarians at these locations. Beginning August 2005, a college orientation course (to include a thorough review of library services) will be required for all Troy University students at all sites worldwide. The Troy University website also contains on-line help information to assist students in accessing resources from remote locations. In addition, both the University College (operated by Troy) and Troy State University Dothan library personnel have developed orientation computer disks that will be available to students who plan to do much of their research from remote locations.

All Troy University library resources are maintained in WEBCAT which is the online library catalog. This is part of the Library Media Service which was purchased from SIRSI. All campus libraries enter their holdings information into the SIRSI system and it is displayed in WEBCAT. There are currently some minor differences in the way in which some materials display in the online catalog. These differences are being eliminated by a Technical Services committee comprised of technical services Librarians from each campus. (See committee list, Appendix A-27.) Through this process there will be standardization in the presentation of information to students, faculty and staff.

Currently there are some differences in the electronic resources that are provided at the Dothan, Montgomery and Troy campuses. As the databases come up for renewal, the differences are being eliminated. It is noted that to the extent permitted by vendors, these differences were already on schedule to be addressed even before the decision was made to merge institutions. Some
differences must await the unification of campuses because a few vendors provide services based on the Carnegie classification of the campus. Since there are differences in the Carnegie classifications of the campuses these databases cannot be made available to all until the unification is legally complete. In one or two instances there may be value in maintaining separate subscriptions for cost or other benefits. These instances are being studied by the Library Leadership Team to see what is best for the institution as a whole.

Troy University also houses two special collections that are campus-based and will, by the nature of their missions, remain so. The Rosa Parks Library and Museum, located on the Montgomery campus, attracts world class historical scholars, civil rights activists, and well known artists who visit the campus to share their creations and ideas, and interact with the university community. The Wiregrass Archives of History and Culture, based in Dothan, houses the papers and letters of historical value to the region and of importance to business and government officials responsible for regional growth and development. Both library programs were initiated and are partially supported by a combination of federal grants and private donations. These collections are now restricted to scholarly activities performed at these locations and there are no plans to make any of these materials mobile at this time. This decision results from the function and fragility of the documents and holdings included in the collections.
7. PHYSICAL RESOURCES
(CR 2.11, CS 3.10.4, CS 3.10.6, CS 3.10.7)

Provide a description of the physical facilities and equipment to support this initiative. Assess the impact that the proposed change will have on existing programs and services.

Currently, the TSU System functions as three separately accredited campuses. These three campuses contain 97 buildings and 854 acres of property. Since the merging of the three campuses into one campus will not, in and of itself, create any additional students or any additional service demands that require additional physical resources, there will be no need for additional physical facilities to accommodate this change.

All facilities and equipment that currently exist on the three campuses will be a part of the new Troy University. As growth occurs in the new university, facilities will be added, renovated, or otherwise improved to accommodate this growth. Major capital improvements will continue to be presented to the Board of Trustees by the Troy University Chancellor (as was the procedure under three separately accredited institutions) with the Board retaining ultimate authority to expend university funds on needed projects. Additionally, there are no instructional program changes or service delivery changes inherent in the merger that would require additional space.

The physical plant and equipment at Troy and its current branches were recently reviewed during the 2003 reaffirmation self-study and peer team visit. Similarly, the sites and equipment for Dothan and Montgomery were thoroughly reviewed during their reaffirmation processes in 2000 and 1999, respectively.
Campus maps, facilities utilization reports, maintenance and renovation plans, and facilities construction plans for all campuses will be available to the Visiting Team during their Fall 2005 review.
8. FINANCIAL SUPPORT
(CR 2.11, CS 3.10.1--CS 3.10.5, CS 3.10.7)

Provide a business plan that includes the following: (a) a description of
financial resources to support the change, including a budget for the first
year; (b) projected revenues and expenditures and cash flow: (c) the
amount of resources going to institutions or organizations for contractual
or support services; and (d) the operational management, and physical
resources available for the change.

The new Troy University will not result in any financial
requirements/challenges in the merger of the Troy State University, Troy State
University Dothan, and Troy State University Montgomery. Currently, these three
separately accredited institutions operate under the criteria of the Commission on
Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and all three
institutions were satisfactorily reviewed during their most recent reaffirmations.
However, they are and always have been one fiscal entity. The Troy State
University System is the legal entity that is recognized in section 16-56 of the
Code of Alabama as amended by Act #97-586 of the Alabama Legislature. One
Board of Trustees, authorized under this statute, is the governing body for the
Troy State University System and all campuses of the System. All audits
conducted by the Department of Examiners of Public Accounts are conducted for
the Troy State University System as a single fiscal entity, one audit for the entire
corporate body. (See audit FY 2002, Appendix C.)

