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Executive Summary

The Commission on Colleges announced that it had reaffirmed the accreditation of the University of West Florida (UWF) at its December 2005 annual meeting. In the notification letter that followed in January 2006, the Commission requested that UWF submit a First Monitoring Report. UWF’s Monitoring Report addresses the Commission’s requests pursuant to four remaining concerns out of the original six recommendations of the Visiting Committee. Having already successfully addressed two of the original six recommendations, UWF presents its responses to the remaining four. We believe that we have made substantial strides in addressing the remaining concerns, as shown in the responses below to the Commission’s four requests.

RECOMMENDATION 3

CR 2.12 (Quality Enhancement Plan)
The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan and demonstrates that the plan is part of an ongoing planning and evaluation process.

(Recommendation 3 Quoted from Visiting Committee Report)
The committee recommends that the university refine its assessment of the QEP in order to better monitor progress towards goals and objectives to include direct and indirect measures to assess improvement in the quality of student learning.

(Request Quoted from UWF Notification Letter from the President of the Commission)
Document the actual assessment strategies employed or proposed in RFPs (Requests for Proposals) accepted in the initial phase of the QEP project. Include a description of the way the RFPs were evaluated in terms of assessment content.

While the QEP itself is acceptable, and the assessment plan for evaluating RFPs in the QEP process is much improved, it is not certain that the assessment strategies within the proposals are consistent with the QEP itself.

We believe that the assessment strategies within the QEP proposals are now consistent with the QEP itself. As noted, the so-called “Exploratory Projects” underway during the Visiting Committee’s review were planned and implemented in 2004-2005.
before the Quality Enhancement Plan was thoroughly vetted and revised. As the evidence provided attests, after the QEP was focused on Project Management, significant progress was made in aligning assessment strategies within the proposals to those of the final plan. Additional alignment occurred after the initial round of regular QEP projects in 2005-2006, and the University anticipates further review and improvement as the QEP continues to be implemented. The primary method for improving alignment at this stage has been through improving both the RFP organization and accompanying template along with the rubric used by the proposal review team. As the QEP advances and matures and the results from individual project activities are analyzed, the QEP evaluation team will be able to provide even more consistency between the proposed projects and the intent of the plan.

RECOMMENDATION 4

CS 3.3.1 (Institutional Effectiveness)
The institution identifies expected outcomes for its educational programs and its administrative and educational support services; assesses whether it achieves these outcomes; and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of those results.

(Recommendation 4 Quoted from Visiting Committee Report)
The Committee recommends that the university demonstrate that it assesses outcomes for its educational programs and its administrative and educational support services and provide evidence that it uses the results for improvement.

(Request Quoted from UWF Notification Letter from the President of the Commission)
Document that the institutional effectiveness system is widely utilized and effectively shows the linkage between assessment activities and program improvements as a result of assessment. There is insufficient evidence that either the online version or the newer tabular framework of the institutional effectiveness process is widely utilized.

Each division at the University of West Florida engages in systematic institutional effectiveness efforts as documented in the response addressing actions taken with regard to the Commission’s request surrounding CS 3.3.1: Institutional Effectiveness.
Not only is the institutional effectiveness repository of information represented by UPIC in wide use but it also incorporates revised annual report formats employed by the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, designed to improve documentation of assessment and resulting improvements in decision-making. In addition to the annual reports and Notable Accomplishments reports archived on UPIC, the University’s units use a variety of appropriate mechanisms to account for their contributions to institutional effectiveness. These include but are not limited to Academic Program Reviews, Management Advisory Services, self-contained systems such as the Division of Administrative Affairs’ Assessment Plan and Outcomes, the needs assessment undergirding the University’s capital campaign Creating Great Futures, and the campus wide initiatives of Making Way for Excellence and strategic planning underway to guide UWF from 2007 through 2012.

RECOMMENDATION 5

CS 3.4.1 (All Educational Programs)
The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded (a) is approved by the faculty and administration, and (b) establishes and evaluates program and learning outcomes.

(Recommendation 5 Quoted from Visiting Committee Report)
The committee recommends that for each educational program for which academic credit is awarded the university evaluate program and learning outcomes.

(Request Quoted from UWF Notification Letter from the President of the Commission)
Demonstrate that a broad cross-section of educational programs have appropriate means to evaluate student learning outcomes. The institution might want to examine the Business and History department proposals for examples of promising evaluation techniques. Many academic programs rely heavily on grades within individual courses and on student surveys as the primary means of assessing student learning outcomes. There is little evidence of more direct measurement of student learning.

In response to recommendations surrounding CS 3.4.1, the following actions were taken to implement assessment of undergraduate degree programs: (a) Faculty
development on the rationale and methods of assessment and (b) structured activities to encourage steady progress in the development of Academic Learning Compacts, student learning outcomes, and assessment plans and in the activities of collecting and interpreting assessment data. To align undergraduate assessment efforts with the focus of the Quality Enhancement Plan (Building Communities of Learners through Active Learning and Student Engagement), departments were asked to focus assessment efforts in 2005-2006 on the assessment of project management. Departments made significant progress in the development, implementation, and use of assessment evidence in undergraduate programs. Documentation from annual reports indicates broad adoption of assessment practices in undergraduate programs. Efforts to establish ongoing collection and use of assessment data for graduate programs are underway, following a clear and specific action plan to successfully implement these assessments in 2006-2007.

RECOMMENDATION 6

CS 3.5.1 (Undergraduate Programs)
The institution identifies college-level competencies within the general education core and provides evidence that graduates have attained these competencies.

(Recommendation 6 Quoted from Visiting Committee Report)
The committee recommends that the university provide evidence that graduates have attained those college-level competencies identified in the general education core.

(Request Quoted from UWF Notification Letter from the President of the Commission)
Document the results of evaluation of general educational competencies. Include in the report examples of specific outcomes/evaluation that extend beyond course grades and student/instructor evaluations.

While the general education program has clearly defined competencies, the assessment of these competencies lacks sufficient documentation of results of assessment activities. There is an emphasis on intra-course assessment and a heavy reliance on course grades as assessment tools. The use of common rubrics, however, shows promise.
In response to recommendations surrounding CS 3.5.1, a model for assessment of General Education was adopted that combines assessments for First Year Experience, General Studies, the university diversity requirement, and co-curricular student activities in a larger organization called Academic Foundations. Academic Foundations represents the first in a series of educational experiences in which skills are introduced (General Studies and other Academic Foundations experiences), reinforced and developed (courses in the major), and brought to mastery (capstone projects). The initial stage of defining Academic Foundation domains and student learning outcomes within domains was completed in Spring, 2006. Departments have now identified General Studies courses and student learning outcomes from two Academic Foundations domains and committed to assess these in the 2006-2007 academic year. A structured plan has been established for the collection and use of assessment data for Academic Foundations, with well-defined intermediary milestones for the development of appropriate direct measures based on embedded assessments, collection of assessment data, and evaluation and use of these data.

As the full First Monitoring Report documents extensively, we believe that UWF has made significant gains in building an evidence-based culture as shown by our QEP project proposals, institutional effectiveness efforts, and educational program improvements, including General Education.
Introduction

When the Commission on Colleges reaffirmed the accreditation of the University of West Florida (UWF) at its December 2005 annual meeting, the Commission requested that UWF submit a First Monitoring Report by September 6, 2006. As required, UWF’s Monitoring Report addresses the Commission’s requests pursuant to four of the Visiting Committee’s recommendations. The requests are quoted below from the Commission’s January 5, 2006, notification letter to UWF:

**CR 2.12 (Quality Enhancement Plan), Recommendation 3**
Document the actual assessment strategies employed or proposed in RFPs (Requests for Proposals) accepted in the initial phase of the QEP project. Include a description of the way the RFPs were evaluated in terms of assessment content.

While the QEP itself is acceptable, and the assessment plan for evaluating RFPs in the QEP process is much improved, it is not certain that the assessment strategies within the proposals are consistent with the QEP itself.

**CS 3.3.1 (Institutional Effectiveness), Recommendation 4**
Document that the institutional effectiveness system is widely utilized and effectively shows the linkage between assessment activities and program improvements as a result of assessment. There is insufficient evidence that either the online version or the newer tabular framework of the institutional effectiveness system is widely utilized.

**CS 3.4.1 (All Educational Programs), Recommendation 5**
Demonstrate that a broad cross-section of educational programs have appropriate means to evaluate student learning outcomes. The institution might want to examine the Business and History department proposals for examples of promising evaluation techniques. Many academic programs rely heavily on grades within individual courses and on student surveys as the primary means of assessing student learning outcomes. There is little evidence of more direct measurement of student learning.

**CS 3.5.1 (Undergraduate Programs), Recommendation 6**
Document the results of evaluation of general educational competencies. Include in the report examples of specific outcomes/evaluation that extend beyond course grades and student/instructor evaluations.

While the general education program has clearly defined competencies, the assessment of these competencies lacks sufficient documentation of results of assessment activities. There is an emphasis on intra-course assessment and a
heavy reliance on course grades as assessment tools. The use of common rubrics, however, shows promise.

The First Monitoring Report addresses the above referenced recommendations in the order that they appeared in the report of the Visiting Committee. In the Monitoring Report document, tabs separate UWF’s response to each Commission request. As directed, for each response to a Commission request, UWF has

1) restated the number of the Core Requirement (CR) or Comprehensive Standard (CS) [and cited the text], the number of the recommendation, and the recommendation as it appeared in the Visiting Committee report

2) cited verbatim the current request of the Commission that is related to the recommendation, referencing the notification letter from the President of the Commission

3) prepared a response to the recommendation.
RECOMMENDATION 3

**CR 2.12 (Quality Enhancement Plan)**
The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan and demonstrates that the plan is part of an ongoing planning and evaluation process.

*(Recommendation 3 Quoted from Visiting Committee Report)*
The committee recommends that the university refine its assessment of the QEP in order to better monitor progress towards goals and objectives to include direct and indirect measures to assess improvement in the quality of student learning.

*(Request Quoted from UWF Notification Letter from the President of the Commission)*
Document the actual assessment strategies employed or proposed in RFPs (Requests for Proposals) accepted in the initial phase of the QEP project. Include a description of the way the RFPs were evaluated in terms of assessment content.

While the QEP itself is acceptable, and the assessment plan for evaluating RFPs in the QEP process is much improved, it is not certain that the assessment strategies within the proposals are consistent with the QEP itself.

**CR 2.12 (QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN): UWF RESPONSE TO VISITING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION 3 AND RELATED COMMISSION REQUEST**

It is important to note that at the time of the review which formed the basis for the action taken at the December 2005 meeting of the Commission on Colleges, the Visiting Committee had preliminary results from an initial set of four “Exploratory Projects.” These Exploratory Projects were created to address related, but much broader, issues that had been identified during the preparation for compliance certification and drafting of the original QEP document. As a pilot initiative, the Exploratory Projects were developed and reviewed according to the intent of the original QEP document rather than the refined and refocused final QEP document.

Based on the recommendation of the Visiting Committee, UWF revised its QEP. The revised QEP then guided the next phase of RFPs, now simply called QEP Projects instead of Exploratory Projects. The first actual QEP Projects, solicited after the QEP
was revised to focus on student learning in the Project Management domain, were reviewed and funded for 2005-2006 and included the following project titles:

- Integration of a Discovery-based Project into a Biology Course (Biology Department)
- Portfolio/Capstone Experience in History (History Department)
- University of West Florida Journal of Undergraduate Psychology Research (Psychology Department)
- Assessing Project Management Skills: Managing a Total Enterprise Simulation (Management/Management Information Systems Department)
- GPS/GIS Partnership and Implementation into Construction Surveying Course (Engineering and Computer Technology Department)

The information to follow has been organized to respond to two guiding questions. First, how are QEP project proposals being evaluated in terms of assessment content? Second, what actual assessment strategies were proposed or used in the QEP project proposal? The discussion will include a description of how the assessment content of proposals for 2005-2006 was evaluated by the review committee and how changes were made in the process for 2006-2007 proposals. Direct excerpts will be provided from both 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 proposals to document the actual assessment strategies planned in each project.
Evaluation of Proposal Assessment Content In QEP Proposals (2005-2006)

All QEP project proposals were reviewed by a subcommittee of the QEP Steering Committee with representation from all colleges and divisions. Each project was evaluated according to a rubric developed in advance and approved by the entire QEP Steering Committee. This rubric was made available to all potential submitters. Specifically, the rubric addressed the issue of project assessment in two ways: the mechanism for measuring SLOs and the procedure for formatively assessing the project in process. As evidenced in the excerpts below, the rubric provided for higher scores for projects including clearly described and feasible direct measures of student learning and a more thorough description of formative assessment driving project improvement. The full text of the 2005-2006 QEP RFP Rubric is available in Appendix A or online at https://nautical.uwf.edu/uwfsacsFiles/library/QEP_RFP_Rubric_(6-1-05).doc.

Excerpts From 2005-2006 QEP Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Outcomes assessment procedures -- How will SLOs be measured?
0 – No outcome assessment procedures are provided
1 – Some outcome assessment procedures are provided but the project focuses most heavily on indirect measures of student learning.
2 – Outcomes assessment procedures include direct measures of student learning but are described only in general terms
3 – Outcomes assessment procedures include direct measures that are clearly described and feasible

Project assessment plan -- How will the project be monitored while it is underway? If necessary, what adjustments would be feasible? How will success of the project be determined?
0 – No assessment plan is provided
1 – Project assessment discussed only in general terms
2 – Overall project assessment plan is provided but there is no indication of how data will be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes during the life of the project
3 – Project assessment plan is provided as well as descriptions of how data will be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes
during the life of the project and how data will be used to determine the overall success of the project.

**Actions Taken to Improve QEP Proposal Process**

All key elements of each proposal, including the project’s assessment plans, were assessed by a review team according to a rubric that had been developed in advance. In addition to the general description of the RFP that was provided to all interested constituents, this rubric and an annotated template based on the rubric were created and made available to faculty and staff preparing QEP project proposals. Specifically the 2005-2006 rubric gave higher point values to proposals in which outcome assessment procedures included direct measures of student learning that were clearly described and measurable. Additionally, high point values were assigned to the projects with an overall assessment plan that included descriptions of how data would be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes during the life of the project and how data would be used to determine the overall success of the project.

We believe that a number of improvements were made in the RFP documents between the 2005-2006 cycle and the current 2006-2007 cycle. Specifically in regard to assessment issues:

- Edits were made in the organization of the documents so that the two critical assessment issues (measuring student learning and assessing the overall project effectiveness) were addressed in a more logical order.

- Content edits were also made to more clearly prompt the proposal authors to consider the critical need for direct assessment measures and to reflect on how assessment results could be used for improvement both of student learning and of the project.
• Numeric weights on the rubric were adjusted to provide greater discrimination between scores, especially on critical issues such as assessment planning.

The 2006 edition of the QEP RFP and supporting documents are available in Appendix B or may be accessed at http://uwf.edu/cutla/qep.htm.

**Documentation of Actual Assessment Strategies In QEP Proposals (2005-2006)**

The 2005-2006 cycle of project proposals included strategies consistent with the intent of the revised and focused QEP. Each of the five projects listed above has generated data that have been presented to the campus community and, in some cases, other constituencies beyond the UWF community. Assessment strategies proposed and employed in the 2005-2006 approved and funded projects have been extracted and presented below. Full text of each proposal and copies of related annual symposium presentations are available at http://www.uwf.edu/cutla/qep.htm

[Note: Excerpts below are quoted verbatim from the original documents. Generally, no specific effort was made to edit or correct technical writing errors or omissions unless it was essential to improve clarity.]

**Assessment Strategies (Excerpted from the 2005-2006 QEP Project Proposals)**

• Project: Integration of a Discovery-Based Project into a Biology Course

**Outcomes assessment procedures and project assessment plan**

The written report and poster presentation will be direct measurements of the project performance. The written report will have first, second and final drafts at specified times during the semester, so that students have the chance to improve their writing and their grade. Deadlines for submission of each draft will be strictly adhered to. First draft will be returned with instructor’s comments for improvement. Second draft will be peer reviewed by two fellow students. The instructor will then grade
the final lab report. Evaluation standards of all writing will be based on a rubric that will already be posted in the syllabus. For the poster preparation, each group will first submit the outline for comments and suggestions from the instructor at a given time before the actual presentation exhibition. Each poster will be evaluated by fellow students from other groups, using a rubric posted in the course syllabus. In addition to the instructor and students of the class, the poster exhibition will be available to invited guest faculty members. Students’ and guest faculty opinions about the poster presentation will be an indirect measurement of the performance of each project and the overall exhibition.

Assessment Plan Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s) and adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilize public access database, perform data analysis, and accurately perform analytical experiments.</td>
<td>Determine whether students can utilize public access database, perform data analysis, and accurately perform experiments.</td>
<td>Direct measurement of success by correct answer to problem. Incorrect answers require remediation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop one aspect related to the significance of the gene, such as bad gene causing genetic disease, and communicate it by writing a research report. Propose a future investigation of the gene or disease.</td>
<td>Determine if students have obtained the scientific knowledge related to the inquired gene, and were able to develop a related global knowledge.</td>
<td>First draft of the paper will be returned with comments for improvement. Second draft will be peer reviewed and returned. The final revisions will earn the grade. The instructor will also have indirect measurement will be based on how much a student has improved in revising his report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</td>
<td>Assessment Plan</td>
<td>Assessment Measure(s) and adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster design and presentation</td>
<td>Determine whether students can integrate several facets of a disease provided by fellow students, and integrate that knowledge into a professional presentation. Assess the students’ ability to objectively score other work using a rubric.</td>
<td>Direct measurement of the poster presentation will be based on the group grade composed of inputs from fellow students from other groups based on a rubric posted in the course syllabus. Indirect measurement will be based on the comments from instructors, fellow students and guest faculty member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Project: Portfolio/Capstone Experience in History**

**Outcomes assessment procedures**

Assessment for the capstone portfolio comprises two steps. Upon completion, the student fills out an on-line interactive self-assessment of his/her portfolio. The student must reflect upon his/her performance and ability to manage the portfolio successfully. The self-assessment will follow a rubric that measures specific student learning outcomes within the broader areas of content knowledge, critical-thinking, communication, ethics and integrity, and project management. In the self-assessment the student has the ability to explain his/her decisions as he/she completes the portfolio. In this way, the History Capstone Experience gives insight into what the student understands, what he/she does not understand, and what instructional strategies and materials might best serve in the interest of student learning.

The faculty member then assesses both the portfolio and the student’s self-assessment. This faculty assessment will follow a rubric that parallels that of the student self-assessment. History will coordinate with [the chair of the Teacher Education department] to explore the possibility of linking “Teacher Education QEP Pilot Project SLO Assessment System” to the online annotation program, Hylighter, that is intended as the basis for the student’s self-assessment rubric.

Data from both student and faculty assessments will be used to locate areas needing improvement in the course curriculum to address deficiencies with the lower-level or general education history courses.
Project assessment plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s) [note: measures described in more detail in narrative above]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptualize, research and present a project</td>
<td>Assessment by professor, self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document sources</td>
<td>Assessment by professor, self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate Work</td>
<td>Assessment by professor, self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for successful completion</td>
<td>Assessment by professor, self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort, analyze, and interpret historical evidence</td>
<td>Assessment by professor, self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate and write in a competent manner</td>
<td>Assessment by professor, self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic integrity and ethical practices</td>
<td>Assessment by professor, self-assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Project: University of West Florida Journal of Undergraduate Psychology Research**

**Outcomes Assessment Procedures**

Like many professional journals, our journal will identify criteria for publication in the “Instructions to the Authors.” Evidence of undergraduates’ self-assessments of their performance comes from their submission letters in which they state why they believe their work meets the criteria stated in these instructions. Whether undergraduate students have achieved the learning outcomes of this project can be assessed tangentially by examining the acceptance/rejection rate of submissions to the journal. The number of revised and resubmitted papers which are eventually accepted for publication will also speak to the students’ ability to master the research process.

The outcomes obtained by the graduate students performing the editorial duties of the journal are assessed by the faculty manager who serves as the journal’s quality assurance. Graduate reviewers will be asked to evaluate manuscripts on a prescribed set of criteria, just as reviewers of peer-reviewed journals are asked to do. The managing faculty member can then periodically review the journal and check the published manuscripts against the criteria. We will evaluate how well the department is doing at engaging graduates in research projects by tracking the number of graduate students who volunteer to review manuscripts each year, the number of manuscripts reviewed, and the average number of manuscripts reviewed per reviewer.
The table below links the various student learning outcomes to their respective assessment procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. apply the steps and acquire resources required to take a research idea to completion as a published manuscript. | • Submissions of completed manuscripts to journal  
• Acceptance of manuscripts for publication |
| 2. apply the individual and group skills, knowledge, and other attributes necessary to complete each step successfully. | • Submissions of completed manuscripts to journal  
• Editorial feedback from reviewers  
• Faculty feedback to submitters  
• Feedback to reviewers and editor from faculty journal manager |
| 3. individually or in groups, manage a research project to completion as a published manuscript. | • Acceptance of manuscripts for publication  
• Successful publication of journal |
| 4. prepare a manuscript in APA style. | • Editorial feedback from reviewers  
• Acceptance of manuscripts for publication  
• Editorial feedback from reviewers |
| 5. demonstrate critical thinking about observations and conclusions in psychological research. | • Editorial feedback from reviewers  
• Acceptance of manuscripts for publication |
| 6. evaluate their project performance and recommend improvements for potential future projects. | • Submission letter (summary of how manuscript meets criteria)  
• Revised and re-submitted manuscript |
| 7. organize manuscript submissions and allocate them to appropriate reviewers, as well as track submissions throughout the review process from submission to eventual publication or rejection. | • Number of manuscripts submitted  
• Number of manuscripts reviewed per reviewer  
• Production of spreadsheet tracking process of submissions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8. review and critique manuscripts submitted by undergraduate students for possible publication in the journal | • Feedback to editor and reviewers regarding quality of their critiques  
• Number of manuscripts reviewed per reviewer  
• Editorial feedback from reviewers  
• Number of accepted manuscripts that meet quality assurance criteria as judged by faculty journal manager |
| 9. apply the steps in the publication process and the resources and skills necessary at each step | • Production of spreadsheet tracking process of submissions  
• Published journal  
• Staying within budget for maintaining resources  
• Meeting journal publication deadlines |
| 10. compose and communicate constructive critiques of manuscripts to the editor and author(s). | • Feedback to editor and reviewers regarding quality of their critiques  
• Number of manuscripts submitted  
• Number of requests for re-revisions that are re-submitted  
• Number of accepted manuscripts that meet quality assurance criteria as judged by faculty journal manager |
| 11. identify common problems within the manuscripts including problems in research design, statistics, composition, and APA style. | • Feedback to editor and reviewers regarding quality of their critiques  
• Number of accepted manuscripts that meet quality assurance criteria as judged by faculty journal manager |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12. evaluate their own editing performance and describe improvements for future editing work. | • Number of accepted manuscripts that meet quality assurance criteria as judged by faculty journal manager  
• End-of-term exit interview of editor by faculty journal manager |

**Project assessment plan**

The project’s success will be monitored in numerous ways. The faculty journal manager will monitor and assure the quality of the journal by supervising the graduate student editor. The faculty journal manager, along with the student editor, will compare the actual process of journal production against the proposed timeline. If failing to meet the timeline, the faculty journal manager will meet with the editor and reviewers to formulate necessary adjustments to bring the journal back on track for production. The number of ‘hits’ the website receives over time (after initial publication) will serve as a strong indicator that the journal is reaching the audience. The number of submissions that the journal receives is expected to grow each year and serves as an indicator of students’ growing interest in conducting and publishing quality projects. The increased number of articles accepted over time would indicate improved performance of the students in our experimental psychology and related courses. As a result of the increased practice in writing and publishing research that students receive through this journal, faculty-student collaborations (e.g., conference presentations, professional journal submissions, etc.) can be expected to increase as well. Faculty-student collaborations are already tracked by the department, so the assessment of this outcome is readily attainable. Additionally, the Psychology Department tracks the number of students that are accepted into doctoral programs. An increase in that number would also serve as an indicator of project success. Finally, the Psychology Department faculty will meet once a year to address whether implementation of the journal has led to improvements in student learning outcomes and make any necessary modifications to the journal process.

- **Project: Assessing Project Management Skills: Managing A Total Enterprise Simulation**

**Outcomes assessment procedures**

The overall project management assessment has two major components: student centered assessment and instructor centered assessment. Students will assess their teammates on all aspects of the project management process.
- There are three primary phases to the project: (a) planning, (b) process and control, and (c) producing project deliverables.
There are two tracks for the project: (a) weekly simulation decisions, and (b) written reports.

Instructors will assess the project deliverables generated by the project team. Instructor evaluated deliverables fall in two categories: simulation performance, and written reports.

Development of the actual assessment rubric is a major feature of this proposed project. Its content and structure is currently envisioned as follows:

Instructor Assessment:
- Written Reports: Instructors will evaluate the written reports based on content, critical thinking, and communication (grammar). Students will be provided with the specific grading rubric at the beginning of the simulation.
- The decisions will be based on relative performance of one team against another in the competitive environment. Financial and other performance measures will be used to calculate relative performance.

Student Assessment: An assessment rubric will be developed for students to assess their team members’ performance on such factors as: group process performance (timeliness, participation, effectiveness as a group member), completion of assigned tasks, and contribution to team reports. A draft assessment rubric is attached indicating relative weights for assessment items.

### Project assessment plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s) [note: measures described in more detail in narrative above]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team member assignments</td>
<td>Student assessment and Instructor Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule meetings</td>
<td>Student assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulate work</td>
<td>Student assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Processes</td>
<td>Student assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn in Decisions</td>
<td>Student assessment and Instructor Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Issues</td>
<td>Student assessment and Instructor Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Strategies</td>
<td>Student assessment and Instructor Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce Reports</td>
<td>Instructor Assessment and Student assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team Member Assignments: Instructor assessment will be accomplished through team completion of a position assignment form where members are assigned to positions. Students will assess the effectiveness at three points – after the fourth, eighth, and final decisions. Team members will provide feedback to their teammates and instructor at these points and behavior can be modified by underperforming students.

Schedule meetings: Students will assess the effectiveness at three points – after the fourth, eighth, and final decisions. Team members will provide feedback to their teammates and instructor at these points and behavior can be modified by underperforming students.

Regulate Work: Students will assess the effectiveness at three points – after the fourth, eighth, and final decisions. Team members will provide feedback to their teammates and instructor at these points and behavior can be modified by underperforming students.

Group processes: Students will assess the effectiveness at three points – after the fourth, eighth, and final decisions. Team members will provide feedback to their teammates and instructor at these points and behavior can be modified by underperforming students.

Turn In Decisions: Instructor will assess weekly by when decisions are submitted. Students will assess the effectiveness at three points – after the fourth, eighth, and final decisions. Team members will provide feedback to their teammates and instructor at these points and behavior can be modified by underperforming students.

Identify Issues, Develop Strategies: Instructor will assess through written reports. Students will assess the effectiveness at three points – after the fourth, eighth, and final decisions. Team members will provide feedback to their teammates and instructor at these points and behavior can be modified by underperforming students.

Produce Reports: Instructor will assess using Content, Critical Thinking and Communication rubric, providing feedback during course of semester. Students will assess the effectiveness at three points – after the fourth, eighth, and final decisions. Team members will provide feedback to their teammates and instructor at these points and behavior can be modified by underperforming students.
• **GPS/GIS Partnership and Implementation into Construction Surveying Course**

**Outcomes assessment procedures**
- Course currently consists of field work that is assessed upon completion of each class through evaluation against criteria, which ties to the Division Assessment Plan.
- Tests and practical exercises will assess the theoretical knowledge required to include:
  - Trigonometry for checking the field notes
  - How to care for and use the transit
  - Basic surveying principles
  - GPS technology – Draw relationships between triangulation and data development with the context of the Global Positioning System.
  - Application of coordinates used in construction
  - How to apply the information to a building layout (a process of establishing the corners of the new building location)
- Assessment will include project management work:
  - The grading (method of topography documentation) of the building location using transit
  - Executing the collection of GPS data
  - The method of downloading the data to a usable format – using prior course knowledge in AutoCAD.
  - Communication techniques with the end user for completion of the project

**Project assessment plan**
The ultimate test of the project’s value is the alignment of the skill sets developed under the project with the requirements of the professions for which the learners are being prepared.

Since the project intends to immerse learners in the application of a relatively new technology to the concrete objectives of the partnership organizations, instruments for measuring the satisfaction of the partners with the performance of the learners will be an essential feature of the project.

In order to facilitate this, each project component engaged in by the learner will incorporate a set of performance objectives that reflect both the course objectives in the learner’s program and the specific requirements of the partner organization. (Maybe Learners will prepare a scope of work statement that identifies specific tasks to be completed, quality standards to be observed and duration of engagement, prior to engaging in the project that is approved by both the instructor and the host partner.)
The learners working together on a project will prepare a portfolio documenting their participation in the project in the context of that scope of work. The portfolio may include written reports, video, and presentations which will be archived on the division's website for reference as case studies and learning tools.

The client (Architectural and Engineering Services) will complete a survey that assesses their satisfaction with the learner’s performance in relation to the project scope of work, and also serve as a forum for expressing concerns about specific knowledge or skill gaps, suggestions for shifts in focus of training, or the introduction of desired improvements in professional communication and interpersonal skills of the learners. The instructor will reconcile these items in a written evaluation of the learner’s performance.

The Division program coordinator will conduct an annual review of the partnership’s progress with other members of the partnership to develop strategies for improvement and to assess the success of the partnership in serving the needs of its members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archived project portfolios</td>
<td>Completion of GPS documentation and completed drawing, mapping or web-based spreadsheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner performance evaluations</td>
<td>On-line evaluations available to University partner members for continual feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of work statement</td>
<td>Reconciliation of the scope of work and the survey will provide a formal procedural assessment method for learner performance evaluations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the current year (2006-2007) two projects have been reviewed and funded and the call for proposals has been reopened with anticipated review targeted for October. The newly funded projects are:
Creating a Co-curricular Peer Education Model: The UWF Student Leadership Symposium (University Commons and Student Activities Office in partnership with Career Services Office)

Breakaway- Alternative Spring Break: Transforming Students into Active Citizens (Career Services/Volunteer UWF program unit)

[Note: Excerpts below are quoted verbatim from the original documents. Generally, no specific effort was made to edit or correct technical writing errors unless it was essential to improve clarity.]

Assessment Strategies (Excerpted from 2006-2007 QEP Project Proposals)

- **Project: Creating a Co-curricular Peer Education Model: The UWF Student Leadership Symposium**

  **Assessment Plan for the Project**
  Assessment for the project will include rubric guided observations of student behavior and performance and student reflections on their learning. Additional assessment will focus on the operational outcomes of the planned program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collect appropriate benchmarks and standards for undergraduate leadership training</td>
<td>Compare to Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) Standards for Leadership Development Programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose developmentally appropriate leadership development content material for the anticipated program audience</td>
<td>1. Compare to Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) Standards for Leadership Development Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Program participant feedback from event evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
<td>Assessment Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct instructional/learning strategies appropriate to the audience and the venue</td>
<td>1. External review by faculty or senior student affairs observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Program participant feedback from event evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an effective event planning and implementation strategy.</td>
<td>1. Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Internal review by a senior student affairs professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective team behaviors</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate effective communication skills</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on how the specific skills and knowledge gained from the experience relate to their professional preparation</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create measurable student learning outcomes for the symposium</td>
<td>Rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assessment plan reflects both direct and indirect measures and focuses primarily on the learning outcomes associated with the graduate students peer education project. Student learning outcomes and assessment for the symposium will be created and conducted by graduate students related to their activity.

- **Breakaway- Alternative Spring Break: Transforming Students into Active Citizens**

**Assessment Plan for the Project**

**Baseline Assessment:**

Use existing Breakaway- Alternative Spring Break constitution and by-laws; Volunteer UWF! and Breakaway- ASB participation and service statistics; Community Partners/ Agency Evaluations to measure student participation.
Formative Assessment:

Throughout the process of project planning and actualization, Volunteer UWF! staff, community partners and Breakaway-ASB members and site leaders will be asked to reflect on the direction of the students and the organization in relation to Breakaway- Alternative Spring Break’s mission and the QEP goals. See Appendices A-C as well as the table below.

Summative Assessment:

All student participants will evaluate the comprehensive year and the relation participation has on their individual learning associated with the QEP goals. Students will be assessed based on Volunteer UWF!’s established Student Learning Outcomes specific to Breakaway: Alternative Spring Break.

These assessment plans will measure student learning related to project management, teamwork, impact of service and Breakaway-Alternative Spring Break as a whole by assessing students, site leaders, staff, and Community Agencies. Furthermore, through these efforts assessment plans for service and related experiences will be refined which will allow a basis to be set for future assessments.

The following is the Volunteer UWF! Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures for Breakaway: Alternative Spring Break related to civic engagement, project management, professional behavior and teamwork. The existing measures allow for formative and summative assessment of student participation in Breakaway: Alternative Spring Break.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Measure or Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Report Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will explain what and how they have learned through volunteer service and service-learning.</td>
<td>Evaluated by scoring students’ description of what they have learned from the applicable experience against the “Learned through Service” rubric.</td>
<td>Evaluated at the end of each project and semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Measure or Performance Indicator</td>
<td>Report Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students will describe how they could make a difference in the world through their service experience.</td>
<td>Evaluated by scoring students’ descriptions of how they can make a difference in the world through their applicable experiences against the “Make a Difference” rubric.</td>
<td>Evaluated at the end of each project and semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students will demonstrate professional behavior during service experiences.</td>
<td>Evaluated by asking students, faculty members, Volunteer UWF! Supervisor, site supervisors, and/or agency supervisors to rate students’ professional behavior based on the “Professional Behavior” rubric.</td>
<td>Evaluated at the end of each project and semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students will demonstrate proficient teamwork and communication skills.</td>
<td>Evaluated by asking students, faculty members, Volunteer UWF! Supervisor, site supervisors and/or agency supervisors to rate students’ teamwork, and communication skills based on the “Teamwork” and “Communication” rubrics.</td>
<td>Evaluated at the end of each project and semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Measure or Performance Indicator</td>
<td>Report Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Students will make a plan to address a community need.</td>
<td>Evaluated by asking students, faculty member, and/or Volunteer UWF! Supervisor to rate students plan based on the “Planning” rubric.</td>
<td>Evaluated at the end of each project and semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students will demonstrate proficient communication skills.</td>
<td>Evaluated by asking students, faculty members, Volunteer UWF! Supervisor and/or agency supervisors to rate student's communication skills based on the “Communication” rubric.</td>
<td>Evaluated at the end of each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students will identify potential opportunities and motivation for civic engagement and responsibility in the communities in which they will likely live and work.</td>
<td>Evaluated by scoring students’ statements of potential opportunities and motivation for civic engagement and responsibility against the “Civic Engagement” rubric.</td>
<td>Evaluated at the end of each semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

In summary, we believe that the assessment strategies within the QEP proposals are now consistent with the QEP itself. As noted, the so-called “Exploratory Projects” underway during the Visiting Committee’s review were planned and implemented in 2004-2005 before the Quality Enhancement Plan was thoroughly vetted and revised. As the evidence provided above attests, after the QEP was focused on Project
Management, significant progress was made on aligning assessment strategies within the proposals to the final plan. Additional alignment occurred after the initial round of regular QEP projects in 2005-2006, and the University anticipates further review and improvement as the QEP continues. The primary method for improving alignment at this stage has been through improving both the RFP organization and accompanying template along with the rubric used by the proposal review team. As the QEP advances and matures and results from individual project activities are analyzed, the QEP evaluation team will be able to provide even more consistency between the proposed projects and the intent of the plan.
RECOMMENDATION 4
CS 3.3.1 (Institutional Effectiveness)
The institution identifies expected outcomes for its educational programs and its administrative and educational support services; assesses whether it achieves these outcomes; and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of those results.

(Recommendation 4 Quoted from Visiting Committee Report)
The Committee recommends that the university demonstrate that it assesses outcomes for its educational programs and its administrative and educational support services and provide evidence that it uses the results for improvement.

(Request Quoted from UWF Notification Letter from the President of the Commission)
Document that the institutional effectiveness system is widely utilized and effectively shows the linkage between assessment activities and program improvements as a result of assessment. There is insufficient evidence that either the online version or the newer tabular framework of the institutional effectiveness process is widely utilized.

CS 3.3.1 (INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS): UWF RESPONSE TO VISITING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION 4 AND RELATED COMMISSION REQUEST

Reconciliation of Competing Institutional Effectiveness Processes

The University Planning Information Center (UPIC) is primarily an online storage and retrieval system for archiving planning and assessment information. The system was designed to automate retrieval of information. The “newer tabular framework” referenced in the Visiting Committee’s request refers to a multi-part annual report document designed for the Academic Affairs division to facilitate reporting on outcome planning and assessment and documenting evaluative action. This form was first used by Academic Affairs for the 2004-2005 annual report cycle and has been continued, with some modification, for the 2005-2006 annual report cycle. The division of Student Affairs has adopted this format beginning with the 2005-2006 annual report cycle.

In general this format is organized into three primary parts. Part One documents the results of outcome assessment and evaluation from the year just ending. Part Two documents significant accomplishments and/or changes made, linked to unit strategic
goals, for both the unit and personnel in the unit as appropriate. Part Three documents the updated outcome assessment plan for the new year just beginning. This form is not intended to serve as a comprehensive annual operating plan but rather is intended to focus on critical outcomes selected by the unit for assessment.

Currently, UPIC remains online as the primary repository of information. The results of all divisions’ planning and assessment efforts are documented in two critical areas of UPIC: the annual report documents and the significant accomplishments documents are uploaded to the site and listed separately to facilitate ease of reporting. The efforts of each division to establish and/or improve the internal processes are described below.

**Institutional Effectiveness**

The University of West Florida organizes itself into Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Administrative Affairs, Development, and the President’s Division. The divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs most directly impact institution-wide initiatives, such as the QEP, designed to raise the quality of student learning. The evidence which follows demonstrates that both of these divisions, whose work is at the heart of quality enhancement in student learning, have made substantial progress in addressing the Commission’s request concerning CS 3.3.1 (Institutional Effectiveness). The Commission requested that UWF “Document that the institutional effectiveness system is widely utilized and effectively shows the linkage between assessment activities and program improvements as a result of assessment.” Below UWF provides evidence of the use of the “newer tabular framework” by Academic and Student Affairs. At the same time, other divisions are developing and utilizing appropriate mechanisms for accounting for their contributions to institutional effectiveness. Some divisions, such as Academic
Affairs, use multiple systematic processes leading to assessment-based improvements, examples being use of Academic Program Review and Management Advisory Services to increase institutional effectiveness as described below.

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**Academic Affairs Institutional Effectiveness Efforts**

A primary contribution of Academic Affairs to institutional effectiveness resides in assessing student learning outcomes for the University’s educational programs and using the results of these assessments to raise the bar with regard to student learning. In keeping with this, several actions have been taken which are fully described in the First Monitoring Report sections on Recommendation 5 (CS 3.4.1 related to All Educational Programs) and on Recommendation 6 (CS 3.5.1 related to Undergraduate Programs). Besides these efforts, other systematic institutional effectiveness-related actions have been taken by the Division of Academic Affairs, including Academic Program Review, Management Advisory Services, and the annual planning process.

**Actions Taken to Increase Institutional Effectiveness**

**Academic Program Review and Improvements**

In addition to assessing the student learning outcomes of academic programs and using the results for improvement, the Division of Academic Affairs engages in other systematic efforts contributing to institutional effectiveness. The Academic Program Review process furnishes a prime example. Scheduled according to the 7-year *University Program Review Plan*, approximately 15 percent of academic programs and related centers/institutes conduct program reviews each year. In 2005-2006, five academic departments and two centers/institutes conducted program reviews. One
department, Music, conducted its program review in concert with its accreditation review for reaffirmation by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

A required component of each program review final report involves citing the recommendations for improvement from the last program review and the actions taken in response. As the following list documents, improvements have been made by departments based on the outcomes of their previous program reviews.

Anthropology:

- Increased faculty lines by two to enhance the Biological and Cultural subfields of Anthropology
- Developed the Anthropology core courses for online teaching and learning to support the Maritime Studies baccalaureate program
- Acquired equipment to enhance teaching-learning experiences, including a dissecting microscope and replicas of artifacts, primate skeletons, and human skeletons.

Art:

- Following its last program review, and in part in response to legislatively mandated changes to teacher education, the Art Department faced the choice of diluting course content in the Art Education curriculum in favor of mandated courses or of abandoning the Art Education degree plan altogether.
- Showing creativity not surprising for an Art department, the faculty deleted the B.A. in Art Education but at the same time created a Minor in Art Education. This minor earned the endorsement of local school boards and the State Teacher
Certification Office and became a model disseminated throughout the Florida Higher Education Arts Network.

Government:
- Now benefits from more resources being designated to support students on graduate assistantships. In 2001, the Government program review yielded the recommendation to allocate more resources for graduate assistantships. As of 2005-2006, the UWF Office of Graduate Studies
  - Conducted analyses of graduate assistant stipends
  - Increased minimum stipend rates for the various types of graduate assistants
  - Created 62 temporary graduate assistant positions for Spring 2006
  - Allocated 59 new graduate assistantships for AY 2006-2007
- Now competes for significant additional support for graduate assistants in that the university used the results of program review along with other assessments to make improvements in graduate student support.

Psychology:
- Enhanced the undergraduate program via comprehensive curriculum revision and instituting of an undergraduate research journal (with a $5,000 QEP grant awarded for the latter)
- Developed a “Chat-n-Chew” series in lieu of a recommended but too costly colloquium series to provide an open forum for faculty to discuss research and professional activities with students and colleagues
- Implemented a database system to track graduate students’ time to degree
• Established a Health Psychology Certificate and a Cognitive Psychology Certificate embedded in the graduate degree program in order to promote a more unified focus for the graduate program across its three tracks.

Music

• Conducted an accreditation review by NASM in lieu of an internal academic program review, the format of which did not call for a discussion of improvements made by Music since its last review.

• In the self-study prepared for the review, documented a number of improvements made as a result of the appointment of a new department chair in 2006, including:
  • Requiring a minimum of three full-time faculty to be present during admission and scholarship auditions to validate admission decisions
  • Mandating that juries constitute fifty percent of students’ final semester applied grades
  • Requiring all full-time faculty to advise and monitor students’ progress to degree within their respective applied areas and to maintain currency with students’ degree requirements.
Center/Institute Reviews

Two centers/institutes conducted program review in 2005-2006. For both the Florida-China Linkage Institute and the Florida-Japan Linkage Institute, this was the first formal program review. As a result, there were no extant recommendations from prior program reviews for which related improvements could be cited.

However, as the list above documents, academic departments conducting program reviews during 2005-2006 cited improvements resulting from actions taken to address recommendations from the departments’ preceding program reviews. This systematic evidence of program review related-improvements shows that carrying out UWF’s 7-year Academic Program Review Plan contributes significantly to institutional effectiveness.

Management Advisory Services and Improvements

During 2005-2006, UWF’s senior management, including Academic Affairs, sought out the advice of the university’s internal audit operation on multiple occasions, resulting in 32 Management Advisory Services (MAS) projects. Differing from audits, Management Advisory Services usually involve developing findings, conclusions and recommendations for client consideration and decision making. Following a request from the Associate Vice President for Research, and with support from the Provost, a Management Advisory Services review was conducted and a report prepared related to the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (RSP). Given that the office had new leadership and changed circumstances due to the spin off of a large research center, it seemed an appropriate time for such a request. The review was organized around the following key questions:
• Does RSP have the right staffing, budget, and program offerings to support the needs of our research community?
• Is RSP best organized to meet current and emergent challenges and take advantage of the resources we now have available?
• What new organizational and operational strategies and policies might need to be considered that are both effective and efficient?
• How can RSP better help faculty attract more external funding?

The findings of RSP’s MAS included ways that RSP could improve planning and evaluation, systems and processes, and customer service. The fact that UWF’s Internal Auditing and Management Consulting unit conducted over 30 MAS projects during 2005-2006 and that the Academic Affairs Division took advantage of this service provides additional evidence of systematic action at UWF to increase institutional effectiveness.

**Annual Planning Process and Improvements**

The Division of Academic Affairs saw multiple changes in leadership across its various educational programs and support units during 2005-2006. New leaders included the Dean of the College of Professional Studies, Dean of Libraries, Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, Associate Vice President for Diversity and International Education and Programs, and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (and SACS Liaison). Further, the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment saw a director retirement followed by an Interim Director to complete the 2005-2006 academic year followed by the appointment of a 2006-2007 Interim Director. Even so, planning of goals and assessment of outcomes to inform and
improve decision making continued across areas having new leadership as well as those with continuing leadership in place.

In 2004-2005, the Division of Academic Affairs adopted a revised annual report format for documenting goals and related assessment to improve its educational programs and support services. For the 2005-2006 annual report cycle, Academic Affairs' academic departments and support units continued to employ the revised annual report format, with some adjustments to enhance reporting on student learning outcomes and improvements (see the Monitoring Report section on Recommendation 5, CS 3.4.1 related to All Educational Programs, and the section on Recommendation 6, CS 3.5.1, related to Undergraduate Programs). The annual reports and other documentation of systematic assessment and related improvements cited above indicate that the Division of Academic Affairs continues to build an “evidence-based culture” (Banta, 2006). The list below provides examples from several administrative and educational support services units of the Division of Academic Affairs. The examples illustrate systematic planning, assessment, and improvements reflected in the annual reports, Notable Accomplishments reports, and other follow-up reports relating to units’ goals.

Academic Technology Center

UWF’s Academic Technology Center (ATC) designers worked with over 30 faculty members in 2005-2006 to develop multiple online courses. One of the ATC’s goals is to provide means for continuous improvement for online courses, programs, and the overall support system for digitally enhanced teaching and learning. ATC uses several mechanisms for continuous improvement, including
• Having 15 UWF faculty serving as beta test reviewers for AskATC which is an online CRM (Customer Relations Management) tool providing around the clock, on-demand assistance to online teaching faculty.

• Conducting eFriday sessions that constitute walk-in services for faculty on campus needing assistance with any aspect of online learning.

• Requesting the appointment of a representative from each college to deal with ongoing issues of faculty course completions and quality.

• Continuing to implement the formative and summative online course evaluation process, including
  - Mid-course review
  - End-of-course student satisfaction survey
  - Faculty-instructional designer meetings to develop recommendations for course improvements.

Enrollment Services

Enrollment Services constitutes a wide range of functions, such as Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, and the SASS degree plan audit system. However, following two major hurricanes, recruitment and admissions gained a special focus for Enrollment Services.

• Following flat and/or declining enrollments of First Time in College (FTIC) students at UWF, analyses were conducted and a plan presented to the Board of Trustees by the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services in September 2006. The plan staked out a number of admissions related initiatives designed to increase FTIC enrollments despite sometimes negative factors over which the institution has little or no control, such as hurricanes. In addition, the Enrollment
Services Recruitment Plan was designed in keeping with Goal 2 of UWF’s strategic plan to “Attract and inspire a diverse and talented student body” while increasing overall enrollment so as to more fully utilize UWF’s capacity.

- Multiple improvements in UWF’s recruiting efforts in Fall 2006 reversed enrollment declines of the past two years in significant part via African American freshman enrollments increasing by 73% (from 69 to 109) in one year and Asian American freshman enrollments increasing by 88% (from 43 to 81).

- The Admissions unit’s expanded recruitment efforts in Alabama combined with a limited tuition differential expanded to all Alabama students for 2005-2006 led to a 28% increase in the number of FTIC applications from Alabama. This represents an improvement in access and affordability of higher education directly related to assessment of the enrollment situation and revised plans in multiple systems (UWF and two state higher education systems).

Fort Walton Beach (FWB)

A report previously submitted to UWF senior administration, entitled *Restructuring Educational Outreach at UWF*, continued to guide implementation of improvements on several related fronts at UWF’s Fort Walton Beach campus.

- The UWF Board of Trustees approved the new name UWF Emerald Coast to provide greater definition to outreach efforts to improve access to higher education east of Pensacola.

- The report further engendered a comprehensive analysis by an Emerald Campus Coast Committee developing recommendations to improve tracking of all students enrolled in outreach locations.
The goal of hiring and retaining a critical mass of full-time faculty directly assigned to FWB in order to promote the long-term improvement of its programs resulted in a total of 29 faculty now being affiliated with the UWF Emerald Coast. This represents a significant increase in overall line support compared to 3 years ago.

Graduate Studies

As a result of having new leadership in Graduate Studies in 2005-2006, many of the unit’s goals entailed formative assessment with the intent of immediate improvements. To explore ways of enhancing graduate student culture at UWF, several assessments, analyses, and plans were developed, including:

- Conducting focus groups with graduate students to assess current perceptions
- Developing and administering an online survey of graduate student needs
- Analyzing the data and developing recommendations of improved parking privileges and extended library hours
- Implemented a fall semester orientation for graduate students, the first held August 23, 2006, and attended by 70 students.

As alluded to in the section above, Academic Program Review and Improvements, the Office of Graduate Studies conducted analyses of graduate assistant stipends and made the following enhancements in/by:

- Minimum graduate assistant stipend levels
- Matriculation fee waiver amounts given to students
- Allocation of over 60 temporary graduate assistantships in spring 2006
- Allocation of almost 60 2006-2007 graduate assistantships.
International Education and Programs

Following the advent of new leadership in the Office of International Programs and Education in 2005-2006, a number of improvements have been made. Formative assessment occurred throughout the year resulting in improvements in the areas of personnel, recruitment and retention, administration, academic, outreach, and professional development. Examples of assessment-related improvements include:

- Reorganization of staff to strengthen infrastructure for educational and support services
- Complete revision of center website
- Increase in Intensive English Program enrollment by 5 percent from fall 2005 to 2006
- Completion of comprehensive audits and analyses of fiscal health of the Office of Diversity, International Center, Japan Center, Florida-China Linkage Institute, and related programs and events of International Education and Programs.
- Analyses and compilation of synopses for 70 international partnership agreements
- Facilitation of the first ever formal program reviews of the Florida China Linkage Institute and the Florida-Japan Linkage Institute.