Therefore, the merger of the three separately accredited campuses into
one university will not pose any significant changes in terms of financial stability.
To reinforce this concept, currently all bond issues for any and all campuses are
issued under the name of The Troy State University System and any resulting
bonded indebtedness is incurred by The Troy State University System and not by any particular campus. The Troy State University System has an excellent reputation in the bond market, and during the last bond issue in 2003, received a bond rating of A2 from Moody's Investor Service. This is a clear indication of the financial stability of what is proposed as one university for August 2005—Troy University.

Several financial and administrative services are and have always been coordinated centrally for the three institutions and, therefore, will require little or no change due to the merger. These include: human resources, accounting services, payroll, purchasing, and administrative computing.

Appendix A-28 is a proposed budget for the 2005-06 fiscal year which clearly indicates adequate financial resources to support the change to one university. Both revenue and expenses are moderate expansions of the current (2004-05) budgets that exist at each institution at this time. The new merged university, as it is today with separately accredited campuses, will have two primary sources of revenue: state funding, and tuition and fees. There is nothing inherent in the proposed merger that would cause either of these revenue sources to be less than what they otherwise would have been if the three universities had not merged. However, based on the expanded brand identity that will evolve from the concept of one university as opposed to three, there is reason to project that enrollment, and therefore tuition, will increase beyond by what would be produced by the three separate institutions.
As it relates to expenses, it is anticipated that the synergy of operating one university as opposed to three can moderately reduce expenditures. There could be some slight increase in expenses in the internal transactions as the University retains old systems and positions while transitioning to new ones. However, after the initial transition, Troy University anticipates savings in excess of $1,000,000 per year on administrative consolidation, coordinated purchasing, technology coordination, consolidated regional and specialized accreditation, a centralized banking system, and other centralized and coordinated services.

Appendix A-29 provides a multi-year view of revenue, expenditures, and cash flow, with the past several years reflected as actual figures and projected figures for 2005-2006. This chart reflects a very conservative estimate of revenue and expenditures for the out years of 2005-2006, but at the same time is a financially sound progression for the actual figures to the projected figures. The new Troy University is projected to be a financially healthy university based on the past financial performance of all three institutions and based on future projections of revenue and control of expenditures through the synergy created by one university.

The major third party contractual obligations that currently exist for the three universities will not change significantly under the new organization. There are several major service and support contracts that already serve the three Troy campuses. Examples are Datatel (administrative computing services) and SIRSI and SOLINET (automated library services), both of which serve all three campuses and costs for which are shared on a prorated basis. Sodexho (food
service, janitorial, grounds, and maintenance) provides different services to each of the three institutions, and as contracts expire, there is an expectation of some cost savings through possible bid offerings covering more than one location. The merger into one institution will give Troy University the financial flexibility to develop bid specifications for multi-campus or for individual sites, as best fits the needs of students and in consideration of the fiscal savings that may be realized.

**Provide contingency plans if required resources do not materialize.**

The revenue sources for Troy University are projected to be stable, and expenditures are expected to be well within revenue parameters. The merger requires no fiscal resources beyond what presently exist for the three institutions individually. In addition, the three universities have a combined surplus of $23,745,323 which is expected to rise to $39,893,412 by the end of the 2003—04 fiscal year. There are and will continue to be adequate funds to handle unanticipated issues, and no contingency plan beyond that provided by institutional surpluses is required.

**For consolidations/mergers, provide a copy of the most recent audit.**

The most recent audit completed and published for The Troy State University System was for 2001-2002. It is included in a separately bound Appendix C to this *Prospectus*. The 2002-2003 audit for The Troy State University System was recently completed by the Department of Examiners of Public Accounts, and summary information will be forwarded to the Commission
once published (within the next several weeks) and prior to the December
meeting in Atlanta. The most recent completed audits will be provided for the
Visiting Team in Fall 2005. The availability of completed audits and information
about audits in-process will depend upon the date of the scheduled visit. The
Team Visit is expected sometime in Fall Term 2005, and the fiscal year for The
Troy State University System does not end until September 30, 2005.

The Troy State University System is financially stable and has obtained
satisfactory audits throughout its history. The new Troy University will be a mirror
image of this financial stability and will continue to be a healthy, viable university
with a sound financial reputation.
9. EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT (CR 2.5, CS 3.3.1)

Describe how the institution assesses overall institutional effectiveness as well as the means to monitor and ensure the quality of the degree programs, off-campus sites, or other changes. Summarize procedures for systematic evaluation of instructional results, including the process for monitoring and evaluating programs at the new site, as well as using the results of evaluation to improve institutional programs, services, and operations.

The institutional effectiveness processes at the three independent institutions (Troy, Dothan, and Montgomery) developed separately and over a period of time. In order to describe the process underway to bring these systems together as one, a summary of these processes as they operate at each separate institution, is provided.