As the foregoing examples demonstrate, the Division of Academic Affairs engages in UWF’s annual planning, evaluation, and reporting processes as an overarching systematic effort to increase institutional effectiveness. However, Academic Affairs exemplifies the evolution towards an evidence-based culture (Banta, 2006) through its multiple systematic processes leading to assessment-related improvements.
These include not only the annual planning and reporting process but also such systematic institutional effectiveness efforts as Academic Program Review and Management Advisory Services. Both of these processes have also led to improved evidence-based decision-making at UWF.

**STUDENT AFFAIRS**

**Student Affairs Institutional Effectiveness Efforts**

In January 2005 a “white paper” and accompanying Power Point presentations were created and distributed to the Student Affairs staff. This document outlined the historical underpinning of the role of Student Affairs in higher education and provided a context for Student Affairs Student Learning Outcomes. It described how a student affairs student learning outcome model that had been developed in 2004 blended local values with national models. It discussed student learning outcomes, program outcomes, and identified assessment strategies. For the purposes of Student Affairs, **program outcome** was defined to mean those operational objectives or outputs of unit programs and services. **Student learning outcome** was defined to mean what students demonstrate that they know, can do, or value as a result of participation in unit programs and services. Finally, the white paper also addressed using planning and assessment for organizational effectiveness. These documents can be found at [http://www.uwf.edu/studentaffairs/AssessmentActivities.htm](http://www.uwf.edu/studentaffairs/AssessmentActivities.htm).

**Actions Taken to Improve Institutional Effectiveness**

In August of 2005 a series of training sessions and meetings were initiated within the Student Affairs Division to introduce an outcomes focused planning and assessment model using a format adapted from Academic Affairs. All key staff were provided with a
“cascade learning kit” that provided background information and critical instructions. A
planning and assessment timeline was also provided that identified critical timing issues.
The Associate Vice President for Student Affairs met with all but three departments
(Housing, Athletics, and Childcare) to work on at least a first effort at using this new
process. The three deferred units each had substantial staffing, facility, and/or
operational challenges during the past 12 to 18 months, but each will be brought into the
revised process during the coming year.

During the months of May and June participating departments were encouraged
to work on the process of “sense making” -- evaluating collected assessment results,
spending time reflecting on what could be learned from those results, and revising
outcome plans for the coming year. This effort is documented in the completed annual
report packets submitted by departments. These annual reports were uploaded to the
UPIC website.

The evidence suggests that focused planning and assessment processes were
widely adopted by Student Affairs departments. Over 80% of the departments/units in
Student Affairs (all units except those identified above) were engaged in the process
described above during the 2005-2006 academic year. It was anticipated that all
departments within the Division of Student Affairs would state program outcomes
(defined in this context to mean anticipated outputs of program activity such as the
number of events, numbers of participants, participant satisfaction, and so forth). In
addition, several departments assert that their programs and services provide
opportunities for student learning as well as student development. These departments
also stated anticipated student learning outcomes (specific outcomes linked with more
the global division-wide student learning outcomes) and associated assessment strategies.

While there is opportunity for refining how program outcomes are identified, stated, and assessed there is compelling evidence that the participating departments did make a significant effort to work within the parameters of the planning and assessment process.

**Evidence for Implementation of Ongoing Assessments**

83% (15 of 18) identified Student Affairs units completed outcome assessment plans for 2005-2006 utilizing the planning and assessment format described above. All published plans included program outcomes and associated assessment plans. These plans can be viewed at [http://www.uwf.edu/studentaffairs/AssessmentActivities.htm](http://www.uwf.edu/studentaffairs/AssessmentActivities.htm). Units with appropriate levels and methods of student contact also provided student learning outcomes and associated assessment plans. Most student learning outcome assessment efforts were direct measures grounded in rubric based activities. Sample rubrics utilized by Student Affairs units can also be found in Appendix C and additional rubrics can be found at the site provided just above.

**Examples of Direct Measures (Extracts from Unit Annual Reports)**

- Recreation and Sports Services
  - Program Outcomes (Operational Objectives): Documentation of participation rates and numbers of classes offered
  - Student Learning Outcomes: Collaborative Work Rubric completed by supervisor (for student staff) or advisor (for student leadership position)
University Commons and Student Activities
- Program Outcomes (Operational Objectives): Documentation of the number of events offered and attendance
- Student Learning Outcomes: Communication Skills Rubric completed by supervisor (for student staff and graduate assistants)

University Testing Services
- Program Outcomes (Operational Objectives): Documentation of completed contracts/agreements with testing agencies who request access/support to provide testing services at UWF
- Student Learning Outcomes: N/A for this unit

Student Affairs Information Technology
- Program Outcomes (Operational Objectives): Documentation that all acquisitions meet or exceed UWF hardware minimum standards
- Student Learning Outcomes: N/A for this unit

Dean of Students/Judicial Affairs
- Program Outcomes (Operational Objectives): Recidivism rate for enrolled students
- Student Learning Outcomes: Interviewer [judicial staff] evaluation and review of research/reflective essays
• Counseling Center
  ▪ Program Outcomes (Operational Objectives): Documentation of client contact hours provided annually
  ▪ Student Learning Outcomes: Interpersonal Style in the Provision of Counseling rubric completed by supervisor for trainee (student)

• Career Services
  ▪ Program Outcomes (Operational Objectives): Documentation of the number of events offered, attendance, and satisfaction rates (students and employers)
  ▪ Student Learning Outcomes: Mock interview skills rubric completed by professional staff for participating students

Examples of Decisions Made Based on Initial Assessment Data (Extracts from unit Annual Reports)

• Recreation and Sports Services
  ▪ Facility Supervisors utilize revised operations manuals to orient and train new student staff
  ▪ Additional staff training is indicated for some elements of professionalism.

• University Commons and Student Activities
  ▪ Additional topics for student organization leadership and management workshops will be provided based on results of participant surveys
  ▪ Additional staff and volunteer training is indicated for a number of skill areas
• University Testing Services
  ▪ Additional training was offered related to proper test administration procedures

• Student Affairs Information Technology
  ▪ Additional effort is required for departments to update position descriptions related to IT knowledge and skill content

• Dean of Students/Judicial Affairs
  ▪ Identified need to significantly improve follow-up survey response rates

• Counseling Center
  ▪ Identified need for more effective record keeping strategy related to professional staff time on task

• Career Services
  ▪ Future workshops will incorporate more role playing and active learning
  ▪ Handout materials will be improved

**ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS**

*Administrative Affairs Institutional Effectiveness Efforts*

The Division of Administrative Affairs provides a wide range of support services contributing to institutional effectiveness. Administrative Affairs is responsible for providing efficient facilities, as well as financial and support services to the University through the units of the division. The Administrative Affairs Division gained new leadership during 2005-2006. Prior to the arrival of the new Interim Vice President, UWF Senior Administration conducted a management review of the division and identified several areas needing attention. In addition to these actions to improve the contribution
of Administrative Affairs to institutional effectiveness, in 2006 the division produced a division wide Assessment Plan and Outcomes document which can be found in Appendix D.

**Actions Taken to Improve Institutional Effectiveness**

The Division of Administrative Affairs *Assessment Plan and Outcomes* document represents a compilation of the goals and the corresponding expected outcomes of the various departments and units of the division and is directly linked to the University’s Strategic Plan located on the University Planning website. The assessment plan addresses the expected outcomes from adherence to the principles of the strategic plan and delineates the measurement of expected outcomes. It also shows the use of the data obtained and provides the resulting opportunities for improvement and/or the changes made as a result of the assessment. Evidence of improvements may be embedded in this plan or may be tied to the Notable Accomplishments and Annual Reports sections of the strategic plan posted online at the UPIC site ([http://upic.uwf.edu/strategic_planning/](http://upic.uwf.edu/strategic_planning/)).

**Evidence of Ongoing Assessments**

Although the Division of Administrative Affairs’ *Assessment Plan and Outcomes* is a recently developed document, the document provides a wide cross-sectional view of evidence of ongoing assessment in the Division of Administrative Affairs and its several units. These include Business and Auxiliary Services, Environmental Health and Safety, Facilities Services, Financial Services, Procurement Services, and University Police. 100% of the units included their respective outcome
assessment plans in the division’s Assessment Plan and Outcomes. These plans can be found in Appendix D.

*Examples of Direct Measures (Excerpts from 2006 Assessment Plan and Outcomes)*

- Business and Auxiliary Services Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  - Demonstrate increased levels of service, volume, sales, commissions, etc.
  - Compare selected indicators of performance against benchmarked organizations
- Environmental Health and Safety Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  - Conduct annual proactive Laboratory Safety Inspections in all Academic and Research Laboratories based on standards for safety.
  - Compare passed to failed maintenance inspections to discern if there is a particular trade having problems complying with the code requirements
- Facilities Services Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  - Evaluate and implement best practices and technology to continually improve each internal process, business practice, creative innovation, and customer service initiative.
  - Annually benchmark parking and transportation fees.
- Financial Services Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  - Document policies and procedures regarding expenditure of University funds.
  - Request that employees evaluate processes and make recommendations for improvements.
• Procurement Services Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  ▪ Improve training, communications and professional development for Procurement Services staff in order to maintain employee satisfaction as well as keep the National Purchasing Institute (NPI) annual award for achievement of excellence in procurement.
  ▪ The National Institute of Governmental Purchasing has recognized the excellence of UWF’s Purchasing Department by awarding it the 2006 Outstanding Agency Accreditation Achievement Award earned by a select group of only 93 organizations from a national pool of over 2,600 entities.

• University Police Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  ▪ 100% of police staff will have completed training by September 2006 in Incident Command Systems and National Incident Management Systems, a terrorism-preventive, multi-agency, response action.
  ▪ Implement community based policing style procedure for improving campus building security by Fall Semester 2006 and improve building security by 20%.

Examples of Decisions Made (or Pending as Indicated) Based on Initial Assessment Data (Excerpts from 2006 Assessment Plan and Outcomes)

• Business and Auxiliary Services Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  ▪ Bookstore operation opened at FWB campus to serve UWF students
  ▪ Installed state-of-the art microform scanners in Pace library
• Environmental Health and Safety Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  ▪ Follow up inspections are conducted and documented to ensure corrective actions have been taken as needed.
  ▪ The comparison of passed to failed maintenance inspections is used to discern if there is a particular trade having problems complying with the code requirements for appropriate work standards and to then provide training as needed.

• Facilities Services Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  ▪ Annually benchmark parking and transportation fees and propose adjustments.
  ▪ Annually update and submit the Fixed Capital Outlay Plan through the Facilities Planning Committee and the University Planning Council Process.

• Financial Services Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  ▪ Audit findings are addressed and policies and procedures adjusted as necessary to prevent recurrence.
  ▪ Dissatisfaction expressed in weekly/monthly meetings or in interaction with Financial Services employees will be investigated and addressed.

• Procurement Services Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)
  ▪ Procurement Services has been awarded the “Achievement of Excellence in Procurement” Award for 2006 by the National Purchasing Institute (NPI), making UWF one of only 52 organizations to receive this national award at least five times.
Procurement Services instituted direct linkage and access to pre-approved contracts by campus customers via the UWF portal in changing from a manual to a technology driven system.

Best in class “Green” programs at other universities will be researched to inform recommendation for formal adoption at UWF thus moving to a “Green Procurement Program.”

University Police Unit Outcomes (Operational Objectives)

- Test results from new community based policing program on selected buildings for two months will be used to improve the implementation of the plan by adding additional features and resources as needed.
- Discrepancy information will be communicated daily with identified building staff so that they can strengthen building security measures or implementation of established security protocols as needed.

DEVELOPMENT

Development Institutional Effectiveness Efforts

The following section describes the Development Division’s institutional effectiveness efforts, evidence of assessments, and decision-making informed by assessment results. The Development Division’s contribution to quality enhancement at UWF grows more critical as state support of higher education declines. Pursuant to its mission to

Enhance the quality of a UWF education by building understanding, loyalty, and support for the University’s mission among its alumni and friends, and to encourage charitable gifts in support of University priorities while providing effective stewardship of those gifts the Development Division has developed specific goals and objectives with directly associated methods of assessment as shown below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal/Objective</th>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the engagement and support of UWF alumni with a special emphasis on establishing active alumni chapters. Also, further develop alumni programs that engage and support current students, resulting in a deep connection to the University throughout their lives.</td>
<td>Track number of chapters established. Track student program participation from year to year. Track alumni giving trends. Introduction of new programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly define and communicate the University’s fundraising priorities thereby enabling the Division to pursue those priorities with a coordinated and efficient development program.</td>
<td>Assess if fundraising priorities are clearly outlined in campaign case statement and fundraising program emphasizes these priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop creative and highly effective programs: annual fund, major gifts, planned giving, and donor recognition &amp; stewardship program.</td>
<td>Number of donors. Nautilus Society members (≥$1000), Heritage Club members (planned giving), “Annual Fund” gifts (&lt;$10,000), Major gifts (≥ $10,000), and Total gifts ($).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In partnership with key Boards and volunteers, prepare for and implement a focused major fundraising campaign to address priorities of UWF.</td>
<td>Assess if Campaign concept, case statement, and priorities are endorsed by key Boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support volunteers and staff in a way that promotes loyalty, satisfaction and joy in serving the University in support of its student-centered mission.</td>
<td>Assess Staff participation in UWF committees and teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary below provides evidence of the Development Division’s extensive use of internal and external assessment and feedback to develop priorities for the University’s current capital campaign called *Creating Great Futures* and therefore to improve the design of its efforts.
Use of Assessment for Development of Campaign Fundraising Priorities (Excerpts from Report by Development Division Vice President)

Internal and external assessment was used in the development of the fundraising priorities for the Creating Great Futures Campaign. This is the first comprehensive university campaign since the mid-1990s, and the institution felt that its fundraising priorities should be established based on internal and external feedback.

In 2004, input was sought from each of UWF’s five divisions with respect to possible projects and priorities for the campaign. The key question was…what critical institutional needs may be a good fit for private support? This resulted in 27 possible projects/priorities, and the list was shared and discussed with the President’s Cabinet, the deans, and Faculty Senate. Also, the campus divisions, the Student Government Association, and the LEAD participants (a leadership development program for faculty and staff) were asked to rate the relative importance of general categories of possible fundraising initiatives, with the results shown below:
Obviously, endowed scholarships and various capital projects were judged most critical.

Next, a draft campaign case statement was developed and shared with several focus groups consisting of leading volunteers and potential major donors. Based on this feedback, the case statement was refined and used in the subsequent feasibility study.

With the assistance of a consulting firm, Bentz Whaley Flessner, a campaign feasibility study was conducted. A total of 43 potential key donors and volunteers were interviewed and asked for their opinion of UWF and for their reaction to the case statement and 27 potential fundraising priorities developed by the University. Based on this assessment, the case statement was shortened from six to two pages, and the 27 priorities were pared and consolidated into six priorities. These six priorities now form the basis for the Creating Great Futures Campaign. They are:

- Endowed Scholarships
- Health Care
- Business and Economic Development
- Science, Engineering and Technology
- Public History and Archaeology
- Arts

UWF is currently in the leadership gift phase of the Campaign. The use of internal and external assessment was critical to sharpening the case statement for the campaign and to developing focal points for the Campaign that represent both areas of internal strength and need, and of potential donor interest.

**PRESIDENT’S DIVISION**

*President’s Division Institutional Effectiveness Efforts*

The President’s Division represents a wide range of central administrative and educational support services contributing to institutional effectiveness under the aegis of the university’s chief executive officer. As a recent example of increasing institutional effectiveness, UWF’s President John Cavanaugh in his September 12, 2006, State of the University Address announced organizational changes to align budgeting and planning. Thus, effective immediately the Associate Vice President for Planning would
report directly to the President, along with the Director of Budget, already reporting to the President.

The list below provides examples from several central administrative and educational support service units of the President’s Division. The examples illustrate and document systematic planning, assessment, and improvements reflected in the annual reports, Notable Accomplishments reports, and other related reports that demonstrate evidence-based decision-making. The response below begins with two overarching efforts, based in the President’s Division, to engage the entire campus community and to increase institutional effectiveness. These initiatives comprise the Making Way for Excellence campaign and the strategic planning process for 2007 to 2012.

**Making Way for Excellence**

In 2004, under the leadership of the President, the University launched a campus wide initiative, Making Way for Excellence (MWE), to increase the quality of services and excellence of operations at the institution. Reporting to the President and Cabinet, the MWE Coordinating Committee is chaired by the heads of two units in the President’s Division: a) the Associate Vice President for Internal Auditing and Management Consulting and b) the Director of Human Resources. The ultimate goal of MWE is to build on what the university has done well and guide the organizational culture to new levels of excellence so that UWF ultimately leads the nation in areas of student satisfaction, employee satisfaction, and employee leadership development. Attuned to raising the bar for service excellence, MWE complements UWF’s QEP whose focus is Project Management as the chief means of implementing the QEP theme, Creating
Communities of Learners through Active Learning and Student Engagement. The QEP and MWE mutually reinforce UWF’s institutional effectiveness efforts.

MWE focuses on current strengths and opportunities to improve service excellence. As such, the first major step was to conduct a situational analysis to assess the current institutional culture. To that end, a consultant organization that is a nationally recognized leader in the area of organizational excellence conducted:

- An extensive Service Excellence Culture Audit™ survey
- An on-site Gap Analysis
- A review of student and faculty survey results posted online
- Focus groups with employee and with students
- Interviews with the university’s senior leaders

Analyses of these multifaceted assessments culminated in a *Situational Analysis Report*. The report was organized around identified strengths, identified opportunities, and a recommended Service and Operational Excellence Implementation Plan. The plan focuses on five key areas for improvement that emerged directly from the situational analysis:

- Create and Maintain a Great Culture
- Select and Retain Great Employees
- Commit to Service Excellence
- Continuously Develop Great Leaders
- Hardwire Success through Systems of Accountability

As a direct outgrowth of the recommended plan, UWF formed seven Service Excellence Teams. The MWE website features a matrix that identifies each MWE team and illustrates team outcomes ([http://uwf.edu/excellence/teams/outcomes.html](http://uwf.edu/excellence/teams/outcomes.html)). A
prime example includes the Leadership Development Team, which designed and launched the Employee Excellence Program. Developed by the 2005-2006 LEAD (Leadership Development and Enhancement) class, the Employee Excellence Program introduces employees to the history and culture of the University of West Florida. The program consists of a year long cycle of 11 monthly sessions. The intent of each session is to help faculty and staff feel welcome and involved in campus life and provide opportunities for campus networking. In addition, employees who complete six of the 11 sessions are given priority for acceptance into the University’s LEAD Program. Sessions are held on the third Friday of each month and are free and open to all faculty and staff. Because the program is cyclical, employees can enter the loop at any time, or catch up on missed sessions the following year. This programmatic offering is a key example of evidence-based decision making that began with MWE’s Situational Analysis Report and has come full circle with the endorsement by the President and Cabinet, and the implementation of the Employee Excellence Program beginning Fall Term 2006.

**University Planning**

UWF has taken the reaffirmation of its SACS accreditation in December 2005 as an opportune moment to initiate development of a revised University strategic plan to guide the institution through 2012. Therefore, in 2005-2006 as a revised UWF strategic planning process was launched, the Office of University Planning has provided administrative and organizational support to the University Planning Council (UPC) and an appointed Strategic Planning Facilitation Team. A small group of faculty and staff serve as the Strategic Planning Facilitation Team. This team which is leading the UPC
through a process that will culminate in a revised strategic plan includes the SACS Liaison and one of the QEP co-directors among its eight members.

To date the Strategic Planning Facilitation Team has conducted approximately 10 listening sessions and has additional sessions being scheduled. These sessions include the Pensacola and Emerald Coast campuses; faculty, staff, students, including the Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, and Student Government Association; and college councils, department chairs, and departmental faculty. A major phase of faculty involvement will begin in the first half of the fall semester when colleges and departments are asked to contribute situational analyses and articulate strategic directions for the University from their perspectives.

In the coming months, a series of web-based surveys will be administered to over 26,000 individuals including UWF’s 10,000 students; 1500 faculty and staff; and 16,000 Board members, alumni, friends, and community stakeholders. Further, the results of parallel efforts, including the Faculty Senate retreat and the Cabinet retreat, will also be blended into the planning process. These are but a few examples from the calendar that the Strategic Planning Facilitation Team has developed in behalf of the University Planning Council. As these examples make clear, the calendar lays out a highly participatory process for developing the guiding document that will be UWF’s strategic plan through 2012.

To be developed by Spring 2007, the strategic plan will articulate four to six overarching goals. As presently envisioned and based on similar plans at comparable universities, each goal will have one to five imperatives that must be met to achieve the goal. For each goal and imperative, the document will assign responsibility and accountability to appropriate divisions, programs, and services of the University. Finally,
divisions, programs, and service units will each develop action plans spelling out their respective and collective contributions to achieving the institution’s agreed-upon overarching strategic goals. The revised strategic planning process will further the evolution of an evidence-based culture (Banta, 2006) and provide for systematic and cyclical assessment of outcomes and use of the results to inform and improve decision-making at UWF.

**Office of University Budgets**

The Office of University Budgets continues efforts to improve and refine the University’s budgeting process by providing the Board of Trustees, the President, and Vice Presidents with comprehensive information ensuring transparency for evidence-based decision-making. Budget Office 2005-2006 accomplishments towards this continuous improvement goal include:

- Appointment of a new Director of Budgets following a national search
- Relocation of the Budget Office placing it in closer proximity to related campus financial and human resources services thereby better serving campus constituents
- Improved office procedures to reduce response times to inquiries and issues
- Presentation of new reports to the Board of Trustees which are easier to understand and which promote transparency
- Staff participation in professional development to remain leaders knowledgeable of contemporary technology, regulatory requirements, and financial best practices, thereby providing continued improvements in the overall financial well-being of the campus.
Office of the General Counsel

The Office of the General Counsel, despite having its Associate General Counsel position vacant and in the process of being filled, contributed in many ways to institutional effectiveness as follows:

- Successfully concluded United Faculty of Florida and Police Benevolent Association collective bargaining agreements with the University, providing the first bargaining agreements negotiated locally, following devolution from oversight by a State Board of Regents to a local Board of Trustees
- Provided orientation to the Board of Trustees concerning sunshine laws, ethics, reporting, and voting issues
- Reviewed and assisted in negotiation of several partnership agreements to expand UWF outreach facilities and programs
- Contributed to the revision and promulgation of the revised regulation related to the Student Code of Conduct.

Human Resources

Human Resources' contributions to institutional effectiveness include numerous accomplishments. Perhaps chief among them was Human Resources' implementation of a more rigorous, evidence-based Performance Management structure that includes an enhanced:

- Staff employee performance evaluation process
- Pay for performance opportunity
- Career progression component
The campus was provided related training via

- Conducting of campus wide training on components of Pay for Performance for University Work Force employees and implemented resultant salary increases
- Offering of 12 specialized training sessions on the Career Enhancement progression Plan for 246 employee participants

The implementation and training significantly enhanced the ability of managers to use the employee evaluation system to distinguish among performance levels, significantly reducing what is colloquially known as Lake Wobegon effects.

**Information Technology Services**

At UWF Information Technology Services (ITS) provides central support services for information technology in areas including academic computing, administrative computing, information technology infrastructure, web information services, training, documentation, networking and telecommunications, classroom technology, computer labs, and help desk services. As such, ITS affects every other unit in the University. In light of this, ITS has instituted a number of efforts to increase its effectiveness and responsiveness to the campus. Examples of evidence-based decision-making by ITS include:

- Conducting an assessment of priorities for computer lab upgrades in consultation with the academic deans and carrying these out following the Provost’s approval
- Assessment of eClassroom service using the following metrics
  - Percentage of classrooms equipped at target technology level
- Frequency of help desk trouble calls and work orders related to classroom technology issues
- Alignment of classroom capabilities with Academic Technology Center goals
- Completion of annual update of eClassroom standards
- Annual customer satisfaction survey of instructors using eClassrooms

- Piloting the eDesktop system with approximately 10 instructors in fall 2006
- Forming a Web Advisory Team and Web Advisory Committee in spring 2006 to improve the University’s web presence
- Collaborating with the Office of University Budgets to develop new and improved budget reports
- Piloting the use of activity-code level budget tracking in the ERP – Banner system
- Using staff surveys and focus groups as well as establishing a Staff Council in ITS to improve the effectiveness of efforts.

Internal Auditing and Management Consulting

As indicated in the section above entitled “Management Advisory Services and Improvements,” UWF’s Internal Auditing and Management Consulting conducted over 30 Management Advisory Services (MAS) projects during 2005-2006. The year presented numerous challenges to the office given that it remained focused on the hurricane recovery process by coordinating all filings with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the State Department of Risk Management. Spending almost 50 percent of its time and resources on hurricane recovery, the internal
audit operations nevertheless spent the next largest amount of its time and resources on MAS projects. The fact that the office was called upon to conduct 32 MAS projects in 2005-2006 indicates that it is viewed as a tool for institutional effectiveness and improvement rather than merely as a fault finder. MAS projects included serving on interdivisional task forces; researching policies, rules, and regulations; providing technology assistance; evaluating workflow processes; and assessing the efforts of UWF’s direct support organizations (DSOs) (as opposed to state supported organizations). As a key indicator of the esteem in which she is held for her leadership, Betsy Bowers, UWF’s Associate Vice President for Internal Auditing and Management Consulting was named International President of the Association of College and University Auditors in 2005-2006.

As the foregoing examples document, the President’s Division engages in UWF’s strategic and annual planning, evaluation, and reporting processes and in so doing contributes to the institutional effectiveness of the University of West Florida.

Summary

In all, every division at the University of West Florida engages in systematic institutional effectiveness efforts as documented in the forgoing response addressing actions taken with regard to the Commission’s request surrounding CS 3.3.1: Institutional Effectiveness. Not only is the institutional effectiveness repository of information represented by UPIC in wide use but it also incorporates revised annual report formats employed by the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, designed to improve documentation of assessment and resulting improvements in decision-making. In addition to the annual reports and Notable Accomplishments
reports archived on UPIC, the University’s units use a variety of appropriate mechanisms to account for their contributions to institutional effectiveness. These include but are not limited to Academic Program Reviews, Management Advisory Services, self-contained systems such as the Division of Administrative Affairs’ Assessment Plan and Outcomes, the needs assessment undergirding the University’s capital campaign *Creating Great Futures*, and, indeed, the actions underway to develop UWF’s revised strategic plan for 2007-2012.
RECOMMENDATION 5

CS 3.4.1 (All Educational Programs)
The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded (a) is approved by the faculty and administration, and (b) establishes and evaluates program and learning outcomes.

(Recommendation 5 Quoted from Visiting Committee Report)
The committee recommends that for each educational program for which academic credit is awarded the university evaluate program and learning outcomes.

(Request Quoted from UWF Notification Letter from the President of the Commission)
Demonstrate that a broad cross-section of educational programs have appropriate means to evaluate student learning outcomes. The institution might want to examine the Business and History department proposals for examples of promising evaluation techniques. Many academic programs rely heavily on grades within individual courses and on student surveys as the primary means of assessing student learning outcomes. There is little evidence of more direct measurement of student learning.

CS 3.4.1 (ALL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS): UWF RESPONSE TO VISITING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION 3 AND RELATED COMMISSION REQUEST

Rationale for the Decision to Focus on Project Management

Among other elements, the principles of good practice for assessment (Huba & Freed, 2000; Rogers, 2006; Suskie, 2004; Walvoord, 2005) state that assessment should focus on questions that are immediately relevant to student learning and the goals of the institution, be ongoing rather than episodic, and be sustainable over the long run. Suskie (2005) and Rogers (2006) suggest that this simplicity is achieved by focusing assessment efforts on a few goals in any given year, making use of embedded assessments, limiting the volume of data collected, and staggering the assessment of different student learning outcomes over time.

This advice was taken to heart in the development and implementation of assessment of student learning at the University of West Florida. Faculty development of expertise in assessment practices was expected to require a commitment of time and
resources as would the creation of assessment methods, collection and interpretation of assessment data, and development and implementation of changes in teaching strategies and/or curriculum based on assessment evidence. To keep this process manageable and sustainable, a decision was made to focus on Project Management in the first cycle of assessment. This decision was motivated by the desire to integrate assessment efforts with the spirit of the Quality Enhancement Plan (Building Communities of Learners Through Active Learning and Student Engagement) and capture a distinctive quality of the educational experience and student learning at the University of West Florida. An added benefit gained by focusing on Project Management was that successful project management implicitly captures student learning in the domains of content, communication, critical thinking, and integrity/values.

**Documentation of Assessment Activities in Department Annual Reports**

A matrix documenting the assessment activities for all undergraduate programs is presented in Appendix E. Although the focus of assessment activities for undergraduate programs was directed at the assessment of the project management domain, many departments chose to assess additional domains. These additional assessment activities for Academic Learning Compacts\(^1\) are noted in the matrix for each department. The detailed information about assessments presented in this matrix is

---

\(^1\) Academic Learning Compacts are a mandate of the Board of Governors of the State of Florida. All departments are required by the Board of Governors to identify student learning outcomes under each of 3 areas of competency (domains) for every undergraduate degree program: Content, Communication, Critical Thinking. The University of West Florida chose to add two additional domains to this list: Integrity/Values and Project Management. Departments could choose to include a sixth domain that identified a niche competency associated with a specific undergraduate program. For example, Chemistry identified Hazard/Risk Management as a sixth domain.
comprised of the following items extracted from annual reports submitted by
departments: description of the assessment method used for project management,
summary of assessment data collected and descriptions of the use of these data for
program improvement, and evaluation of the assessment methods. The reader is
directed to a more comprehensive matrix that presents information extracted from
annual reports about a variety of assessment activities, including assessment activities
for General Education, undergraduate programs, and graduate programs, which may be
found on the CUTLA web site at the following URL:
https://nautical.uwf.edu/uwfscsFiles/library/Assessment_Summaries_Annual_Report_2
006_ (8-7-2006).xls. This comprehensive matrix was a document developed primarily for
the extraction and summary of assessment information from annual reports for use in
preparing this monitoring report. This matrix is too large to be included as appendix
material in this report. However, this matrix provides information about all the
assessment activity that took place across all departments in the three colleges for all
educational programs during 2005-2006.

In summary, the actions taken to implement assessment of undergraduate
degree programs (described in the next section) entailed two related lines of activity: (a)
faculty development on the rationale and methods of assessment and (b) structured
activities to encourage steady progress in the development of Academic Learning
Compacts, student learning outcomes, and assessment plans and in the activities of
collecting and interpreting assessment data.


**UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS**

*Undergraduate Program Assessments: Actions Taken*

Several workshops were provided by the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment to help faculty develop suitable rubrics and identify direct measures for the assessment plans of their departments.

- October 25, 2005: Creating Rubrics for Grading Curriculum and Assessment
- February 14 & 15, 2006: Curriculum Assessment: Creating Direct and Indirect Assessments
- March 7 & 8, 2006: Curriculum Assessment: Selecting Multiple Assessments for an Assessment Plan

Departments were strongly encouraged to make use of embedded assessments so as to make the best use of resources to obtain reliable measures of student learning.

Dr. Barbara Walvoord, nationally noted author and consultant on assessment of student learning, visited campus in April 2006 to conduct a two-day workshop on planning assessments for Academic Foundations (for assessment of General Studies) that emphasized assessments based on the use of rubrics to evaluate embedded course assignments.

Departments reported progress on assessment of student learning in undergraduate programs, graduate programs, and General Education (referred to as General Studies at UWF) in their annual reports.

*Undergraduate Program Assessment Information Requested in Annual Report*

- Documentation that Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) with Student Learning Outcomes were posted to the web
• Identification of the ALC domain(s) and Student Learning Outcome(s) used to illustrate assessment efforts for the current year
• Description of the method of assessment used
• Presentation of a summary of assessment results
• Description of the use of assessment information used to make decisions about program changes and improvements
• Description of changes that will be made in student learning outcomes or assessment plans as the result of what the department learned from this year’s assessment efforts
• Identification of domain(s) to be examined in assessments conducted in the following year
• Identification of assessment questions to be addressed in the following year

Evidence for Implementation of Ongoing Assessments

For the 2006 annual report, 91% (42) of the 46 undergraduate programs (all but 4 programs) submitted reports in which they documented their creation of an Academic Learning Compact document and provided a brief summary of their assessment plan. Among the Academic Learning Compacts posted to the CUTLA web site (http://uwf.edu/cutla/ALC/compacts.html), 59% (27) are complete and 41% (19) require updating to include information about the assessment plan. Direct measures of student learning based on measures other than grades on courses or assignments were reported by 72% (33) of undergraduate programs (10 additional programs reported assessments that might have been direct measures, but the description provided did not clearly indicate that these measures differed significantly from grades).
To encourage departments to think about assessment as a cyclic process, the annual report request asked departments to identify the domain(s) that would be assessed in the upcoming year and to identify a question about their curriculum or student learning that would be addressed by the next cycle of assessment. In the annual reports, 76% (35) of the programs identified a domain for assessment for the 2006-2007 academic year and 50% (23) of the programs described a specific assessment question that they intended to address in the next cycle.

Many departments submitted thoughtful discussions of assessment and student learning in these annual reports. Overall, 74% (34) of the programs described explicit plans to make specific changes to teaching strategies (modifying syllabi, revising rubrics, spending more class time on specific topics or skills) or curriculum changes (creation of capstone courses or other courses to meet specific instructional needs), while 35% (16) of the programs were not satisfied with the quality of data generated by their assessment methods and described plans to improve their assessment methods in the next year.

Selected Examples of Direct Measures (Excerpts Quoted Verbatim from Department Annual Reports)

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Chemistry: Rubric for evaluating student work in embedded assignments
Electrical & Computer Engineering: Samples of student work; portfolio in targeted courses; Academic competitions; Fundamentals of Engineering Exam
History: Rubric instructor evaluation of paper in capstone course
Medical Technology / Program in Clinical Laboratory Studies: National Board Certification Exam; ASCP [American Society for Clinical Pathologists] Board of Registry; Assess use of lab info systems and communication skills during clinical rotations [embedded assignments]; simulated exercises in lab management; grad performance in job placement after graduation
Music: Capstone experience; jury exams; advancement exam
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
Management / MIS: evaluate an embedded assignment (case study)

COLLEGE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES
Criminal Justice / Legal Studies: 2 embedded assignments in Research Design evaluated with a rubric; Faculty assessment (as a group) of student's progress toward completion of research design work/quality of work (minutes kept of meeting)

Samples of rubrics used for direct measures based on embedded course assignments are included in Appendix F.

Examples of Decisions Made Based on Initial Assessment Data (Excerpts from Department Annual Reports)

College of Arts and Sciences
Chemistry: Instructors for these courses are planning to include additional lecture time to improve the student’s abilities in the areas outlined above. In addition, some of the content and skills being assessed by these tools should have been learned by students in previous chemistry coursework. Therefore, instructors in the prior courses will also be adding some additional emphasis on the materials related to these topics.

Computer Science: Further develop software written, develop new protocols. Final projects may need 50% more time than currently allotted. Further develop time estimate and timesheet templates for the students. Need to plan to capture enhancements to the PM [Project Management] outcomes in future assessments.

Electrical & Computer Engineering: In order to improve the professional skills and formalize incorporation of engineering standards and constraints, the department has initiated two sequence senior design courses (EGN 4xx1 & EGN 4xx2), effective fall 2006 or 2007 depending on the completion of the CCR [Curriculum Change Request] review process

History: Based on preliminary data from all five domains, which demonstrate some difficulties with written and verbal communication, critical thinking skills, and project management, the History Department will focus on the latter, which encompasses components of the other two. The Department will emphasize project management in 3000/4000-level history courses, with foundation work coming in HIS 3002 Research Methods. Evaluation of Assessments: In 06-07, all graduating seniors will be asked to assemble and maintain a portfolio of their best work completed as part of a 3000/4000 in 06-07. History will create a packet to mail out to graduating seniors with assessment rubrics for student and professor, a contract between student and professor, and an exit
interview. A committee will evaluate materials, with special attention to project management, and recommend changes.

**Medical Technology / Program in Clinical Laboratory Studies:** Our Program scores in certain sub-content areas are below national means. Need to increase the number of computer administered comprehensive /self assessment exams in preparation for the national Board certification exams. Increase the number of case studies and other critical thinking and decision making exercises in course work. Plan for improvement: practice talk in advance of the presentation to be made in front of a small group of peers. Designed a rubric for peer review. The following components will be strengthened in the clinical year curriculum: Financial, operational, marketing and human resource management of the clinical laboratory to offer cost-effective, high quality, value-added laboratory services. 2006-2007 QEP Plan: In the course MLS 4705 Special Clinical Topics achievement of SLOs in Integrity and Values will be assessed through a rubric specifically designed to evaluate student learning in this area. Lab safety information needs to be continuously updated. Practice of safety methods is to be enforced in the laboratory at all times.

**Music:** Addition of new literature courses per NASM [National Association of Schools of Music] standards. The addition of applied area studio classes. New policy guidelines for Recital Cancellation. The addition of a full-time staff accompanist. The addition of ensemble handbooks.

**College of Business Management / MIS:** Instructors of the course continue to adjust pedagogy to help students overcome this problem. Several deficiencies were found in written communications. Interventions will be planned with the English department to improve student grammar skills.

**College of Professional Studies Criminal Justice / Legal Studies:** In one faculty meeting, CCJ4700 professors reported student scores to their colleagues. In this faculty meeting, CCJ4700 professors shared their evaluations of written assignments and strategies for encouraging more thoughtful written discussion, as well as strategies for improving content retention and critical thinking. Further, CCJ4700 professors reported student responses to their colleagues on the following: application of classroom knowledge of research methodology and vocabulary, develop effective writing skills, develop effective communication skills, translate theory into practice, explore patterns and relationships in order to compare/contrast information, analyze the merit of each research design from the standpoint of qualitative and quantitative measures.

Samples of data obtained from departmental assessments are presented in Appendix G.
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Graduate Program Assessments: Actions Taken

In 2005-2006, departments offering graduate programs adopted a strategy similar to that taken for identifying domains of student competencies and associated student learning outcomes used to develop Academic Learning Compacts for undergraduate programs. These competencies and assessment plans were summarized in a document known as an Academic Learning Plan. Collection and evaluation of assessment data for graduate programs will begin in 2006-2007.

Departments reported progress on the development of Academic Learning Plans and assessment of student learning in graduate program in the 2005-2006 annual report.

Graduate Program Assessment Information Requested in the Annual Report

- Submit an electronic copy of the Academic Learning Plan (ALP), including assessment strategy.

Evidence for Implementation of Ongoing Assessments

In the 2006 annual report, 78% (14) of the 18 programs that are not part of Teacher Education submitted Academic Learning Plans and described assessment plans. Of these, 10 Academic Learning Plans have been posted to the CUTLA web site (http://uwf.edu/cutla/alp.html). Remaining ALPs are undergoing final editing before posting.

Teacher Education submitted Academic Learning Plans for 100% (25) of their graduate programs. These ALPs will be posted to the CUTLA web site following a final review and edit process.
**Action Plan**

Plans are underway to assist departments with graduate programs with the refinement of assessment plans, including the development of appropriate direct measures. A meeting was held with department chairs on September 13, 2006. The chairs of departments with graduate programs requested an additional meeting (November 1) to reconvene and discuss their progress with the development of rubrics for assessing theses and other capstone experiences (planned for the spring 2007 term). Thesis and Internship Portfolios should provide an effective mechanism for the development of direct assessments. The Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment will provide departmental consultations on the development of rubrics for use in assessment of student learning outcomes evidenced in these documents. A TIP Sheet was prepared and posted to the CUTLA web site to provide information and guidance about the development of assessments for graduate programs, with a sample rubric for assessment of student learning documented in a thesis.

**Schedule for Accomplishing Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2006</td>
<td>Department chairs from departments that offer graduate degree program and their assessment liaisons will convene with the Interim Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (Dr. Claudia Stanny) to discuss the development of assessments for Theses and Internship Portfolios. Other direct measures such as licensure exams will be explored. Minutes will be kept of this meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2006</td>
<td>As needed, the Interim Director of CUTLA will schedule individual meetings with department chairs to refine the assessment methods for their department. Minutes will be kept of these meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2006</td>
<td>Department chairs and their assessment liaisons will convene with the Interim Director of CUTLA to give a status report on their progress in finalizing ALPs and developing rubrics or other direct assessment methods for student learning in graduate programs. Minute will be kept of this meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January, 2007
Department chairs or their assessment liaison/assessment committee chair will submit copies of their assessment plans and associated rubrics to the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment no later than January 19, 2007. All graduate ALPs, including assessment plan summaries, will be updated and posted to the CUTLA web site.

June, 2007
Department Chairs will include information in their annual report which will summarize assessment evidence for graduate programs, evaluate the assessment methods used, and describe the use of assessment evidence for curriculum decisions or improvement of student learning in graduate programs. The cyclic nature of assessment will be reinforced by requesting that departments describe their target questions for assessments in the upcoming year.

Evidence of Resources Allocated to Accomplish the Action Plan

The Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment will direct a substantial part of its resources toward offering in-house workshops and identifying external consultants who can provide workshops on assessment, development and use of rubrics, and active learning strategies. The Interim Director for the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment organized meetings with departments that offer graduate program during Fall, 2006, and structured reporting activities to encourage and support the collection and use of assessment data for graduate programs (described above in the action plan). Portions of the CUTLA budget will be directed toward the expenses associated with these workshops and the fees of external consultants for additional workshops. Additional support will be requested from respective Colleges and the Division of Academic Affairs as needed.

Summary

In response to recommendations surrounding CS 3.4.1 (All Educational Programs), the following actions were taken to implement assessment of undergraduate degree programs: (a) Faculty development on the rationale and methods of assessment
and (b) structured activities to encourage steady progress in the development of
Academic Learning Compacts, student learning outcomes, and assessment plans and in
the activities of collecting and interpreting assessment data. To align undergraduate
assessment efforts with the focus of the Quality Enhancement Plan (Building
Communities of Learners Through Active Learning and Student Engagement),
departments were asked to focus assessment efforts in 2005-2006 on the assessment
of project management. Departments made significant progress in the development,
implementation, and use of assessment evidence in undergraduate programs.
Documentation from annual reports indicates broad adoption of assessment practices in
undergraduate programs. Efforts to establish ongoing collection and use of assessment
data for graduate programs are underway, following a clear and specific action plan to
successfully implement these assessments in 2006-2007.
RECOMMENDATION 6

CS 3.5.1 (Undergraduate Programs)
The institution identifies college-level competencies within the general education core and provides evidence that graduates have attained these competencies.

(Recommendation 6 Quoted from Visiting Committee Report)
The committee recommends that the university provide evidence that graduates have attained those college-level competencies identified in the general education core.

(Request Quoted from UWF Notification Letter from the President of the Commission)
Document the results of evaluation of general educational competencies. Include in the report examples of specific outcomes/evaluation that extend beyond course grades and student/instructor evaluations.

While the general education program has clearly defined competencies, the assessment of these competencies lacks sufficient documentation of results of assessment activities. There is an emphasis on intra-course assessment and a heavy reliance on course grades as assessment tools. The use of common rubrics, however, shows promise.

CS 3.5.1 (UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS): UWF RESPONSE TO VISITING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION 3 AND RELATED COMMISSION REQUEST

Rationale for Assessment of General Education

Academic Foundations is comprised of First Year Experience, General Studies (UWF refers to its general education curriculum as General Studies), the university diversity requirement, and co-curricular student activities. Integrating General Studies with these other educational experiences in a larger organization called Academic Foundations captures the spirit of the Quality Enhancement Plan, which acknowledges the value of learning associated with co-curricular activities. Academic Foundations represents the first in a series of educational experiences in which skills are introduced (General Studies and other Academic Foundations experiences), reinforced and developed (courses in the major), and brought to mastery (capstone projects). Academic Foundations is intended to establish basic skills that will prepare students for the more sophisticated learning experiences they will encounter in courses in their major. The
student learning outcomes associated with Academic Foundations include engaging in an appropriate orientation to academic life; demonstrating development of skill in communication, critical thinking, ethical reasoning and project management; and behaving in a manner that demonstrates integrity. Thus, the overarching goal of Academic Foundations is to establish the initial stages of student learning that will be reinforced and developed when students begin work on courses associated with their major.

The student learning outcomes for Academic Foundations are organized into four ability domains (Critical Thinking, Communication, Values/Integrity, and Project Management) that parallel the Academic Learning Compacts for undergraduate degree programs. Based on advice from our consultant, Barbara Walvoord, the “content” domain that is part of the assessment plan for degree programs (i.e., Academic Learning Compacts) was not included in the assessment plan for Academic Foundations. The multiple avenues that students take through their first two years of higher education discourage measurement strategies that address content; common content across the variety of courses that contribute to General Studies would be difficult to target and might produce more uniformity in the structure of the General Studies curriculum than would be desirable for a university curriculum. However, instructors in their individual courses still have responsibility for content-related student learning outcomes, a responsibility reinforced by the Academic Learning Compacts.

The four domains for Academic Foundations and the student learning outcomes within each domain are represented in the matrix provided below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL THINKING</th>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>VALUES/INTEGRITY</th>
<th>PROJECT MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis/Evaluation</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Academic Integrity</td>
<td>Project Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Personal/Cultural Values</td>
<td>Self-Regulation (deadline skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td>Team Work Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>Tech/Visual Literacy</td>
<td>Diversity Skills</td>
<td>Service Learning/ Civic Engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic departments that contribute one or more courses to the General Studies curriculum made a commitment to collect data on student learning outcomes from a minimum of two of the 16 outcome areas represented in the 4 x 4 grid areas of the matrix. Each department identified one student learning outcome from a “primary” Academic Foundations Domain shared by other departments in the same General Studies distribution area (e.g., Natural Science, Social Science). The Academic Foundations Domains identified for the each of the five major distribution areas are listed in the table below. The number of semester hours required for each distribution area and the types of courses that are included in this area are also listed. Thus, as students complete courses to meet requirements for each distribution area, they will encounter learning activities and assessments in all four Academic Foundation Domains. In addition, departments identified a second SLO for assessment in their General Studies course(s), which could be from either the same domain or any other domain in the matrix.
DISTRIBUTION AREAS FOR GENERAL STUDIES AND ACADEMIC FOUNDATION DOMAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution Area</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Academic Foundation Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6 sh</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Communication (Writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>6 sh</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Communication (Quantitative Literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>9 sh</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>8-9 sh</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>7 sh</td>
<td>Bio/Chem/Phys/ES</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This strategy is expected to provide assessments that will be distributed across the matrix for students who complete the required distribution of General Studies courses. By completing the distribution requirements for General Studies, students get substantial practice across all of the four primary domains. Incorporating a secondary domain then provides additional and appropriate practice in a given SLO area as that SLO is defined in a variety of disciplines. For example, a student may be assessed on ethical reasoning as defined in Philosophy (e.g., reasoning about ethical dilemmas) and in Psychology (e.g., ethical issues surrounding use of research participants). The initial stage of defining Academic Foundation domains and student learning outcomes within domains was completed in Spring, 2006. The collection and use of assessment data for Academic Foundations/General Studies will occur in the 2006-2007 academic year.

Information about specific commitments made by individual departments to collect assessment data on student learning outcomes in General Studies courses is presented in the Summary of Assessment Plans for General Education / Academic Foundations Described in Annual Reports (2005-2006), presented in Appendix H. This
matrix describes the two student learning outcomes that each department agreed to assess in the Fall Term, 2006, a description of the method of assessment that will be used, and information from departments that collected assessment data during 2005-2006. While the above-described distributed assessment of General Studies student learning outcomes is taking place, departments continue to assess student content learning in all undergraduate courses to insure that all core competencies are addressed and to determine the extent to which students attain core competencies in their respective baccalaureate programs.

**Actions Taken**

Departments that offer one or more courses in the General Studies curriculum met and identified four Student Learning Outcomes in each of four Academic Foundation Domains (Critical Thinking, Communication, Integrity/Values, and Project Management). Each department was asked to identify student learning outcomes in two domains for which it would develop and collect assessment data in the Fall 2006 semester.

Dr. Barbara Walvoord visited campus April 13 & 14, 2006 to conduct a two-day workshop on planning assessments for Academic Foundations (for assessment of General Studies). Special emphasis was given to the use of rubrics and embedded assessments as a means to obtain direct measures of student learning.

Departments reported progress on assessment of student learning in undergraduate programs, graduate programs, and General Education in the 2005-2006 annual reports.
General Education Assessment Information Requested in Annual Report

- Describe the two domains that the department agreed to measure as its contribution to Academic Foundations
- Speculate about how the department will begin gathering data on those outcomes in the fall semester

Evidence of Progress in Implementation of General Education Assessment

There are 18 departments that contribute one or more courses to the General Studies curriculum. In their annual reports, 83% (15) of the departments identified at least one domain or student learning outcome for assessment in the Fall Term, 2006. In addition, 72% (13) of the departments reported plans for assessment of outcomes in their selected domains. Of these, all but one department described plans to use a form of embedded assessment consisting of assignments or projects in which student learning outcomes relevant to the assessment domain would be evaluated. Assessment methods included rubrics for evaluating student work or data based on responses to selected questions from objective exams or quizzes. Two additional departments identified domains but were still in the process of clarifying their assessment procedures, with clear plans to engage in data collection in 2006-2007.