Troy University (Troy, Phenix City, University College)

In 1988, the Troy Committee on Institutional Effectiveness began its work. Thomas Souter, Dean of the Library, chaired the committee of twenty-five members, drawn from every division of the Institution. Recognizing the importance of institutional effectiveness, the Board of Trustees of Troy State University on March 17, 1989, issued two resolutions which established institutional effectiveness programs at Troy State University. By fall 1990, all faculty and staff had in hand the *Troy State University Institutional Effectiveness Plan 1990-91*. In August 1993 the *Manual for Developing Planning Documents* was completed to provide content, process, and procedural information in regard to developing the Six Points of Institutional Effectiveness (SPIE), the Self-Study, Planning Statements (short and long-range), and budgeting to implement the plan. In 1995, *Troy State University Challenge 2000: Strategic Plan to the
Twenty-first Century was completed and provided the Chancellor's and other administrators' visions, strategic directions, strategic goals, guiding principles, external and internal factors, and planning assumptions to direct and under gird the planning efforts of Troy State University to the year 2000. A new strategic plan to continue into the twenty-first century, Over the Horizon: Strong Values-Clear Vision was completed in 2001, and provided strategic guidance to 2005. In August 2005 the campuses of Troy State University in Dothan, Montgomery, and Troy will merge to become one university, Troy University.

**Troy University-Dothan Campus**

The institutional effectiveness system at Troy State University Dothan (TSUD) started in the 1980s with the initial establishment of the Title III funded Office of Planning, Management, and Evaluation (PME). The Office of PME maintained the annual planning and other evaluation functions and produced the University's first model for institutional effectiveness which was later replaced by the Strategic Planning process in 1995. In Spring 1998, the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) was created and functioned under the direct supervision of the Executive Vice President of the University. In Fall 1998, the annual planning and assessment process was formally initialized and has been continuously implemented ever since. This process is a systematic, on-going process of planning, evaluation, and improvement; it is directly related to the University’s Mission Statement, Goals, and Strategic Plan; and it involves wide participation throughout the University. The process strives for more effective educational programs and support services in a continuous quest for quality, and
it also plays a key role in ensuring institutional effectiveness and academic integrity through a variety of assessments and evaluations that measure the effectiveness of programs and services and that demonstrate the use of assessment results for improvement. This process is coordinated by the Coordinator of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) and documentation is available in the IRE Office.

**Troy University-Montgomery Campus**

The Troy State University Montgomery (TSUM) Institutional Effectiveness Program was officially initiated on September 1, 1987, and was based on a formal five-year implementation plan that was completed on August 31, 1992. The current Institutional Effectiveness Manual was revised in November 1998 and was further revised in 2002 to incorporate a new software package that allowed support unit leaders to update their Strategic Plan Objectives online. It also allowed support unit leaders to give a percentage completion for each objective and it allowed anyone to view the status of the objectives. In addition, a software management tool called "Dashboard" was implemented that allowed TSUM support unit leaders to view a screen that depicted the status of the Support Unit Strategic Plan Objectives in aggregate using bar, line and pie charts. Troy State University Montgomery is currently in the third-year of a four-year Strategic Plan, *Lighting the Way to a Brighter Future*.

For this final year of transition (2004-2005) leading toward one university, each of the three campuses that are currently independently accredited will complete their annual cycles of planning, evaluation, and use of data to improve
services as outlined, above. A systemwide committee composed of institutional
effectiveness officers at all three institutions and led by the Associate Vice
Chancellor for Institutional Effectiveness (based in Troy) is working on a new
structure that combines the strengths of all three campus processes. The work
in progress, the *Troy University Institutional Planning and Effectiveness*
document, will draw upon the *Troy State University Manual for Annual Planning
Planning Documents 1993*, the *Troy State University Manual for Planning and
Institutional Effectiveness Plan 1995*, and institutional effectiveness and planning
procedures of Troy State University Dothan and Troy State University
Montgomery. When completed the *Troy University Institutional Planning and
Effectiveness* document will supersede all previous planning documents and put
forth content, processes, and procedures for institutional planning and
effectiveness for Troy University as one institution. The *Troy University
Institutional Planning and Effectiveness* document will provide guidance for the
institutional effectiveness process and Strategic and Annual Planning for
programs and services of Troy University.

Although still a work in progress, the *Troy University Institutional Planning
and Effectiveness* document in its present draft form sets forth Troy University's
procedures for institutional planning and effectiveness. As such, the document
relies upon the Troy University Mission (purpose) Statement and the Troy
University Strategic Plan to shape and control all programs and services. This
document formulates plans and procedures for engaging in "ongoing, integrated
and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that incorporate a systematic review of programs and services that (a) results in continuing improvement and (b) demonstrates that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. Furthermore, the process identifies expected outcomes for educational programs as well as administrative and educational support services. Outcomes will be assessed, and evidence will support the use of analysis to improve programs and services.