Examples of Direct Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (Excerpts from Department Annual Reports)

History: This summer, Dr. Matt Clavin has experimented with two methods of assessing critical thinking--online quizzes (pre and post lecture with interpretive questions that were automatically graded) and document analyses--in AMH 2020 U.S. History Since 1877. The first, online quizzes, proved unfeasible due to limitations of the web-based product used and the second unfeasible due to time requirements and the inability to produce quantitative data. In the analyses of four historical documents over six weeks, students demonstrated improvement in their
critical thinking skills, but the measure proved very time consuming to grade and hard to quantify; it does not appear to be a strategy likely to be embraced by all faculty teaching surveys. History continues to experiment with measuring this domain in an efficient and effective manner. History will explore with Ms. Melissa Finley, Associate Librarian extraordinaire, the possibility of developing a freshman/sophomore-level tutorial/exercise on information literacy.

**Mathematics & Statistics:** A uniform, comprehensive final exam is the method of assessment. The final exam contains questions that address directly the specified student learning outcomes, upon which a uniform syllabus is formulated.

**Music:** The Department of Music forged forward with assessment data of all three General Education course offerings this Spring, 2006. The Chair met with the three faculty members associated with these courses agreeing upon the rubric, the two domains, and sub-domains. Though the subject matter and course delivery are very different with each course, we were able to utilize objective multiple choice testing identifying specific test questions that would supply the assessment data. Provided below are two detailed assessment reports from the Department of Music.

1. **Brief description of the Basis of Performance:** The questions from the mid-term exam and the final exam. Because these are online exams multiple choice and true false questions were used. Therefore, the students either meet the expectation or fail to meet the expectation. It is impossible to judge if they exceed the expectation with multiple choice and true false questions.

2. **Brief Description of Basis of Performance:** On-line multiple choice quizzes and exams dealing with the special issues of the History of Western Music were utilized to provide the assessment data. Therefore, the students either meet the expectation or fail to meet the expectation. It is impossible to judge if they exceed the expectation with multiple choice questions.

**Action Plan**

Plans are underway to assist remaining departments with the identification of two appropriate student learning outcomes for their courses and the development of appropriate direct measures based on embedded assessments. The Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, Dr. Jane Halonen (Dean, CAS), and Dr. Tom Westcott (Assistant Dean, CAS) met with department chairs on September 6, 2006, to finalize assessment plans for General Studies / Academic Foundations in the fall term. Chairs agreed to follow the proposed action plan and suggested modifications that would help ensure success. The original report deadline (December 8) was modified
to a more workable deadline (December 22) that would better accommodate other end-of-term activities and deadlines. Three new TIP Sheets were written and posted to the CUTLA web site to provide information and guidance to faculty involved with the development and implementation of assessment of student learning in Academic Foundations. Claudia Stanny (Interim Director, CUTLA) met with specific departments to consult about assessment methods. Claudia Stanny made a presentation about General Studies/Academic Foundations assessment at the Art department’s faculty retreat, met with the two assessment people in Biology, and consulted with the executive committee in Psychology during August and September, 2006. The Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment will offer workshops on the development of rubrics for use in assessment and the use of existing student assignments and activities as opportunities for obtaining embedded assessment data.

**Schedule for Accomplishing Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August, 2006</td>
<td>CUTLA will prepare and circulate a TIP sheet with advice about assessment in General Education and alerting faculty to the urgency of engaging in effective assessment of General Education during the Fall Term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6, 2006</td>
<td>Department chairs from the 18 departments that participate in General Education and their assessment liaisons will convene with Dean Jane Halonen, Dr. Tom Westcott, and the Interim Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (Dr. Claudia Stanny) to discuss the Student Learning Outcomes identified for assessment, to establish direct measures based on embedded assignments or exams for these assessments, and to establish the timeline for the collection and report of assessment data in the Fall 2006 term. Minutes of this meeting will be kept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September, 2006</td>
<td>As needed, the Interim Director of CUTLA will schedule individual meetings with department chairs to refine the assessment methods for their department. Minutes will be kept of these meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2006</td>
<td>Chairs will submit a memo to Dr. Barbara Lyman, AVP Academic Affairs, reporting the status of their plans to implement assessment data collection during the Fall Term. Departments will identify two SLOs in the Academic Foundations (ideally in two different domains), describe the method of assessment to be used, and identify the class(es) in which assessment will take place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department chairs or their assessment liaison/assessment committee chair will draft a summary of the assessment data collected during the Fall Term. This summary will be submitted to the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment no later than December 22, 2006. If a department fails to collect assessment data during the fall term, it must submit an action plan with a specific time line and identification of resources to ensure that assessment data will be collected during the Spring 2007 term.

Department chairs and assessment liaisons from the 18 participating departments will convene to discuss their assessment data and discuss student learning in General Education. The agenda for this meeting will include the following: What did departments learn from their assessment data? What actions can be taken to improve student learning in future terms? Establish assessment plans for the following cycle (Fall 2007): Identify SLOs to be addressed by each department; determine which courses will be used for collection of assessment data; evaluate and possibly revise assessment methods used; discuss potential changes in teaching activities; identify needs for faculty development to improve student learning in General Education. Minutes will be kept of this meeting. The departmental summaries of assessments will be included in the minutes.

Consultations with department chairs that must collect assessment data during the Spring 2007 term.

Department Chairs will include information in their annual report on the impact of assessment evidence obtained in General Education/Academic Foundations on decisions about the structure and teaching of General Education courses in their department.

**Evidence of Resources Allocated to Accomplishment of Action Plan**

The Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment will direct a substantial part of its resources toward offering in-house workshops and identifying external consultants who can provide workshops on assessment, development and use of rubrics, and active learning strategies. The Interim Director for the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment organized meetings with General Studies departments for Fall, 2006, and structured reporting activities to encourage and support the collection and use of assessment data for Academic Foundations/General Studies (described above in the action plan). These activities will include consultations with chairs and faculty of departments individually (the Interim Director held such meetings with faculty in Biology and Art in August, 2006). Additional workshops will be
offered to all faculty on assessment strategies, rubric development, and active learning strategies. The QEP budget ($75,000) and portions of the CUTLA budget will be directed toward the expenses associated with these workshops and the fees of external consultants for additional workshops when these include discussions of project management. Departments have been encouraged to consider developing a QEP proposal to support the development of projects entailing project management as embedded assessments in General Studies courses. Additional support for faculty development in assessment and instructional strategies will be requested from respective Colleges and the Division of Academic Affairs as needed.

**Summary**

In response to recommendations surrounding CS 3.5.1 (Undergraduate Programs), a model for assessment of General Education was adopted that combines assessments for First Year Experience, General Studies, the university diversity requirement, and co-curricular student activities in a larger organization called Academic Foundations. Academic Foundations represents the first in a series of educational experiences in which skills are introduced (General Studies and other Academic Foundations experiences), reinforced and developed (courses in the major), and brought to mastery (capstone projects). The initial stage of defining Academic Foundation domains and student learning outcomes within domains was completed in Spring, 2006. Departments have now identified General Studies courses and student learning outcomes from two Academic Foundations domains and committed to assess these in the 2006-2007 academic year. A structured plan has been established for the collection and use of assessment data for Academic Foundations, with well-defined intermediary
milestones for the development of appropriate direct measures based on embedded assessments, collection of assessment data, and evaluation and use of these data.
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“Creating a Community of Learners through Active Learning and Student Engagement”

Quality Enhancement Plan Project Proposal Packet [2005-2006]
Proposal for Quality Enhancement Plan Project
Cover Sheet

Department Name

Name of Contact Person

Phone E-mail

List of faculty and staff involved

We understand that the following project proposal elements must be included in all proposals considered by the UWF Quality Enhancement Steering Committee:

- Project Rationale
- Relationship to the University’s QEP goals (see Appendix A) and the program’s Academic Learning Compact (see Appendix B)
- Project student learning outcomes (see Appendix C for suggested format)
- Outcomes assessment procedures
- Instructional /learning strategy enhancements focusing on active learning/student engagement
- Project assessment plan (see Appendix D for suggested format)
- Information dissemination plan
- Institutionalization plan
- Resources needed (see Appendix E for suggested format)
- Timeline for project activities and events

We understand that the UWF Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee will recommend funding only if the project is consistent with the intent of the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan. We further understand that all funds must be expended in accordance with the terms and conditions of approval.

Print name of contact person Signature Date Phone

Department/Division Head Signature Date Phone
(Signature signifies departmental endorsement of the project.)

Dean/Vice President Signature Date Phone

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
Date and time application was received: ______________________________
Signature: ____________________________________
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Proposal for Quality Enhancement Plan Projects Background

General Information
The University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), developed as one component of the process for reaffirmation of accreditation by SACS/COC, focuses on improving student learning through increased use of active learning and student engagement strategies. The QEP is integral to the University’s strategic plan relating directly to the goal to “promote learning and living environments that encourage the development of communities of learners and individual potential in students, faculty and staff.” For academic units, the QEP is also directly related to the development and implementation of the program-level Academic Learning Compacts required by the State University System Board of Governors.

In particular, the value-added domain of Project Management suggests a distinctive feature of the University of West Florida experience. Therefore, for the purpose of UWF’s Focused QEP, Project Management has been selected as the centerpiece of the effort that will eventually be reported to SACS. Currently the learning outcome plans for every academic program and the division of Student Affairs include Project Management elements.

Funding will be available annually during the period 2005-2010 to assist academic and student affairs units to develop and implement projects leading to enhanced student learning through use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies. Projects must show a direct relationship to one or more of the unit’s program level student learning outcomes as reflected in its Academic Learning Compact and must include direct measures of student learning. First priority will be given to projects that address learning outcomes and assessments related to the Project Management domain. The basic intent of these funds is to provide seed funds for units to develop and evaluate new approaches to instruction and assessment, rather than ongoing support of existing activities. Approximately six to eight projects will be funded annually with a maximum of $5,000 per project. Initial funding will generally be for one academic year; however, multiyear projects will be considered if sufficient justification is provided.

Proposal Format and Content
Proposals should include the following:
1. Completed cover sheet with required signatures
2. Narrative that includes discussion of the overall significance of the project to the unit, college/division, and university, and identification and discussion of each of the project proposal elements as listed on the cover page.
3. Description of each of the proposed active learning/student engagement activities including reason for selection, an indication
of how the activities will impact specified student learning outcomes, and how assessments will be used to improve activities.

4. Detailed budget request, including information on personnel needs and matching or other available funds. (Because it is anticipated that funding of these projects will be through E&G sources, funds allocated through this proposal process may be spent only in accordance with E&G expenditure policies. For example, E&G funds may not be used for refreshments, gifts, or decorations.)

Proposal Submission
E-mail your proposals to either QEP Co-Director: Dr. Gary Howard, Director, Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment at ghoward@uwf.edu or Dr. Jim Hurd, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs at jhurd@uwf.edu.

For 2005-2006 there will be two submission deadlines: July 1, 2005 and October 1, 2005. At least one-half of the 2005-2006 allocation will be reserved for applications received in October.

Evaluation
A review committee comprised of members of the QEP Steering Committee will review proposals and make recommendations to the QEP Leadership Team. Awards will be made by the Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs. Recommendations for funding July 1 proposals will be made by August 1 2005. Recommendations for funding October 1 proposals will be made by November 1. Funding decisions will be announced not later than August 15 and November 15 respectively. Project proposals will be rated and selected on the basis of conformity with the goals of the Quality Enhancement Plan and likelihood of success of the project using the criteria identified in the Rubric for Evaluating Proposals (see attachment).

Required Reports
A progress report will be expected at the midpoint of the project and a final report will be expected at the conclusion of the project. Units with funded projects will be required to share findings from the project in the annual Quality Enhancement Plan Symposium to be held during the Fall Semester of each academic year.

Questions and Additional Information
A Web site with information about Quality Enhancement Plan projects can be found at http://uwf.edu/cutl. For questions or assistance with proposal development contact Dr. Gary Howard, Director, Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (473-7435; ghoward@uwf.edu) or Dr. Jim Hurd, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs (857-6274; jhurd@uwf.edu).
APPENDICES

Appendix A  Goals of the Focused Quality Enhancement Plan

1. Improve student learning of knowledge, skills, and values relevant to Project Management. Students will be able to:
   a. Develop a proposal for a project that uses information, skills, and/or methods of inquiry pertinent to the discipline.
   b. Identify and describe the human, physical, and financial resources necessary to design and complete a successful project in the discipline.
   c. Identify, describe, and adhere to steps or phases in planning and implementation of this project, with appropriate guidelines.
   d. Adapt to and work with other team members of differing attitudes, skills, and backgrounds.
   e. Evaluate the process and result of a project and make recommendations for improvement in future situations.
   f. Effectively present the results of a successful project in the discipline, using appropriate oral, written, and/or visual means.

2. Increase use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies and related assessments for development of Project Management skills, knowledge, and values.
   a. Refine program- and course-level outcomes.
   b. Develop and refine appropriate assessments, both direct and indirect.
   c. Increase use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies and appropriate assessments.

3. Provide opportunities for faculty and staff development related to improving student learning of Project Management.

Appendix B  Academic Learning Compact Domains

Required by Board of Governors
   Content
   Critical Thinking
   Communication

UWF “value-added” domains
   Integrity/Values
   Project Management
   Discipline Specific Skills
Appendix C  Project Student Learning Outcomes (Suggested Format)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Relationship to QEP Goals</th>
<th>Relationship to Program Academic Learning Compact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D  Assessment Plan Summary (Suggested Format)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix E  Resource Needs Summary (Suggested Format)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Item Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Template for QEP Project Proposal [2005-2006]

The following template is provided as a convenience for units preparing QEP Project Proposals and as a mechanism to assist reviewers. The template includes headings reflecting all required proposal elements (plus a heading for References) and brief descriptions of the essential content needed for each heading.

If applicants choose not to utilize this template, it is strongly encouraged that the basic organizational pattern be followed to facilitate effective review of the proposal.
Proposal for Quality Enhancement Plan Project
Cover Sheet

Department Name

Name of Contact Person

Phone   E-mail

List of faculty and staff involved

We understand that the following project proposal elements must be included in all proposals considered by the UWF Quality Enhancement Steering Committee:

- Project Rationale
- Relationship to the University’s QEP goals (see Appendix A) and the program’s Academic Learning Compact (see Appendix B)
- Project student learning outcomes (see Appendix C for suggested format)
- Outcomes assessment procedures
- Instructional /learning strategy enhancements focusing on active learning/student engagement
- Project assessment plan (see Appendix D for suggested format)
- Information dissemination plan
- Institutionalization plan
- Resources needed (see Appendix E for suggested format)
- Timeline for project activities and events

We understand that the UWF Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee will recommend funding only if the project is consistent with the intent of the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan. We further understand that all funds must be expended in accordance with the terms and conditions of approval.

Print name of contact person   Signature   Date   Phone

Department/Division Head   Signature   Date   Phone
(Signature signifies departmental endorsement of the project.)

Dean/Vice President   Signature   Date   Phone

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
Date and time application was received: ____________________________
Signature: ______________________________________________________
University of West Florida Quality Enhancement Plan
Project Proposal Narrative

Project Title:

Contact Person:

Project Rationale

[Insert narrative explaining specifically why the project was selected and providing a convincing case for the project’s efficacy.]

Relationship to QEP Goals and Program ALC Student Learning Outcomes (or Student Affairs Outcomes)

[Insert narrative describing the relationship of the project to both the QEP and one or more of the related academic programs ALC student learning outcomes (or, for student affairs units, Student Affairs Outcomes).]

Project student learning outcomes

[Insert narrative describing appropriately constructed student learning outcomes and/or present in a format such as below – note that preference will be given to proposals addressing the Project Management domain.]

Suggested format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Relationship to QEP Goals</th>
<th>Relationship to Project Academic Learning Compact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes assessment procedures

[Describe outcome assessment procedures that include direct measures that are clear and feasible.]

Instructional /learning strategy enhancements

[Describe specific instructional/learning strategy enhancements that focus on active learning/student engagement; address how proposed activities will both directly and indirectly impact student learning outcomes; include a theoretical framework supporting the efficacy of selected activities – note that preference will be given to proposals addressing the Project Management domain.]

Project assessment plan

[Chart assessment plan and provide narrative of how data will be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes during the life of the project and how data will be used to determine the overall success of the project.]

Suggested format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information dissemination plan

[Describe how the process and results will be shared with the campus and the broader academic community.]
Institutionalization plan

[Discuss the potential for this activity to be extended beyond the original department or unit and describe how success aspects of the project will be incorporated into regular routine.]

Resources needed

[Describe resource needs that are appropriate and sufficient to the project – remember to include personnel, technology, and other resources.]

Suggested format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Item Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline for project activities and events

[Describe the sequence of project activities and events including approximate dates of key activities and events.]

References

[List any applicable references.]
Quality Enhancement Plan Projects
Rubric for Evaluating Proposals [2005=2006]

Project: ____________________________________ Reviewer: _____________

There are 10 project proposal elements (some with multiple criteria) plus an overall evaluation element. Each element can earn a score of 0, 1, 2, or 3 per the descriptor that most appropriately fits the element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project Rationale (general qualities) – Why was this project selected?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Contains no statement of rationale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rationale is stated only in general terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rationale is specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rationale is specific and provides a convincing case for the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Relationship to the University’s QEP goals and Academic Learning Compact student learning outcomes – What is the relationship of the proposal to the University’s QEP goals and the Academic Learning Compact student learning outcomes?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No clear relationship is demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Relationship is tenuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Demonstrates a clear relationship to one or the other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates a clear relationship to both the program’s Academic Learning Compact student learning outcomes and the University’s QEP goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project student learning outcomes</strong> – What will students be expected to know or be able to do as a result of this project?</td>
<td>0 – Does not address student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Includes vague or inappropriately constructed student learning outcomes</td>
<td>1 – Includes vague or inappropriately constructed student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Provides appropriately constructed student learning outcomes</td>
<td>2 – Provides appropriately constructed student learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Clearly describes appropriately constructed student learning outcomes in the Project Management Domain</td>
<td>3 – Clearly describes appropriately constructed student learning outcomes in the Project Management Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes assessment procedures</strong> – How will SLOs be measured?</td>
<td>0 – No outcome assessment procedures are provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Some outcome assessment procedures are provided but the project focuses most heavily on indirect measures of student learning.</td>
<td>1 – Some outcome assessment procedures are provided but the project focuses most heavily on indirect measures of student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Outcomes assessment procedures include direct measures of student learning but are described only in general terms</td>
<td>2 – Outcomes assessment procedures include direct measures of student learning but are described only in general terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Outcomes assessment procedures include direct measures that are clearly described and feasible.</td>
<td>3 – Outcomes assessment procedures include direct measures that are clearly described and feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Instructional/learning strategy enhancements focusing on active learning/student engagement</strong> : Description -- What activities will be used in this project?</td>
<td>0 – No instructional/learning strategy enhancements are described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Provides only general descriptions of instructional/learning strategy enhancements</td>
<td>1 – Provides only general descriptions of instructional/learning strategy enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Provides clearly described and specific instructional/learning strategy enhancements that focus on active learning/student engagement</td>
<td>2 – Provides clearly described and specific instructional/learning strategy enhancements that focus on active learning/student engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Provides clearly described and specific instructional/learning strategy enhancements that focus on active learning/student engagement via project management</td>
<td>3 – Provides clearly described and specific instructional/learning strategy enhancements that focus on active learning/student engagement via project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Instructional/learning strategy enhancements focusing on active learning/student engagement: Rationale for selection – Why should these activities “work?”</strong></td>
<td>0 – Does not address how proposed activities will impact student learning outcomes &lt;br&gt;1 – Addresses how proposed activities will indirectly impact student learning outcomes &lt;br&gt;2 – Addresses how proposed activities will both directly and indirectly impact student learning outcomes &lt;br&gt;3 – Addresses how proposed activities will both directly and indirectly impact student learning outcomes and provides a theoretical framework supporting efficacy of activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project assessment plan – How will the project be monitored while it is underway? If necessary, what adjustments would be feasible? How will success of the project be determined?</strong></td>
<td>0 – No assessment plan is provided &lt;br&gt;1 – Project assessment discussed only in general terms &lt;br&gt;2 – Overall project assessment plan is provided but there is no indication of how data will be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes during the life of the project &lt;br&gt;3 – Project assessment plan is provided as well as descriptions of how data will be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes during the life of the project and how data will be used to determine the overall success of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | **Information dissemination plan** – How will process and results be | **Score** 0 – No plan is provided  
1 – Plan is poorly developed  
2 – Plan contains good elements but is not fully developed and convincing  
3 – Plan is clear, specific, and feasible |
|       | shared with the campus and the broader academic community?          |                                                                                           |
|       | **Institutionalization plan (Potential)** -- If successful, could the | **Score** 0 – Project shows little or no potential for institutionalization/continuity  
1 – Project shows some potential for institutionalization/continuity  
2 – Project shows good potential for institutionalization/continuity  
3 – Project shows outstanding potential for institutionalization/continuity |
|       | project feasibly be extended beyond the original department or unit?|                                                                                           |
|       | **Institutionalization plan (Description)** – How will successful as- | **Score** 0 – No plan is provided  
1 – Plan is poorly developed  
2 – Plan contains good elements but is not fully developed and convincing  
3 – Plan is clear, specific, and feasible |
<p>|       | pects of the project be incorporated into “business as usual?”       |                                                                                           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resources needed – What resources will be needed to carry out this project?</strong>&lt;br&gt;0 – Plan does not address resources needed or requires resources in excess of available funds for award&lt;br&gt;1 – Plan describes resource needs which are insufficient for scope of project or excessive for scope of project&lt;br&gt;2 – Plan describes resource needs that can be adapted to the project and are within the expected funding range&lt;br&gt;3 – Plan describes resource needs that are appropriate and sufficient to the project and are within the expected funding range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timeline for project activities and events – What is the sequence of project activities and events?</strong>&lt;br&gt;0 – Timeline is not provided&lt;br&gt;1 – Timeline is provided but is not specific and/or realistic&lt;br&gt;2 – Timeline is appropriate but not fully developed or convincing&lt;br&gt;3 – Timeline is specific, clear, and reasonable given scope of project and existing constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point</td>
<td>Overall Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>Recommend reject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend revise and resubmit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend accept with revisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

2006-2007 QEP RFP DOCUMENTS

Formal RFP
Proposal Template
Proposal Rubric
Appendix B

General Theme: “Creating a Community of Learners through Active Learning and Student Engagement”

Specific Focus: Enhancing Student Learning in the Project Management Domain

Quality Enhancement Plan Project Proposal Packet

2006-2007

Submission Deadline: April 24, 2006
Proposal for Quality Enhancement Plan Project
Cover Sheet

Department Name

Name of Contact Person

Phone E-mail

List of faculty and staff involved

We understand that the following project proposal elements listed below must be included in all proposals considered by the UWF Quality Enhancement Steering Committee. Refer to the Rubric for Evaluating Programs for guidance in developing each program element.

- Abstract (100 word limit)
- Project Rationale
- Relationship to the University’s QEP Goals (See Appendix A)
- Project Student Learning Outcomes Associated With This Proposal (See Appendix B for University level outcomes for Project Management)
- Instructional strategies and evidence of rationale for their selection
- Assessment Plan for the Project. (How will student learning be measured? See Appendix C For Suggested Format for SLOs. How will the success of the project be measured? What is the relationship of this assessment to the University’s outcome assessment effort?)
- Plan for Formative Assessment (how will ongoing assessment be used during the life of the project to improve the process and/or outcomes?)
- Information Dissemination Plan (How will the strategies and results be shared with the campus and the broader academic community?)
- Institutionalization Plan (How likely is that this project be extended to other programs/disciplines? How can this project be institutionalized at UWF?)
- Resources Needed (Include all resources required. See Appendix D for suggested budget format. Budget requests should be specific and appropriate to the project. Budget requests should be for direct support of the project. Budget requests should be thoroughly justified.)
- Timeline for Project Activities and Events (What is the sequence of project activities? Include proposed implementation date.)
We understand that the UWF Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee will recommend funding only if the project is consistent with the intent of the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan. We further understand that all funds must be expended in accordance with the terms and conditions of approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print name of contact person</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Division Head</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
(Signature signifies departmental endorsement of the project.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dean/Vice President</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

Date and time application was received: ________________________________

[Signature]
Proposal for Quality Enhancement Plan Projects Background

General Information

The University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), developed as one component of the process for reaffirmation of accreditation by SACS/COC, focuses on improving student learning within the Project Management Domain through increased use of active learning and student engagement strategies. The QEP is integral to the University’s strategic plan relating directly to the goal to “promote learning and living environments that encourage the development of communities of learners and individual potential in students, faculty and staff.” For academic units, the QEP is also directly related to the development and implementation of the program-level Academic Learning Compacts required by the State University System Board of Governors.

In particular, the value-added domain of Project Management suggests a distinctive feature of the University of West Florida experience. Therefore, for the purpose of UWF’s Focused QEP, Project Management has been selected as the centerpiece of the effort that will eventually be reported to SACS. Currently the learning outcome plans for every academic program and the division of Student Affairs include Project Management elements. Note that a highly structured class project or co-curricular activity may not fit within the domain of Project Management as defined since the “project” is actually being managed by the course instructor or the staff program director. It is essential that the student learning outcomes be specifically enumerated with some explanation of how they are being addressed.

Funding will be available annually during the period 2005-2010 to assist academic and student affairs units to develop and implement projects leading to enhanced student learning through use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies. Projects must show a direct relationship to one or more of the unit’s program level student learning outcomes as reflected in its Academic Learning Compact and must include direct measures of student learning. First priority will be given to projects that address learning outcomes and assessments related to the Project Management domain. The basic intent of these funds is to provide seed funds for units to develop and evaluate new approaches to instruction and assessment, rather than ongoing support of existing activities. Approximately six to eight projects will be funded annually with a maximum of $5,000 per project. Initial funding will generally be for one academic year; however, multiyear projects will be considered if sufficient justification is provided.
Proposal Format and Content

Proposals should include the following:

5. Completed cover sheet with required signatures
6. Narrative that follows the general outline of the QEP Project Template.

Proposal Submission

E-mail proposals to Mary Hallford (mhallford@uwf.edu) at the Center for University Teaching, Learning and Assessment. The deadline for 2006-2007 funded projects will be April 24, 2006. In the event that not all funds are allocated an additional round of proposals may be solicited mid-year but no funds will be held specifically for mid-year awards.

Evaluation

A review committee comprised of members of the QEP Steering Committee will review proposals and make recommendations to the QEP Co-Directors and Leadership Team. Awards will be made by the Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs. Recommendations for funding 2006-2007 proposals will be made by May 31, 2006. Project proposals will be rated and selected on the basis of conformity with the goals of the Quality Enhancement Plan and likelihood of success of the project using the criteria identified in the Rubric for Evaluating Proposals (see attachment).

Required Reports

A final report will be expected at the conclusion of the project. Units with funded projects will be required to share findings and/or activities from the project at regularly scheduled Quality Enhancement Plan Symposia to be held during each academic year. Additionally, each project team must submit a monograph documenting the activities and outcomes of the project.

Questions and Additional Information

A Web site with information about Quality Enhancement Plan projects can be found at http://uwf.edu/cutla. For questions or assistance with proposal development contact Dr. Barbara Lyman, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (474-2035; blyman@uwf.edu) or Dr. Jim Hurd, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs (474-2214; jhurd@uwf.edu).
APPENDICES

Appendix A: Goals of the Focused Quality Enhancement Plan

1. Improve student learning of knowledge, skills, and values relevant to Project Management.
2. Increase use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies and related assessments for development of Project Management skills, knowledge, and values.
   a. Refine program- and course-level outcomes.
   b. Develop and refine appropriate assessments, both direct and indirect.
   c. Increase use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies and appropriate assessments.
3. Provide opportunities for faculty and staff development related to improving student learning of Project Management.

Appendix B: Academic Learning Compact Project Management Domain

The Project Management learning domain is organized into four broad outcomes, each with several more specific student learning outcomes. These more specific student learning outcomes may be modified as necessary by individual departments or units to suit the needs of the program in question. The four broad outcomes and associated specific student learning outcomes are:

- **Project Conceptualization**
  - Selects and defines realistic problem to be solved
  - Identifies relevant resources and potential obstacles
  - Develops strategies execution in relation to constraints
  - Integrates discipline concepts appropriately
  - Identifies criteria for successful completion
  - Accurately assesses quality of plan

- **Self-regulation**
  - Sets appropriate goals for completing project
  - Manages appropriate timeframe
  - Executes appropriate priorities
  - Shows flexibility by planning back-up strategies
  - Accurately identifies quality of individual process

- **Team-work Skills**
  - Completes responsibilities as team member
  - Practices appropriate ethical judgment
  - Contributes positively to task completion
  - Manages conflict among team members
  - Assesses quality of contribution accurately
• Project Delivery
  o Delivers acceptable product on time
  o Effectively presents results using appropriate oral, written, and/or visual means
  o Responds effectively to constructive feedback
  o Makes valid suggestions for improvement in process and product

Note that the proposed project is not expected to address all of the SLOs in Project Management but the proposal must identify which ones are being addressed.

Appendix C: Assessment Plan Summary (Suggested Format for SLOs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Student Learning Outcomes/Activities</th>
<th>Assessment Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D: Resource Needs Summary (Suggested Format)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Item Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Enhancement Plan Projects
Rubric for Evaluating Proposals [2006-2007]

Project: ___________________________________________ Reviewer: ______________________

There are a number of specific proposal elements described on the Project Cover Sheet. Some of these elements have compound parts and so have multiple rubric items associated with them. In addition there is an overall evaluation item. Each item can earn a numeric score according to the descriptor that most appropriately fits the item. Note that some items are weighted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – No abstract is provided</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Abstract is provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – Contains no statement of rationale</td>
<td>Project Rationale (general qualities) -- Why should this project be selected?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Rationale is stated only in general terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Rationale is specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Rationale is specific and provides a convincing case for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – No clear relationship is demonstrated</td>
<td>Relationship to the University’s QEP goals -- What is the relationship of the proposal to the University’s QEP goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Demonstrates a clear relationship to at least goal 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Demonstrates a clear relationship to goals1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Demonstrates a clear relationship to all three goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | **Project student learning outcomes** -- What will students be expected to know or be able to do as a result of this project?  
0 – Proposal does not address student learning outcomes  
1 – Includes vague or inappropriately constructed student learning outcomes  
2 – Provides appropriately constructed student learning outcomes  
3 – Clearly describes appropriately constructed student learning outcomes in the Project Management Domain | |
|       | **Instructional/learning strategy enhancements focusing on active learning/student engagement: Description** -- What activities will be used in this project?  
0 – No instructional/learning strategy enhancements are described  
2 – Provides only general descriptions of instructional/learning strategy enhancements  
4 – Provides clearly described and specific instructional/learning strategy enhancements that focus on active learning/student engagement  
6 – Provides clearly described and specific instructional/learning strategy enhancements that focus on active learning/student engagement via project management | |
|       | **Instructional/learning strategy enhancements focusing on active learning/student engagement: Rationale for selection** -- Why should these activities “work?”  
0 – Does not address how proposed activities will impact student learning outcomes  
2 – Addresses how proposed activities will indirectly impact student learning outcomes  
4 – Addresses how proposed activities will both directly and indirectly impact student learning outcomes  
6 – Addresses how proposed activities will both directly and indirectly impact student learning outcomes and provides a theoretical framework supporting efficacy of activities | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | **Assessment Plan for the Project:** -- How will SLOs be measured and what is the relationship of this assessment to the University's outcome assessment efforts? | 0 – No outcome assessment plan is provided  
2 – Some outcome assessment procedures are provided but the project focuses most heavily on indirect measures of student learning.  
4 – Outcomes assessment procedures include direct measures of student learning but are described only in general terms  
6 – Outcomes assessment procedures include direct measures that are clearly described and feasible and the relationship to the University’s outcome assessment effort is clear. |
|       | **Formative assessment plan** -- How will the project be monitored while it is underway? If necessary, what adjustments would be feasible? How will success of the project be determined? | 0 – No assessment plan is provided  
2 – Project assessment discussed only in general terms  
4 – Overall project assessment plan is provided but there is no indication of how data will be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes during the life of the project  
6 – Project assessment plan is provided as well as descriptions of how data will be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes during the life of the project and how data will be used to determine the overall success of the project |
|       | **Information dissemination plan** -- How will process and results be shared with the campus and the broader academic community? | 0 – No plan is provided  
1 – Plan is poorly developed  
2 – Plan contains good elements but is not fully developed and convincing  
3 – Plan is clear, specific, and feasible |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Institutionalization plan (Potential) -- If successful, could the project feasibly be extended beyond the original department or unit?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – Project shows little or no potential for institutionalization/continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Project shows some potential for institutionalization/continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Project shows good potential for institutionalization/continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Project shows outstanding potential for institutionalization/continuity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Institutionalization plan (Description) -- How will successful aspects of the project be incorporated into “business as usual?”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – No plan is provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Plan is poorly developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Plan contains good elements but is not fully developed and convincing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Plan is clear, specific, and feasible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Resources needed -- What resources will be needed to carry out this project?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – Plan does not address resources needed or requires resources in excess of available funds for award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Plan describes resource needs which are insufficient for scope of project or excessive for scope of project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Plan describes resource needs that can be adapted to the project and are within the expected funding range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Plan describes resource needs that are appropriate and sufficient to the project and are within the expected funding range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timeline for project activities and events -- What is the sequence of project activities and events?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 – Timeline is not provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – Timeline is provided but is not specific and/or realistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 – Timeline is appropriate but not fully developed or convincing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 – Timeline is specific, clear, and reasonable given scope of project and existing constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend reject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend revise and resubmit next year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend accept with revisions for the current year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend accept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Template for QEP Project Proposal [2006-2007]

The following template is provided as a convenience for units preparing QEP Project Proposals and as a mechanism to assist reviewers. The template includes headings reflecting all required proposal elements (plus a heading for References) and brief descriptions of the essential content needed for each heading.
Proposal for Quality Enhancement Plan Project
Cover Sheet

Department Name

Name of Contact Person

Phone E-mail

List of faculty and staff involved

We understand that the project proposal elements listed below must be included in all proposals considered by the UWF Quality Enhancement Steering Committee. Refer to the Rubric for Evaluating Programs for guidance in developing each program element.

- Abstract (100 word limit)
- Project Rationale
- Relationship to the University’s QEP Goals (See Appendix A)
- Project Student Learning Outcomes Associated With This Proposal (See Appendix B for University level outcomes for Project Management)
- Instructional strategies and evidence of rationale for their selection
- Assessment Plan for the Project. (How will student learning be measured? See Appendix C For Suggested Format for SLOs. How will the success of the project be measured? What is the relationship of this assessment to the University’s outcome assessment effort?)
- Plan for Formative Assessment (how will ongoing assessment be used during the life of the project to improve the process and/or outcomes?)
- Information Dissemination Plan (How will the strategies and results be shared with the campus and the broader academic community?)
- Institutionalization Plan (How likely is that this project be extended to other programs/disciplines? How can this project be institutionalized at UWF?)
- Resources Needed (Include all resources required. See Appendix D for suggested budget format. Budget requests should be specific and appropriate to the project. Budget requests should be for direct support of the project. Budget requests should be thoroughly justified.)
- Timeline for Project Activities and Events (What is the sequence of project activities? Include proposed implementation date.)
We understand that the UWF Quality Enhancement Plan Steering Committee will recommend funding only if the project is consistent with the intent of the University’s Quality Enhancement Plan. We further understand that all funds must be expended in accordance with the terms and conditions of approval.

Print name of contact person  Signature  Date  Phone

Department/Division Head  Signature  Date  Phone
(Signature signifies departmental endorsement of the project.)

Dean/Vice President  Signature  Date  Phone

**FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

Date and time application was received: ____________________________

Signature: ______________________________________________________
University of West Florida Quality Enhancement Plan

Project Proposal Narrative

Project Title:

Contact Person:

Abstract

[Short summary (100 word limit) describing the proposal and expected outcomes]

Project Rationale

[Insert narrative explaining specifically why the project was selected and providing a convincing case for the project’s efficacy.]

Relationship to QEP Goals

[Insert narrative describing the relationship of the project to the stated goals of the QEP]

Project student learning outcomes

[Insert narrative and/or a tabular presentation describing appropriately constructed student learning outcomes. QEP projects should focus on the Project Management domain but may include SLOs from other domains as well.]

Instructional /learning strategy enhancements
[Describe specific instructional/learning strategy enhancements that focus on active learning/student engagement; address how proposed activities will both directly and indirectly impact student learning outcomes; include a theoretical framework supporting the efficacy of selected activities.]

Assessment Plan for the Project

[Describe student learning outcome assessment procedures that will be used in the course of the project. You should include direct measures that are clear and feasible. Include narrative describing how this project will contribute to some aspect of the University's ongoing effort to improve outcome assessment. Refer specifically (as appropriate) to the Academic Learning Compacts, Academic Learning Plans, or Student Affairs Planning and Assessment activities.]

Plan for Formative Assessment of the Project

[Provide a narrative of how the ongoing success of the project will be measured. Describe how data will be used to adjust activities to better achieve learning outcomes during the life of the project.]

Information dissemination plan

[Describe how the process and results will be shared with the campus and the broader academic community.]

Institutionalization plan

[Discuss the potential for this activity to be extended beyond the original department or unit and describe how success aspects of the project will be incorporated into regular routine.]
Resources needed

[Describe resource needs that are appropriate and sufficient to the project – remember to include personnel, technology, and other resources. Budget requests that are not specifically and clearly linked to the project may be reduced or unfunded.]

Suggested format for budget request:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Item Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline for project activities and events

[Describe the sequence of project activities and events including approximate dates of key activities and events.]

References

[List any applicable references.]
Appendix C

SAMPLES OF RUBRICS USED BY STUDENT AFFAIRS DEPARTMENTS/UNITS

University Commons
   Work Habits Rubric

Recreation and Sports Services
   Recognition and Action Rubric

Career Services
   Resume Rubric
Appendix C

WORK HABITS RUBRIC

WORK HABITS – INITIATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Takes Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WORK HABITS – POSITIVE ATTITUDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# WORK HABITS – TIME MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Punctuality</strong></td>
<td>Never on time</td>
<td>On time some of the time</td>
<td>On time most of the time</td>
<td>Always on time and prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Can never seem to find the thing they're looking for</td>
<td>Loses things sometimes</td>
<td>Rarely loses things but not always at hand</td>
<td>Has materials organized and readily at hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task Completion</strong></td>
<td>Rarely completes tasks on time; requires someone to follow up with them all of the time</td>
<td>Completes some tasks on time; needs to be checked on often</td>
<td>Completes most tasks on time; needs only occasional reminders</td>
<td>Completes tasks on time without reminders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK HABITS– PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attire</strong></td>
<td>Attire is consistently inappropriate and/or poorly maintained</td>
<td>Attire is sometimes inappropriate and/or poorly maintained</td>
<td>Attire is usually appropriate, neat, clean and well maintained</td>
<td>Attire is consistently appropriate, neat, clean and well maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygiene</strong></td>
<td>Poor personal hygiene and grooming</td>
<td>Fair personal hygiene and grooming</td>
<td>Good personal hygiene and grooming</td>
<td>Excellent personal hygiene and grooming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Verbally hostile; abusive; uses derogatory or demeaning terms; is dismissive; swears</td>
<td>Is sometimes disrespectful; occasionally uses derogatory or demeaning terms; is dismissive; swears</td>
<td>Usually friendly; uses mostly complimentary terms; rarely swears</td>
<td>Always friendly; uses complimentary terms; never swears</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Impression</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does not provide any greeting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Greets some customers with indifference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Greets most customers in a polite or friendly manner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Greets all customers in a polite or friendly manner; is openly helpful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demeanor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaks rudely without regard to customers and nonverbal behaviors indicate lack of respect for customers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses a tone of voice that may sound indifferent or impolite to the customer. Other nonverbal behaviors may be inconsistent with service message</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses a tone of voice that is courteous or pleasant; Other nonverbal behaviors do not contradict the customer service message</strong></td>
<td><strong>Uses a tone of voice that suggests “I want to help.” Other nonverbal behaviors are consistent with a positive, customer service message</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fails to provide service or provides inaccurate information</strong></td>
<td><strong>May not provide all requested services or details</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provides service or information requested; does not offer additional information or perform additional service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provides accurate, thorough service or information and serves as a knowledgeable source for the customer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Recognition and Action Rubric
Critical thinking, problem solving, action plan implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates Critical Thinking&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Does not identify or is confused by the issue, or represents the issue inaccurately. Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.</td>
<td>Misinterprets information or questions. Ignores alternative solutions or point of views. Deductive and inductive skills are weak. Seldom explains reasons.</td>
<td>Accurately interprets key information and questions. Explores alternative solutions and point of views. Competently uses deductive and inductive skills. Can justify and explains reasoning.</td>
<td>Accurately interprets key information and questions with ease. Thoughtfully analyzes alternate solutions &amp; point of views. Consistently draws warranted conclusions. Justifies and explains reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates Problem Solving&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Does not try to solve problems. Does not offer to help others solve problems. Lets others solve the problem.</td>
<td>Offers no problem solving suggestion but is willing to follow the plan of others. Asks others to solve problem so he/she will have a plan to follow.</td>
<td>Seeks solutions from others as starting point for own solution. Makes changes to a suggested solution.</td>
<td>Actively looks for solutions and suggests solutions to problems. May solve problem on own or offer suggestions to solve problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates Implementing Plan of Action</td>
<td>Does not develop a plan of action or does not implement an action plan. May not recognize need for plan.</td>
<td>Recognizes need for action plan. Implements a plan of action that is incomplete. Fails to address major components necessary for successful implementation.</td>
<td>Recognizes need for action plan. Implements a plan of action that has addressed all necessary issues.</td>
<td>Recognizes need for plan and importance of plan. Implements a plan of action that has addressed all necessary issues. Assess plan while in action and makes adjustments to the plan to ensure success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>3</sup> Adapted from “Collaborative Work Skills; Teamwork” rubric. Retrieved June 24, 2005 from http://rubistar.4teachers.org/index
## Resume Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Resume needs significant improvement and would not be considered.</th>
<th>2. Resume is average and needs improvement to be considered.</th>
<th>3. Resume could land you an interview but may need a few improvements.</th>
<th>4. Resume should effectively land you an interview.</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
<td><strong>Format</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This resume is either a half page or three pages long. The font is too big or may be hard to read. There is more white space than words on the page. You have picked the wrong format to use. There are multiple spelling errors.</td>
<td>The font and spacing of the resume is not appealing and easily scanned. Information such as dates are inconsistent on the page. There are more than one spelling or grammar errors.</td>
<td>This resume has some uneven white space. Some information is inconsistent (dates, bolding, underlining). There may be a single spelling or grammar error.</td>
<td>The resume makes good use of space. It can be easily scanned and is pleasing to the reader. There are no grammar or spelling errors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Header</strong></td>
<td><strong>Header</strong></td>
<td><strong>Header</strong></td>
<td><strong>Header</strong></td>
<td><strong>Header</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The header is hard to read and missing information. Some information may be inappropriate (e-mail, telephone information).</td>
<td>Your name and header information are hard to read or may be confusing. Phone numbers are not clearly labeled and some information may be missing.</td>
<td>Header information is easy to find but your name is not the biggest and boldest thing on the page. Current and permanent contact information may not be labeled correctly.</td>
<td>Header information is easy to read and contains necessary information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Section</td>
<td>Experience Section</td>
<td>Other Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This section is missing some crucial information, i.e. Institution listed without a location, graduation date is not listed, major is listed but not the name of the degree.</td>
<td>This section is not well defined and there is no order to the descriptions of each position. Descriptions are not detailed and offer no illustration of what was done. No locations and dates of employment are listed.</td>
<td>There is information missing in these sections. No descriptions or detailed information is listed about leadership, teamwork, or other transferable skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This section is not well organized. Some information is missing. There is no order to how information is formatted in this section.</td>
<td>Descriptions are not in the form of bullets beginning with action verbs. Complete sentences in paragraph form are used to describe previous positions. Places of work are included for each position but not locations, dates, and titles.</td>
<td>This section is missing key information such as leadership positions held or dates of involvement. Organizations are listed describing the organization, not individual involvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This section is organized and easy to read. This section includes: institution and location, graduation date, name of degree, and major. Some “extra” information that might help you is missing. (ex. Relevant coursework or honors and achievements.)</td>
<td>Descriptions are clear in the form of bulleted statements beginning with action verbs. Descriptions are not detailed enough and do not directly relate to the position applied for.</td>
<td>This section contains all necessary information but is difficult to follow. Leadership roles within organizations are listed but skills are not defined. Dates of involvement are listed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This section is organized, clear, and well defined. It highlights the most pertinent information. This section also helps add value for the position applied for including relevant coursework or honors and achievements.</td>
<td>This section is well defined and information relates to the intended career field. Descriptions are clear and well marked in the form of bulleted statements beginning with action verbs. This section could be split into related and other experience.</td>
<td>These sections are well organized and easy to understand. They relate directly to the position applied for. Leadership, teamwork, and other character traits are apparent through the use of these sections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mission

The mission of the Administrative Affairs Division is to provide in an effective and efficient manner the business, financial, maintenance, and administrative support services that contribute to the enhancement and delivery of the University’s academic and student programs and activities essential to the overall educational experience of the University student constituency.

Organization

The Division is responsible for providing efficient facilities, financial and support services to the University through the departments or units of the Division. Those departments or units consist of Business & Auxiliary Services, Environmental Health & Safety, Facilities Services, Financial Services, Procurement Services and University Police.

Assessment Plan

This plan is a compilation of the goals and the corresponding expected outcomes of the various departments and units of the Division and is directly linked to the University’s Strategic Plan located on the University Planning website. The Assessment Plan addresses the expected outcomes from adherence to the principles of the Strategic Plan and delineates the measurement of expected outcomes. It also shows the use of the data obtained and provides the resulting opportunities for improvement and/or the changes made as a result of the assessment. Evidence of improvements may be intrinsic in this plan or may be tied to the Notable Accomplishments and Annual Reports sections of the Strategic Plan posted online at the UPIC site.
Departments and Unit Assessments

Business & Auxiliary Services Department

Expected Outcome #1 - Continually seek ways to provide high quality, cost effective business and auxiliary services to the University

Measuring Expected Outcome

- Comparison of selected information against benchmarked organizations
- Participation in annual ICASA (SUS Auxiliary Offices) Institutional Research
- Increased use of technology in programs
- Demonstrated increase in levels of service, volume, sales, commissions, etc.
- Survey results

Use of Assessment Results (How data obtained will be used)

Information obtained is used to help define and prioritize services that should be created, deleted, or changed to increase value to university community.

Actual/Proposed changes based on assessment results

- Bookstore operation opened at FWB campus to serve UWF students
- Installed state-of-the art microform scanners in Pace library
- Piloting a potential project of a pay-for-print option
- Provided four additional dining establishments to campus and renovated 3 existing venues
- Installed door access equipment on turnstiles and selected exterior doors in new HLS facility
- Offer new and enhanced printing services including full-color printing, large format printing, Perfect Binding, perforating and scoring

Expected Outcome #2 - Provide guidance, leadership and direction to ensure that operations are fiscally sound.

Measuring Expected Outcome

- Results of internal and state audits indicating that financial records are accurate and being maintained in an acceptable manner
- Preparation of detailed P&L statements on monthly basis
- Preparation and distribution of ledger summary reports and other reports on regular basis to provide comparison of actual to budgeted figures
- Review of contracted operations P&L and Operating Statements and comparison to projected figures.

Use of Assessment Results (How data obtained will be used)

Information obtained is used to determine staffing levels, appropriate charges and fees, whether operations have the ability to acquire needed equipment, desired amounts in repair and replacement accounts, and timelines for renovations.
Actual/Proposed changes based on assessment results

- Installed new walk-in cooler/freezer equipment in main kitchen
- Upgraded Printing Services equipment including Buckle Folder, Heidelberg Quick-setter, plate-setter, color copier
- Contributed to renovation of Starbucks in Library
- Increased OPS staffing in Printing Services

Expected Outcome #3 - Recruit, train and retain qualified staff and enhance their personal and professional growth and development.

Measuring Expected Outcome

- Amount of funds set aside to allow for employee attendance at workshops and other training opportunities.
- Results of annual audit of desktop computer equipment
- Comparison of actual space allocated to employees to the SUS Office Space Square Footage Criteria
- Frequency of staff meetings
- Written and oral communication to staff
- Turnover

Use of Assessment Results (How data obtained will be used)

The information obtained is used to determine the need for additional training and in the specific areas needed, to have a basis for upgrading employee workstations and work space, for determining effectiveness of current communication tools and changing as them as needed

Actual/Proposed changes based on assessment results

- Began formal USPS Mail-piece Quality Specialist training program in Postal Services
- Reorganized staffing and job functions in Auxiliary Office
- Development of Career Enhancement Development Plan for all employees
Expected Outcome #4—Provide excellent customer service.

Measuring Expected Outcome
- Degree of participation by auxiliary managers in such things as cascade learning and serving on excellence teams.
- Develop training materials and conduct training sessions
- Implement and analyze customer service surveys
- Implement secret shopper program

Use of Assessment Results (How data obtained will be used)
The information obtained is used for refining processes and procedures so that improved customer interaction is obtained and service recovery practices are developed and implemented as necessary.

Actual/Proposed changes based on assessment results
- Created a database for copier and vending service calls which is placed on the department server
- Developed new catering guide and an on-line catering needs assessment
- Installed credit card clearing terminal in the Dining Services operation to allow use of credit cards at all POS terminals
- Assisted other campus departments in improving the Financial Aid check distribution at beginning of each semester
- Implemented new workflow/filing system that includes the use of new online (PDF) work order forms and are writeable/submitable and double as invoices
- Disposition of 1,794 cubic feet of non-permanent university records
Environmental Health & Safety Department

Expected Outcome #1 - Conduct annual proactive Laboratory Safety Inspections in all Academic and Research Laboratories. The inspections will be to ensure safety of students, faculty and staff.