With its heavy emphasis on internal evaluation and continuous improvement, the Troy University Institutional Planning and Effectiveness process will enhance, strengthen, and improve areas normally evaluated by agencies such as the Alabama Commission on Higher Education and specialized/programmatic accrediting bodies. The Troy University Institutional Planning and Effectiveness process will utilize the University's organizational structure together with standing councils and committees including the Institutional Effectiveness Committee that oversees the institutional effectiveness efforts of Troy University. (See Committee membership and organization, Appendix A-30.)
The Troy University Planning Process includes five major components: (1) Troy University Mission Statement; (2) Strategic Planning; (3) Annual Effectiveness Report; (4) College and Division Planning; and (5) Chancellor’s Cabinet Planning. All of these components contribute annually to the Troy University Plan.

Every five years the University develops a strategic plan. This strategic plan is developed by a steering committee and sub-committees appointed by the Chancellor and representing the various constituencies of the University. Strategic planning takes an approach to planning different from annual planning. In-depth strategic planning requires the University to research external and internal factors that impact on the University. Based upon this process, the University formulates assumptions, reviews its Mission Statement, and establishes a vision. From this information, strategic initiatives and strategic goals that guide the ongoing, long-range development of the University are established. The strategic plan is one of the driving factors in the annual planning process.

Institutional effectiveness is measured against validated expected outcomes (benchmarks) that are established for programs and services operated by the University. These validated outcomes are normed against a regional or national benchmark or otherwise be validated by a logical and objective process. The Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (IRPE) office, in coordination with the senior vice chancellors, establishes a list of the programs and services that are to be measured for effectiveness. Each of the identified
programs and services must develop validated expected outcomes that are approved by the appropriate dean/director and by the appropriate senior vice chancellor in early fall of 2005. During June of each year, an assessment of the expected outcomes of the identified programs and services is submitted in an Annual Effectiveness Report. (See AER, Appendix A-31.) Any programs which fail to meet the established outcomes are required to submit a Plan for Improvement (PFI) designed to assist the program or service in meeting the expected outcomes.

Academic deans and division heads will review the Annual Effectiveness Reports (AER) and Plans for Improvement (PFI) and integrate this information into the college or division annual planning process. As a follow-up procedure to determine the success and status of the Plans for Improvement, deans and division heads complete column 5 on the College/Division Plan of the previous year. (See College Division Plan, Appendix A-32.) These reports are submitted to the senior vice chancellors with a copy to the Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness office which maintains a comprehensive Evidence of Improvement file.

By July 31 of each year, colleges and divisions of the University develop and submit annual plans which identify pertinent and realistic objectives for the coming year. These plans are developed on the basis of information obtained from (1) the Annual Effectiveness Report (AER) of the various units of the colleges or divisions; (2) requirements from program accrediting agencies; (3) other external factors that impact the college or division; (4) priorities that are
established by the Strategic Plan; (5) the Evidence of Improvement file related to these colleges or divisions; and (6) a review of what was achieved in the previous year's plan. Deans and division heads are responsible for orchestrating the planning process for their respective units. Each year at the Troy University Leadership Conference, college and division leaders work with Senior Vice Chancellors to create annual plans for the university using approved planning forms. (See Troy University Annual Plan, Appendix A-33.)

College and division plans are reviewed by the Chancellor's Cabinet. The Cabinet consolidates the college and division objectives and adds university-wide objectives where there are gaps between divisions or where economic, political, social, or legal dynamics suggest modifications or new directions that have not been considered by individual colleges or divisions.

The final product of this process is the annual Troy University Plan which is completed in September of each year. Annually, new objectives for the Troy University Plan are entered into a "dashboard" computer program that will allow key administrators to provide computer entries of the specific progress of the objectives in the Troy University Plan. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee of the University is responsible for reviewing the Troy University institutional effectiveness process. Once each year the Institutional Effectiveness Committee with IRPE personnel review the Annual Effectiveness Reports and the Evidence of Improvement file. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee will make recommendations and commendations to the Chancellor's Cabinet, deans, and division heads regarding institutional effectiveness.
To aid in implementing the annual institutional effectiveness and planning process, Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (IRPE) personnel provide oversight as well as an annual Fact Book of demographic data and a Compendium of Survey and Test Results – both of which are provided online and in printed copy to key personnel. These documents assist programs and services in evaluating their success in meeting established outcomes.

This Troy University Institutional Planning and Effectiveness document is designed to guide each academic department, school, college, and division and each non-academic unit and division through the institutional planning and effectiveness processes. All programs must have approved outcomes; therefore, new or revised programs and services, must submit proposed outcomes as a part of the approval process. For information purposes, Appendix A-34, describes the proposed process for establishing new or revised programs and services.