Measuring Expected Outcome

Each laboratory will be inspected and assessed for chemical hygiene, fire safety devices, proper hazardous waste handling procedures, use and availability of personal protective equipment, proper use and maintenance of fume hoods, biological safety cabinets or laminar flow hoods. Additionally, compliance with all appropriate training requirements will be confirmed.

Use of Assessment Results

The inspections results will be used to determine if unsafe conditions exist or non-compliance with state or federal regulations in the laboratories. Should such conditions exist, the appropriate supervisory personnel will be notified and required to correct the deficiencies. Follow up inspections will be conducted and documented to ensure corrective actions have been taken.

Actual/Proposed Changes Based on Assessment Results

The corrective changes made by laboratory supervisory personnel following the inspection will result in a safer and more productive learning environment for students.

Expected Outcome #2 - Conduct quarterly proactive Occupational Safety and Environmental Compliance Inspections of all Facilities Management facilities. The inspections will include the main Maintenance Complex and the Central Utilities Plant.

Measuring Expected Outcome

Each Maintenance Shop and Utility area will be inspected and assessed for compliance with occupational safety regulations, fire safety, proper use of personal protective equipment, and proper hazardous waste and Universal waste handling procedures. Compliance with all appropriate occupational and environmental regulatory training requirements will be confirmed.

Use of Assessment Results

The inspection results will be used to determine if unsafe conditions exist or non-compliance with state or federal regulations in the maintenance and utility areas. Should such conditions exist, the appropriate supervisory personnel will be notified and required to correct the deficiencies. Follow up inspections will be conducted and documented to ensure corrective actions have been taken.
Actual/Proposed Changes Based on Assessment Results

The corrective actions taken by supervisory personnel following the inspections will result in a safer and more productive working environment for the University’s maintenance staff.

Expected Outcome #3 - Maintain an excellent internal building code inspections and permitting program. Conduct code awareness internal training of Facilities personnel. Providing internal training of Facilities maintenance staff ensures that work is done properly there by providing a safe and comfortable work environment for students, faculty and staff.

Measuring Expected Outcome

The State of Florida Building Code mandates that most types of maintenance work be inspected by certified code inspectors for compliance with applicable building codes. At UWF, all inspections are conducted internally by the Environmental Health and Safety’s Building Code Department. The number of maintenance inspections passed will be compared to the number of failed inspections.

Use of Assessment Results

The comparison of passed to failed maintenance inspections will be used to discern if there is a particular trade which is having problems complying with the code requirements for appropriate work standards.

Actual/Proposed Changes Based on Assessment Results

All maintenance trades will be given the opportunity to attend code compliance training, however, special emphasis and additional training will be given to trades which have a greater than normal rate of code inspection failures.
Facilities Services Department

Expected Outcome #1 - Develop and maintain a reliable and inviting high quality physical facilities resource base to support the University’s Strategic Plan consistent with the Campus Master Plan and implement corresponding organizational improvements (University Goal 1, Priority 3, 6 & 9, and University Goal #2, Priority #4).

Strategic Priorities #1: Update and maintain a Five-Year PECO Major Capital program. Accountability Measures #1: Annually update and submit the Fixed Capital Outlay Plan through the Facilities Planning Committee and University Planning Council process.

Strategic Priorities #2: Update and maintain a Five-Year PECO Formula Funds (Minor Project) plan. Accountability Measures #2: Annually update and submit the Fixed Capital Outlay Plan through the Facilities Planning Committee and University Planning Council process.

Strategic Priorities #3: Update and maintain a Five-year utilities/infrastructure/roof/capital renewal plan. Accountability Measures #3: Update total E&G Facilities Condition Assessment report each three years.

Strategic Priorities #4: Maintain a Three-Year Capital Improvement Trust Fund (CITF) plan. Accountability Measures #4: Annually update and submit the Formula Funded (Minor Project) Plan through the Facilities Planning Committee and University Planning Council process.

Strategic Priorities #5: Utilize maximum advantage of facility funding and optimize preservation of life-cycle values during the continued $350,000 base operations budget reduction. Accountability Measures #5: Update total E&G Facilities Condition Assessment report each three years.

Strategic Priorities #6: Further enhance campus beautification. Accountability Measures #6: Annually updating and submitting the PECO Formula Funded plan to the Facilities Planning Committee for recommendations to the University Planning Council.

Strategic Priorities #7: Continue to communicate facilities projects in future UWF Foundation Fundraising. Accountability Measures #7: Update total E&G Facilities Condition Assessment report each three years.

Strategic Priorities #8: Maintain E&G Facilities Condition Assessment report. Accountability Measures #8: Update total E&G Facilities Condition Assessment report each three years.
Expected Outcome #2 - Recruit, develop, and retain a highly capable technical and administrative staff that is engaged, productive, communicated with consistently, and committed to achieving the organization's mission. (University Goal 2, Priority 4).

Strategic Priorities #1: Attract and retain experienced and motivated staff.
Accountability Measures #1: Advertise all vacant positions in multiple media.

Strategic Priorities #2: Expand growth/development and technical and non-technical training for staff of all levels.
Accountability Measures #2: Advertise all vacant positions in multiple media.

Strategic Priorities #3: Town Hall Meetings
Accountability Measures #3: Host One Town Hall meeting each academic year.

Strategic Priorities #4: Facility Departments Meetings
Accountability Measures #4: Meet every two weeks with Facilities Services Lead Staff for special topics and cross-communication.

Strategic Priorities #5: Provide bi-weekly communication "Facts from Facilities" newsletter.
Accountability Measures #5: Host One Town Hall meeting each academic year.

Strategic Priorities #6: Utilize employee suggestion boxes and update actions taken.
Accountability Measures #6: Host One Town Hall meeting each academic year.

Strategic Priorities #7: Provide bi-annual new and refresher computer training for Facilities Services staff, focusing on Facilities Services goals and needs.
Accountability Measures #7: Measure training opportunities completed according to each Department's training matrix. Annually fund professional organization and recertification training.

Expected Outcome #3 - Evaluate and implement best practices and technology to continually improve each internal process, business practice, creative innovation, and customer service initiative. (University Goal 1, Priority 6, and Goal 4, Priority 5).

Strategic Priorities #1: Sustain accuracy with each transaction and process.
Accountability Measures #1: Provide Fiscal Year-End Annual Report summarizing organization activities.

Strategic Priorities #2: Seek benchmarking opportunities with internal and external professional organizations, agencies and consultants.
Accountability Measures #2: Annually provide benchmarking through APPA.

Strategic Priorities #3: Annually benchmark parking and transportation fees and propose adjustments.

Strategic Priorities #4: Annually survey Campus users to improve the Trolley Service.
Strategic Priorities #5: Reengineer internal processes by identifying, developing and maintaining Standard Operating Procedures for the organization.
Accountability Measures #5: #39 SOP’s generated and maintained by Department or Program.

Strategic Priorities #6: Continually replace equipment for the organization.
Accountability Measures #6: Annually update a Three-Year Equipment plan, based on equipment life cycle, for the organization.

Architectural and Engineering Services Unit

Expected Outcome #1 - Develop and maintain a reliable and inviting high quality physical facilities resource base to support the University’s Strategic Plan consistent with the Campus Master Plan and implement corresponding organizational improvements. (Facilities Services Goal #1, University Goal #1, Priorities 3, 5 & 6, and University Goal #2, Priority #4)

Strategic Priority #1: Provide recommendations to the PECO Five-Year Formula Funds plan and maintain recurring lists of window coverings, sidewalks, carpet replacement and floor refinishing.
Accountability Measure #1: Annually updating and submitting the PECO Formula Funded plan to the Facilities Planning Committee for recommendations to the University Planning Council.

Strategic Priority #2: Utilize maximum facility funding opportunities to create high quality, long-life facilities and optimize preservation of life-cycle values.
Accountability Measure #2: Annually provide the Facilities Planning Committee Project Scope Statements that detail costs of construction for prioritization.
Accountability Measure #2: Maintain updated “UWF Building Design and Construction Standards” in two-year increments. The next update will be April, 2008.

Strategic Priority #3: Maintain Space Management documentation, analysis and reporting, and publish updated Space Book.

Strategic Priority #4: Enhance the Information Technology System (ITS) created Project Management Report to coincide with SCT Banner Financial information.
Accountability Measure #4: Monthly evaluate the Project Management report and the SCT Banner reports to assure reconciliation.

Expected Outcome #2 - Recruit, develop, and retain a highly capable technical and administrative staff that is engaged, productive, communicated with consistently, and
committed to achieving the organization’s mission. (Facilities Services Goal # 2; University Goal #2, Priority 4)

**Strategic Priority #1**: Effective communications within the Architectural & Engineering Services department.
**Accountability Measure #1**: Bi-weekly Architectural & Engineering Services department meetings.

**Strategic Priority #2**: Expand growth/development and technical and non-technical training for all staff.
**Accountability Measures #2**: Provide a minimum of two (2) training opportunities per staff member per year.

**Strategic Priority #3**: Attract and retain experienced, motivated staff.
**Accountability Measure #3**: Advertisement all vacant positions in diverse multiple media.
**Accountability Measures #3**: Ascertain an effective, diverse search committee process as set forth by Human Resources guidelines.

**Expected Outcome #3** - Evaluate and implement best practices and technology to continually improve each internal process, business practice, creative innovation, and customer service initiative. (Facilities Services Goal #3; University Goal #4, Priority 5)

**Strategic Priority #1**: Re-engineer internal processes and develop Standard Operating Procedures as required.
**Accountability Measure #1**: Create a minimum of six (6) Standard Operating Procedures to achieve the highest degree of efficiency possible.

**Strategic Priority #2**: Design/implement standardized computer file structure.
**Accountability Measure #2**: Complete electronic file management revisions by June 30, 2007.

**Strategic Priority #3**: Benchmark with external organizations, agencies and other universities that are organizationally structured the same.
**Accountability Measure #3**: Annually provide benchmarking through APPA.

**Strategic Priority #4**: Maintain a dynamic and highly utilized Project Manager’s Manual
**Accountability Measure #4**: Annually update the Project Manager’s Manual.

**Expected Outcome #4** - Develop meaningful professional relationships by involving those facility staff members, campus leaders, and external stakeholders in facility discussions where they will be impacted by the decision. (Facilities Services Goal #4; University Goal #2, Priority 4)

**Strategic Priority #1**: Effective relations with campus ITS leaders and other internal stakeholders.
Accountability Measure #1: Schedule monthly meetings with ITS staff regarding project assistance and priorities.

Strategic Priority #2: Construction Project Update News Letter
Accountability Measure #2: Distribute the Construction Project Update report bi-weekly and post on the AES website.

Strategic Priority #3: Develop effective relationships with consultants and contractors.
Accountability Measure #3: Communicate expectations with consultants and contractors on each project. Assure accountability of contractors for performance, quality of workmanship and correction of deficiencies.

Strategic Priority #4: Communicate effectively to campus customers regarding project progress.
Accountability Measure #4: Complete project evaluations from customers to measure customer service and performance for all projects.

Facilities Maintenance Unit

Expected Outcome #1 - Maintain the overall Facilities Management Backlog of work orders at less than 30 days.

DATA SOURCE
TMA, which is the Computerized Maintenance Management System used by Facilities Management.

FY 05-06 averaged 45.0 work-orders in backlog per month. There was a personnel issue in Vehicle Maintenance for approximately 4 months; without Vehicle Maintenance the backlog would have averaged 31.4

Expected Outcome #2 - Maintain the UWF Main Campus energy consumption per square foot for each commodity at FY 2004-2005 levels.

DATA SOURCE
Energy bills and space data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMODITY</th>
<th>UNITS/SF</th>
<th>FY 02/03</th>
<th>FY 03/04</th>
<th>FY 04/05</th>
<th>FY 05/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRIC</td>
<td>KWH</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL GAS</td>
<td>MCF</td>
<td>49.94</td>
<td>48.22</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td>45.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>GALS</td>
<td>83.71</td>
<td>81.10</td>
<td>55.80</td>
<td>56.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWER</td>
<td>MGALS</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td>27.99</td>
<td>22.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected Outcome #3 – Benchmark facilities management cost levels with APPA and maintain at midpoint of all colleges or less.
DATA SOURCE
APPA Facilities Core Data Survey and budget report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 03/04 Note 1</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
<th>BUILDING SERVICES</th>
<th>MAINTENANCE</th>
<th>UTILITIES OPERATIONS Note 2</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$/ACRE</td>
<td>$/SQ FT</td>
<td>$/SQ FT</td>
<td>$/SQ FT</td>
<td>$/SQ FT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWF</td>
<td>$1,989</td>
<td>$1.09</td>
<td>$0.93</td>
<td>$0.64</td>
<td>$2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL APPA</td>
<td>$4,396</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$1.17</td>
<td>$0.37</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1 latest information available FY 04/05 expected soon
Note 2 Higher than average because of operating a water utility
Financial Services Department

Strategic Goal #1 - Promote a learning/working environment that encourages the development of individual potential in students, faculty, and staff (while meeting the financial processing and information needs of the University Community).

Intended Objective I: Provide all employees with an opportunity for personal and professional development.

Expected Outcome
- All employees are encouraged to participate in some form of professional/personal development each year. This can be in the form of professional training or participation in university workgroups and committees.
- All employees will attend Career Enhancement Planning Training.
- Supervisors will assist in developing a plan for interested employees.
- Encourage 100% participation in Making Way for Excellence program.

Method for Assessment
- Personal/professional growth opportunities will be part of the objectives for each staff member annually.
- Fulfillment or barriers to fulfillment will be noted in quarterly objectives reviews and ultimately in the staff annual evaluation, a copy of which is maintained in the employee's personnel file in Financial Services.
- Associate Controllers/Controller will review all evaluations for compliance.

Use of Assessment Results
Staff not participating in professional/personal development will be counseled by their supervisors to identify interests and locate a suitable avenue for personal and professional growth.

Intended Objective II: Encourage employees to evaluate processes and make recommendations for improvements.

Expected Outcome
- Each Financial Services process and related procedures and policies will be documented and available for review and cross-training initiatives.
- Cross-training initiatives bring a fresh eye to individual processes.
- Efficiencies and improvements will be encouraged through the creation of a safe environment for brainstorming and eliminating zero tolerance for risk-taking and errors.

Method for Assessment
- All operational areas have up-to-date desk manual detailing procedures.
- Each major functional area has flowcharts of basic information flow.
Processes make use of available technology, or the decision to forego is documented and reasonable.

Monthly meeting with various University constituencies reveal customer satisfaction.

Discussion on topic encouraged in weekly staff meetings.

Individuals participating in cross-training are debriefed by supervisors for potential areas of improvement.

**Use of Assessment Results**

Dissatisfaction expressed in weekly/monthly meetings or in interaction with Financial Services employees will be investigated and addressed.

**Strategic Goal #2** - Manage growth responsibly through focus on continuous quality improvement of programs and processes.

Intended Objective I: Improve on functionality of Banner ERP system by implementing Phase II of the project.

**Expected Outcome**

Successfully implement receiving function for university departments.

**Method for Assessment**

University departments enter receiving data directly into Banner.

**Use of Assessment Results**

Use of emails as a means of documenting receipt can be eliminated, and matching can occur automatically within the Banner system.

Intended Objective II: Successful identification of use and implementation of workflow, document imaging, electronic signature, and other technology to improve processes.

**Expected Outcome**

- Controller’s involvement with committee to select document imaging package will provide necessary background to identify potential uses within Financial Services.
- Potential workflow projects have been identified and prioritized.
- Use of specified technology will greatly reduce processing times, staff and student frustration, and paper pushing.

**Method for Assessment**

- Reduction in the volume of paper purchased and processed with commensurate reduction in the need for storage space.
- Reduction in time required to investigate discrepancies and to process various requests, as identified by staff.
• Comparison to benchmarking standards developed by SUS Consortium for Florida Universities.

Use of Assessment Results
Successful implementation will generate experience and enthusiasm for successive projects.

Intended Objective III: Development of policies that capitalize on our new governance structure and focus on accountability.

Expected Outcome III
• Documented policies regarding expenditure of University funds
• Documented policies and procedures related to Student Financial Services operations which incorporate changes in federal and state regulations while maintaining flexibility in providing customer service.
• Documented policies and procedures for collecting and reporting sales tax.
• Documented policies and procedures for preparation of the Unrelated Business Income Tax (UBIT) return.
• Documented policies and procedures for reporting and returning unclaimed property to the State.
• Documented policies and procedures for general Financial Service operations.

Method for Assessment
• Absence of audit findings on operational, financial, and special purpose audits.
• Customer survey program in Student Financial Services.
• Student Financial Services meets with Financial Aid and other Enrollment Services departments before and after each term for an assessment of “what went right, what went wrong”.

Use of Assessment Results
• Audit findings will be addressed and policies/procedures adjusted as necessary to prevent recurrence.
• Items identified in customer surveys or interdepartmental meetings will result in adjustment to policies/procedures within statutory limitations.

Strategic Goal #3 - Provide solutions to educational, cultural, economic, and environmental concerns.

Intended Objective I: Improve the timeliness and quality of information delivered to decision makers and the campus community.

Expected Outcome
Financial Services staff provides improved response time and increased efficiency in meeting requests for information by reducing reliance on ITS for ad hoc reporting.
Method for Assessment
Select staff in Financial Services receives training on the use of the University’s report writer and establishes competency in meeting Financial Services ad hoc reporting needs.

Use of Assessment Results
Competency with the University’s report writer is used to meet ad hoc reporting needs of decision makers across campus.

Intended Objective II: Improve the accessibility of financial information.

Expected Outcome
- Revamped and updated Financial Services website.
- Annual financial statement package available via web.
- Financial Services policies available via web.
- Financial Services forms available via web.
- Financial Services website includes links to related resources.

Method for Assessment
Webmaster contact information provided on website, comments and recommendations solicited.

Use of Assessment Results
Suggestions and recommendations reviewed and implemented as appropriate.
Procurement Services Department

Expected Outcome #1 – Reduction in procurement lead-time from identification of need through contract and delivery of the commodity or service.

Measuring Expected Outcome

- Compare process times for each type of procurement at Fiscal Year end versus previous Fiscal Year results.

Use of Assessment Results

- Identify areas that need improvement and analyze and make appropriate changes to increase efficiency.

Actual/Proposed Changes

- This analysis will be performed at the end of this Fiscal Year for the first time. UWF is in the second year of our ERP system that now will allow this analysis to be performed.

Expected Outcome #2 – Transition of Procurement Systems and Processes from a manual and task oriented system to a more strategic, technology driven one that incorporates best practices.

Measuring Expected Outcome

- Percentage of Purchase Orders and Contracts placed within the new ERP system versus manual transactions.

Use of Assessment Results

The information obtained will identify areas for potential improvement through re-training opportunities and/or procedural changes.

Actual/Proposed Changes

- Proposed departmental goal that 90% of procurement transactions occur in the ERP system.
- Proposed departmental goal of 20% of all procurement transactions performed on P-Card.
- Establish minimum P-Card rebate goal of $25K annually.
- Procurement Services instituted direct linkage and access to pre-approved contracts by campus customers via the UWF portal.
**Expected Outcome # 3** – Support socially responsible programs that are incorporated in the Minority Business Program and the Green Purchasing Program.

**Measuring Expected Outcome**

- Compare percentage of dollars spent with certified minority providers through Procurement Services annually using previous versus most current Fiscal Year end.
- Existence of a formal Green Procurement Program.
- Number of training sessions to support the programs.

**Use of Assessment Results**

Identify areas not conforming to expected outcome and recommend appropriate changes.

**Actual/Proposed Changes**

- Increase the number of training sessions for campus community regarding the use of certified minority vendors.
- Research best in class “Green” programs at other universities and make recommendations for formal adoption at UWF.

**Expected Outcome #4** – Improved training, communications and professional development for Procurement Services staff in order to maintain employee satisfaction as well as keeping the NPI annual award for achievement of excellence in procurement.

**Measuring Expected Outcome**

- Total training dollars spent annually.
- Number of staff obtaining and maintaining their “certifications”.
- Receiving NPI annual award.
- Employee satisfaction score is a minimum of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale.

**Actual/Proposed Changes**

- Formalizing the internal training effort within Procurement Services.
- Use of Power Point training internally.
- Test procurement staff on knowledge semi-annually.
- Increase training budget allocation and spend.
University Police Department

**Strategic Goal #1** - Train all officers and support police staff in Incident Command Systems and National Incident Management Systems. This is a terrorism, multi-agency, response action.

**Expected Outcome** - 100% of police staff training by September 2006.

**Strategic Priority #1** Identify training source and implement a training schedule.

**Accountability Measures**
Research after-action reports from cities which have used Incident Command Systems.

**Accountability Measure Data**
Program does not currently exist.

**Accountability Measure Data Analysis**
The outcome is to be in full compliance with Federal NIMS mandate no later than September 2006.

**Strategic Priority #2** Mandate all staff to complete training by August 2006.

**Accountability Measures**
Provide time schedule and equipment, such as computer access, for on-line training.

**Accountability Measure Data**
- 100% of police support staff should be trained by August 2007.
- 100% of officers trained by September 2007

**Strategic Goal 2** - Implement community based policing style procedure for improving campus building security by Fall semester 2006.

**Expected Outcome** - 20% improvement in building security.

**Strategic Priority #1** Test new community based policing program on selected buildings for two months.

**Accountability Measures**
Track data from building security log. Compare data from before test program and after two months of test program on selected buildings.

**Accountability Measure Data**
Before and after data for test will be compared after two months of test.
Accountability Measure Data Analysis
Test before and after data comparison from building security log.

Strategic Priority #2 Identify and meet with campus staff from selected buildings to participate in program.

Accountability Measures
Communicate discrepancy information daily with identified building staff.

Accountability Measure Data
Communications will be conducted through email.
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### Appendix E

**ALC Domains Assessed - 2005-2006 Annual Report**

*X = Annual report indicated that this domain was assessed
Blank = No claim made in annual report that this domain was assessed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>45.0201</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The capstone experience/projects in the listed courses already exist. Students are graded on their performance. We have not yet developed or required a written evaluation of the capstone experience/project. The contents/topics of the evaluations will be developed in the coming academic year.

| CAS | Art | Art BA | 50.0701 | X |          |                   |                  |                    |                      |

| CAS | Art | Art BFA Second ALC is for Art History | 50.0702 |   |          |                   |                  | X | The instructors of the capstone experiences and the graduating seniors were asked to complete the same assessment form, one that asked both groups to rank the students' mastery of all SLO’s in all five domains. |
### ALC Domains Assessed - 2005-2006 Annual Report

X = Annual report indicated that this domain was assessed  
Blank = No claim made in annual report that this domain was assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
<th>Project Management Assessments Material Quoted from Annual Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Biology General and Marine Biology</td>
<td>26.0101 &amp; 26.1302</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See the rubric utilized for assessing this specific domain in Appendix B1.BS. BIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology / School of Allied Health and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Sciences / Biology</td>
<td>11.0103</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See the rubric utilized for assessing this specific domain in Appendix B1.BS. BIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Information Technology: Bioinformation Track</td>
<td>30.0101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See the rubric utilized for assessing this specific domain in Appendix B1.BS. BIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Sciences / Zoo Science</td>
<td>30.0101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See the rubric utilized for assessing this specific domain in Appendix B1.BS. BIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology / School of Allied Health and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Pre-Dental (either Biology or Chemistry)</td>
<td>40.0501</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See the rubric utilized for assessing this specific domain in Appendix B1.BS. BIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology / School of Allied Health and Life Sciences (Environmental Studies)</td>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>40.0607</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>See the rubric utilized for assessing this specific domain in Appendix B1.BS. BIOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>40.0501</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>CIP Code</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Integrity / Values</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>6th Domain (Optional)</td>
<td>Project Management Assessments Material Quoted from Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>9.0102</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A random sample of 5 portfolios of students enrolled in Creative Direction were evaluated by 1 faculty member and 2 advertising professionals. Experimental exit survey was administered to graduating seniors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>9.0102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Organizational Communications</td>
<td>9.0102</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>A random sample of 3 projects by students enrolled in the Health Communication Leadership Project course were evaluated by 1 faculty member and by 2 health industry professionals in the community. Experimental exit survey was administered to graduating seniors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ALC Domains Assessed - 2005-2006 Annual Report

*X* = Annual report indicated that this domain was assessed  
Blank = No claim made in annual report that this domain was assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>9.0102</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Telecommunication &amp; Film</td>
<td>9.0102</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Computer Science / School of Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Computer Information Science</td>
<td>11.0101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>CIP Code</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Integrity / Values</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>6th Domain (Optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Computer Science / School of Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Information Technology (IT)</td>
<td>11.0103</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>14.0901</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>14.1001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>English &amp; Foreign Languages</td>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>23.0101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>3.0104</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>Maritime Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AIC Domains Assessed - 2005-2006 Annual Report

X = Annual report indicated that this domain was assessed  
Blank = No claim made in annual report that this domain was assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Government &amp; International Studies / Political Science</td>
<td>45.0901</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>54.0101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ours is a dual method. First, we began to require all graduating students to fill out an exit survey in which they are asked to give a “grade” to the Department, from A to F, on each of the SLOs. Second, regular faculty assign a “grade” to all graduating students they had in class on each of the SLOs, then we average across the “grades.” In the second half of the assessment method, the faculty “grade” the students they have had in class on each dimension and then an average is computed across all dimensions and all faculty for every student. Here we set the following benchmarks: a “grade” of 3.5 or above means that the student exceeded expectations, 3.0-3.499 means that the student met expectations, and below 3.0 that the student did not meet expectations.

Capstone experience paper completed by twenty-five students as part of Dr. Amy Mitchell-Cook’s 4000-level Age of Discovery course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
<th>Project Management Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>27.0101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Through simulated exercises in laboratory management 2. Monitoring of graduate’s performance in these areas upon job entry 3. Scores obtained in the category of ‘lab operations’ in the certification exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td>Program in Clinical Laboratory Studies</td>
<td>51.1005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>51.1601</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religious Studies</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>38.0101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religious Studies</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Humanities</td>
<td>24.0103</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>40.0801</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ALC Domains Assessed - 2005-2006 Annual Report

X = Annual report indicated that this domain was assessed  
Blank = No claim made in annual report that this domain was assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
<th>Project Management Assessments Material Quoted from Annual Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>42.0101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect measure, composed of self-assessment of 5 components of project management for the diagnostic project. Direct measure by instructor of those same 5 components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>50.0501</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Accounting / Finance</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>52.0801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This was conducted by the Department of Management and MIS in MAN 4720, the capstone course for all COB majors. The Department responded to recommendations from this assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Accounting / Finance</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>52.0301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Management / MIS</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>52.0201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ALC Domains Assessed - 2005-2006 Annual Report

X = Annual report indicated that this domain was assessed  
Blank = No claim made in annual report that this domain was assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
<th>Project Management Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Management / MIS</td>
<td>Management Information Systems</td>
<td>52.1201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Marketing / Economics</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>52.0601</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Marketing / Economics</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>52.1401</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice / Legal Studies</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>43.0104</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice / Legal Studies</td>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>CIP Code</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Integrity / Values</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>6th Domain (Optional)</td>
<td>Project Management Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Engineering / Computer Technology</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering Technology</td>
<td>15.1101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student reports about class content. Students generated portfolios of projects that were undertaken in the class. Faculty review of portfolio and class processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ALC Domains Assessed - 2005-2006 Annual Report

X = Annual report indicated that this domain was assessed  
Blank = No claim made in annual report that this domain was assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
<th>Project Management Assessments Material Quoted from Annual Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Engineering / Computer Technology</td>
<td>Information Engineering Technology</td>
<td>15.1101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The assessment plan was developed in the 2005-2006 academic year and will be evaluated throughout the 2006-2007 academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>HLES</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>52.0901</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COPS    | HLES       | Health Education | 31.0501 | X       | X             | X                |                   |                   |                   | Research paper in HSC 4500 Epidemiology  
HSC 4940 Internship (activities and capstone project)  
Number of graduates entering graduate program. |
### ALC Domains Assessed - 2005-2006 Annual Report

X = Annual report indicated that this domain was assessed  
Blank = No claim made in annual report that this domain was assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>CIP Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Integrity / Values</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>6th Domain (Optional)</th>
<th>Project Management Assessments Material Quoted from Annual Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Social Work (BA/BSW)</td>
<td>24.0101</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Each semester students in Senior Seminar (SOW 4510) complete a macro project in their field agency as part of their course requirements in senior seminar. Typically, students spend 25-35 hours on their project. Larger projects may have up to 4 interns involved from the same agency, although typically they involve one student. The criterion for the macro project is the following: addresses a need in the agency, benefits the clients that the agency serves, and on some level involves the community. Student interns must have the approval of their agency field supervisor and submit a proposal to the instructor of Senior Seminar prior to beginning their project. The grade for each project is based on the magnitude of the project, the amount of work involved, and the quality of the student’s macro project overview paper. The goal for the macro project is a minimal grade of “B” for students enrolled in the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Teacher Education (Global ALC)</td>
<td>13.xxxx</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Florida Teacher Certification Exam Professional Education Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceptional Student Education / ESOL</td>
<td>13.1006</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Florida Teacher Certification Exam Professional Education Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>CIP Code</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Integrity / Values</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>6th Domain (Optional)</td>
<td>Project Management Assessments Material Quoted from Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Education/ESOL</td>
<td>13.1202</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Florida Teacher Certification Exam Professional Education Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School Education</td>
<td>13.1203</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Florida Teacher Certification Exam Professional Education Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prekindergarten / Primary Education / ESOL</td>
<td>13.121</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Florida Teacher Certification Exam Professional Education Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Career &amp; Technical Studies</td>
<td>13.132</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Florida Teacher Certification Exam Professional Education Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Management Data

**Summary of Evaluation and Use of Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Evaluation of Project Management Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Material Quoted from Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Art BFA Second ALC is for Art History</td>
<td>The stylistic and thematic cohesiveness—demanded of this SLO—is often times elusive, even with seasoned professionals. Further study is required to determine whether the average score is an accurate evaluative reflection of BFA program. Since that program is a professional degree requiring more studio practice than the general BA degree, it is anticipated that the BFA students would score better in this project management criterion. The data were collected without respect to CIP Code or sub-discipline. Therefore, the inference drawn must apply to the entire group of 19 graduating seniors, and not just the 4 in the BFA degree program. However, the small sample size would not allow for any statistically viable conclusions, even if the BFA students were to be considered separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Biology General and Marine Biology</td>
<td>See a summary of SACS follow-up reports on standards (with tables derived from baseline data) in: Appendix 4.SACSFollowUpReports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Project Management Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology / School of Allied Health and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Sciences / Biology</td>
<td>See a summary of SACS follow-up reports on standards (with tables derived from baseline data) in: Appendix 4.SACSFollowUpReports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology / School of Allied Health and Life Sciences</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Information Technology: Bioinformation Track</td>
<td>See a summary of SACS follow-up reports on standards (with tables derived from baseline data) in: Appendix 4.SACSFollowUpReports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology / School of Allied Health and Life Sciences (Environmental Studies)</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Sciences / Zoo Science</td>
<td>See a summary of SACS follow-up reports on standards (with tables derived from baseline data) in: Appendix 4.SACSFollowUpReports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Pre-Dental (either Biology or Chemistry)</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Sciences</td>
<td>See a summary of SACS follow-up reports on standards (with tables derived from baseline data) in: Appendix 4.SACSFollowUpReports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology / School of Allied Health and Life Sciences (Environmental Studies)</td>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>See a summary of SACS follow-up reports on standards (with tables derived from baseline data) in: Appendix 4.SACSFollowUpReports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Professionals’ evaluations were of little use because of confusion over the directions provided. Very positive responses About program, courses And faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Project Management Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of Evaluation and Use of Data Material Quoted from Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CAS     | Communication Arts | Organizational Communications | 2 practitioners:  
Met expectations well: 3  
Met expectations: 2  
Failed to meet expectations: 1  
Faculty member:  
Met expectations well: 3  
Met expectations: 2  
Failed to meet expectations: 1  
Generally high praise for the program. | Material Quoted from Annual Reports |
| CAS     | Communication Arts | Public Relations | 2 practitioners average:  
Met expectations well: 3  
Met expectations: 2  
Failed to meet expectations: 0  
Faculty member:  
Met expectations well: 4  
Met expectations: 1  
Failed to meet expectations: 0  
Generally high praise for program and its hands-on approach. On the basis of the practitioners’ advice about improving portfolios (CDs, tabs, etc.), that advice will be conveyed to students next year. | Two external evaluators provided useful feedback. Next year both public relations faculty members on the Pensacola campus will evaluate the portfolios, not one. Survey questions produced useful answers. |
| CAS     | Communication Arts | Telecommunication & Film | All 10 projects were evaluated as having met expectations well. Students are positive about the program, especially its hands-on approach. But they frequently cited the need for better equipment. Students’ frequent mention of the need for better equipment must be addressed. | No changes recommended at this time. Self-evaluation forms produced useful answers. |
### Project Management Data
#### Summary of Evaluation and Use of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Evaluation of Project Management Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Computer Science / School of Science &amp;</td>
<td>Computer Information Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Further develop time estimate and timesheet templates for the students. Important part of plan to capture enhancements to the PM outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Computer Science / School of Science &amp;</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Information Technology (IIT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>English &amp; Foreign Languages</td>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CAS Environmental Studies

- **Program:** Environmental Studies
- **Summary of Evaluation and Use of Data Material Quoted from Annual Reports:** Storage space for portfolios is being created in Summer 2006. Filing of student portfolios begins in Fall 2006. Based upon feedback, especially from our Advisory Board, we plan to create a more flexible curriculum, to take effect in Fall 2007.

### CAS Environmental Studies

- **Program:** Maritime Studies
- **Summary of Evaluation and Use of Data Material Quoted from Annual Reports:**

### CAS Government

- **Program:** Government & International Studies / Political Science
- **Summary of Evaluation and Use of Data Material Quoted from Annual Reports:** This was the only dimension in which the average “grade” assigned by students was below 3.75. Instead, they assigned it a 3.55 grade. We consider that it met their expectations but we’d like to do better.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Project Management Data</th>
<th>Evaluation of Project Management Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>See Annual Report for detailed presentation of data. Based on preliminary data from all five domains, which demonstrate some difficulties with written and verbal communication, critical thinking skills, and project management, the History Department will focus on the latter, which encompasses components of the other two. The Department will emphasize project management in 3000/4000-level history courses, with foundation work coming in HIS 3002 Research Methods.</td>
<td>In 06-07, all graduating seniors will be asked to assemble and maintain a portfolio of their best work completed as part of a 3000/4000 in 06-07. History will create a packet to mail out to graduating seniors with assessment rubrics for student and professor, a contract between student and professor, and an exit interview. A committee will evaluate materials, with special attention to project management, and recommend changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td>Program in Clinical Laboratory Studies</td>
<td>1. From the certification exam results, it appears that students obtain basic principles of laboratory operation and management. 2. Through employer and graduate surveys indicate that those students who exhibit leadership qualities in training perform well in undertaking supervisory/management responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Music Performance &amp; Music Teaching</td>
<td>The majority of students achieved successful completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Project Management Data</td>
<td>Evaluation of Project Management Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary of Evaluation</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Use of Data</td>
<td>Material Quoted from Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quoted from Annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religious</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Self-assessment was</td>
<td>1. In the fall semester, the undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>largely consistent with</td>
<td>curriculum committee will meet to review and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instructor assessment</td>
<td>develop a more effective procedure to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of project management</td>
<td>gather data with the exit survey,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>components. Overwhelm-</td>
<td>providing more effective incentives for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ing majority of students</td>
<td>student response. 2. In the fall semester,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>were able to develop an</td>
<td>we will need to establish a clearer process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initial project plan</td>
<td>for implementing project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with appropriate stages</td>
<td>assessment in the Experimental labs. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the project defined</td>
<td>standard self-report rubric was used for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and appropriate deadlines</td>
<td>this course. The instructor will examine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for each project stage.</td>
<td>the utility of this rubric, for possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also, overwhelming</td>
<td>revision to address the unique aspects of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>majority achieved</td>
<td>the project assigned for this course. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completion of project</td>
<td>project management assignment and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stages by planned</td>
<td>assessment strategy will be shared with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deadlines. Assessment</td>
<td>other faculty seeking to modify their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>data reveal that</td>
<td>courses to include project management as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students believe that</td>
<td>graded component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they profited from the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>However, it is also</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clear that students did</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not make appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use of scholarly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resources to complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the project. The SLO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and syllabus description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the project will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>revised to emphasize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>use of appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>library and scholarly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resources for successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completion of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project. In some isolated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cases, students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appeared to misunderstand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>details of the assigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project requirements,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resulting in poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Description of project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>details will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reviewed for possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>revision for enhanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clarity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religious</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>1. In the fall semester,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>the undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>curriculum committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will meet to review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and develop a more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>effective procedure to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gather data with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>exit survey, providing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more effective incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for student response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. In the fall semester,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>we will need to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>establish a clearer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>process for implementing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessment in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental labs. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>standard self-report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rubric was used for this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>course. The instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>will examine the utility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of this rubric, for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>possible revision to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>address the unique aspects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the project assigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for this course. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assignment and assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strategy will be shared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with other faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seeking to modify their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>courses to include</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>project management as a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>graded component.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The two departmental courses that were targeted following the assessment were FIN 3403 and ACG 3311. In both courses, faculty agreed on a master syllabus, and agreed to spend more effort on financial statement analysis. Student weakness in financial statement analysis was cited in the assessment performed by the Department of Management and MIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Evaluation of Project Management Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Accounting / Finance</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Material Quoted from Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Accounting / Finance</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Management / MIS</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Management / MIS</td>
<td>Management Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Marketing / Economics</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Marketing / Economics</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice / Legal Studies</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice / Legal Studies</td>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Project Management Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Engineering / Computer Technology</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering Technology</td>
<td>Students effectively integrated the new instructional systems into the class projects. Using the projects outlined in BCN 3281C, all specializations in Engineering Technology will incorporate additional project management strategies. Based on the discussion in a faculty meeting on June 30, 2006, one of the course classes in ET will be revised to include project management techniques for all students to apply techniques in problem-based, authentic activities, to be implemented in the 2007-2008 catalog. As appropriate in other classes, students will be required to work in teams, develop common presentations, and create project plans. Based on feedback from Advisory Committees, focus groups, faculty interaction with other Departments, student input, benchmarking data from learned societies, several modifications to the ET core and individual specializations were made. The student learning outcomes were re-evaluated and, based on the available data, not revised, as they continue to provide an adequate framework for the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for the graduating ET student. To provide students with additional flexibility and technology skills, several Construction courses will be delivered either in a blended fashion or completely online. Based on needs of local industry and innovations in engineering, courses were modified for Electrical ET. Additional students participated in co-op, internships, and senior products, extending the skill development of these students. In the area of IET, faculty have worked with IIT and Computer Science faculty to identify courses that further expand the ability of IIT to be offered at a distance, with a strong Computer Science skill content that complements and supports information student marketability. In our discussions with industry partners about Engineering Technology, there has also been a strong interest, especially from industry in the Emerald Coast area, to re-institute Manufacturing as a full-blown specialization. A needs assessment is being conducted during the Summer Term, 2006 to evaluate how the Department can meet this interest and need. A combination of efforts, including continuing education, certificates, minor, and major are being considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Project Management Data Summary of Evaluation and Use of Data Material Quoted from Annual Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Engineering / Computer Technology</td>
<td>Information Engineering Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>HLES</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>HLES</td>
<td>Exercise Science, Physical Education, Athletic Training, and Sports Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>HLES</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>Assessment will be implemented in the 2006-7 academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Management Data

#### Summary of Evaluation and Use of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Quoted from Annual Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Evaluation of Project Management Assessment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Quoted from Annual Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Examples of macro projects from AY 2005-2006:**

- **Coordination of a Hospice Camp Monarch Day at Adventures Unlimited** for bereaved teens ages 13-18. Grade B. 1. Researched, designed, and facilitated a six week psycho-educational grouping for a community mental health outpatient program for homeless clients who were dually diagnosed with mental health and substance abuse disorders. Grade B+ 2. Student intern in an alternative school setting for girls designed a ten week psycho-educational Group on social skills. Grade B+ 3. Student intern in a college outreach program coordinated the first annual high school senior workshop for students in the Educational Talent Search program called "Crossing Bridges". Grade B+ 4. Student intern in a child welfare agency revised and updated a resource list of referral agencies for agency staff. Grade B+ The average grade for the macro Projects for AY 2005-2006 was a B. Although we met our minimal threshold grade of “B” for the macro project exercise in Senior Seminar, we felt a need to provide additional preparation for the students prior to entry into Senior Seminar and Field Instruction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Project Management Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

We have deleted a course, and merged content in two existing courses, SOW 3113 Human Behavior in Organizations & Communities and SOW 4233 Social Justice, Action & Policies. This will provide our students with a more solid foundation of knowledge and skills to better prepare them for completing the Macro Project in their capstone semester. We will continue to monitor the Macro Project as a measure of the level of knowledge and skills that our students demonstrate.

---

**COPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Social Work (BA/BSW)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education (Global ALC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Student Education / ESOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Education**

- **Teacher Education (Global ALC)**

  - There was a 100% Pass Rate on this Exam, We will increase Professional Development Plan (PDP) referrals to increase students’ grade point averages in initial certification programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of Project Management Assessment Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Exceptional Student Education / ESOL**

- **Exceptional Student Education / ESOL**

  - There was a 100% Pass Rate on this Exam, We will increase Professional Development Plan (PDP) referrals to increase students’ grade point averages in initial certification programs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Project Management Data</th>
<th>Evaluation of Project Management Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Education/ESOL</td>
<td>There was a 100% Pass Rate on this Exam, We will increase Professional Development Plan (PDP) referrals to increase students’ grade point averages in initial certification programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School Education</td>
<td>There was a 100% Pass Rate on this Exam, We will increase Professional Development Plan (PDP) referrals to increase students’ grade point averages in initial certification programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prekindergarten / Primary Education / ESOL</td>
<td>There was a 100% Pass Rate on this Exam, We will increase Professional Development Plan (PDP) referrals to increase students’ grade point averages in initial certification programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Career &amp; Technical Studies</td>
<td>There was a 100% Pass Rate on this Exam, We will increase Professional Development Plan (PDP) referrals to increase students’ grade point averages in initial certification programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

SAMPLES OF DATA OBTAINED FROM DEPARTMENTAL ASSESSMENTS

Assessment reports included in departmental Annual Report

Communication Arts (Journalism)

History

Psychology

Program in Clinical Laboratory Sciences
Appendix F

Annual Report, 2005-2006

Department/Division: ______Communication Arts________
College: ______Arts and Sciences________

Part I-AJC, Summary Report on Assessment, Academic Learning Compacts (ALC)
Program Title: ____Communication Arts - Journalism_______ Degree: ___B.A.______ CIP Code: __06013J________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALC Domainc</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomed</th>
<th>Method of Assessmente</th>
<th>Summary of Assessment Resultsf</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Programg</th>
<th>Evaluation of Assessment Planh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character/Integrity/Values</td>
<td>Describe and adhere to ethical principles in journalism</td>
<td>A random sample of 5 students’ ethics papers were evaluated by two practicing journalists and one faculty member to answer these questions: Have students been accurate in their analyses? Have students’ suggested solutions to ethical dilemmas been well-argued and rational? Experimental exit survey was administered to graduating seniors.</td>
<td>On 55 questions: 2 Journalists average: Met expectations well 33 Met expectations 18 Failed to meet expectations 4 Faculty Met expectations 42 Met 97 expectations Failed to meet 4 Expectations 9</td>
<td>Generally positive results. Asked for fewer night classes, more preparation for interviewing and generating story ideas.</td>
<td>On the basis of all three evaluators’ noticing a few students’ failure to address the question asked, more emphasis will be placed on that necessity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More attention will be paid to interviewing skills and story ideas.</td>
<td>Two faculty should evaluate, before the summer break. Responses to ethics questions have proved notoriously hard to grade. Next year we will shift to a random collection of student articles to evaluate all five domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey questions produced useful answers.
Prepare separate summary table for each degree program.
For example, BA, BSBA, MEd.
Select one domain to serve as a specific example to illustrate your assessment efforts for the current year. If you would like, you may describe additional domains.
From approved ALC.
From ALC Assessment Plan.
Summary of data regarding student learning outcome(s) identified above.
Describe assessment information from all domains used to make decisions about program changes and improvements, even if you do not describe all domains and all student learning outcomes in earlier blocks.
Describe changes you will make in your student learning outcomes or assessment plan as the result of what the department learned from this year's assessment efforts. Explain
### ALC Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALC Domain</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
<th>Summary of Assessment Results</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program</th>
<th>Evaluation of Assessment Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>Conceptualize, research, and present a historical paper or applied history project</td>
<td>Capstone experience paper completed by twenty-five students as part of Dr. Amy Mitchell-Cook’s 4000-level Age of Discovery course</td>
<td>Student self-assessment and faculty assessment in relation to course expectations in a class of twenty-five students:</td>
<td>Based on preliminary data from all five domains, which demonstrate some difficulties with written and verbal communication, critical thinking skills, and project management, the History Department will focus on the latter, which encompasses components of the other two. The Department will emphasize project management in 3000/4000-level history courses,</td>
<td>In 06-07, all graduating seniors will be asked to assemble and maintain a portfolio of their best work completed as part of a 3000/4000 in 06-07. History will create a packet to mail out to graduating seniors with assessment rubrics for student and professor, a contract between student and professor, and an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptualize</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC Domain&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Method of Assessment&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Summary of Assessment Results&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Evaluation of Assessment Plan&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document sources of information (i.e., bibliography)</td>
<td><em>Document</em> E M F</td>
<td>Professor 14 11 0</td>
<td>exit interview. A committee will evaluate materials, with special attention to project management, and recommend changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulate the pace of work appropriately to meet deadlines</td>
<td><em>Regulate</em> E M F</td>
<td>Professor 12 11 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborate effectively with colleagues and/or clients</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate skills relevant to careers in education, research, communications, information management, advocacy, government</td>
<td><em>Demonstrate</em> E M F</td>
<td>Professor 9 16 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The table indicates the methods used for assessment, the summary of assessment results, and the use of these results to improve the program. The evaluation plan includes an exit interview and a committee evaluation.
**Program Title**: Psychology  
**Degree**: Bachelor of Arts  
**CIP Code**: 42.0101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALC Domain</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
<th>Summary of Assessment Results</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program</th>
<th>Evaluation of Assessment Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All 5 domains of the ALC: Content, Critical Thinking, Communication, Integrity/Values, and Project Management.</td>
<td>1. All 17 specific SLOs are listed in the ALC.</td>
<td>1. Indirect measure, composed of self-assessment in an exit survey of graduating seniors. The measure was sent electronically, by e-mail, late in both fall and spring semesters, with 2 follow-up messages to encourage response.</td>
<td>1. Response to the first message was extremely limited, totaling 3, with no response to either follow-up message. The volume of response was not sufficient to generate useful data to report.</td>
<td>1. The extremely low response rate reveals a need to revise and implement a more effective procedure.</td>
<td>1. In the fall semester, the undergraduate curriculum committee will meet to review and develop a more effective procedure to gather data with the exit survey, providing more effective incentives for student response. 2. In the fall semester, we will need to establish a clearer process for implementing project management assessment in the Experimental labs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The specific domain selected for further assessment in upper level courses is Project Management.</td>
<td>2. Project Management: a) Design and implement (individually or with others) a project to examine a psychological</td>
<td>2. In upper level courses indirect self-assessment and direct instructor assessment measures are available.</td>
<td>2. Only 2 upper level courses employed a project management assessment. With new instructors for Experimental labs,</td>
<td>2. Refer to next 2 sections for report on individual courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC Domain&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Method of Assessment&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Summary of Assessment Results&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Evaluation of Assessment Plan&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management (EXP 4250, Human Factors Psychology)</td>
<td>Course syllabus SLO: Upon completion of this course students will be able to apply the principles of psychology (e.g., human physiology, behavior, and cognition) and use the methodologies and tools of the human factors discipline to analyze, critique, and develop (conceptually) user-friendly human-machine interfaces.</td>
<td>Indirect measure, composed of self-assessment of the student’s project management.</td>
<td>All reported having consistently met deadlines. Majority reported being able to clearly communicate results of project (92%), that the project was relevant to psychology (88%), and that the project improved skills in research methodology (79%). Majority reported that they did not use any scholarly resources (55%) or library data bases (63%) to complete the project.</td>
<td>Assessment data reveal that students believe that they profited from the project experience. However, it is also clear that students did not make appropriate use of scholarly resources to complete the project. The SLO and syllabus description of the project will be revised to emphasize use of appropriate library and scholarly resources for successful completion of the project.</td>
<td>The standard self-report rubric was used for this course. The instructor will examine the utility of this rubric, for possible revision to address the unique aspects of the project assigned for this course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Report, 2005-2006 (Option One)

Department/Division: Program in Clinical Laboratory Sciences / Division of Allied Health & Life Sciences

College: Arts & Sciences

Part I-AWC, Summary Report on Assessment, Academic Learning Compacts (ALC)

Program Title: Program in Clinical Laboratory Sciences    Degree: BS    CIP Code: 51.1005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALC Domain</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
<th>Summary of Assessment Results</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program</th>
<th>Evaluation of Assessment Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>1. Recognize and apply concepts, principles, and theories from the sciences that underlie clinical lab skills (e.g., biochemistry, pathophysiology)</td>
<td>National Board Certification Exam ASCP Board of Registry</td>
<td><strong>Pass rate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Program: 100% National: 78%&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mean Scaled Scores</strong>&lt;br&gt;Program: 527 National: 493&lt;br&gt;Program (P) Mean Scaled Scores are above the national (N) means in each area tested</td>
<td>Program scores in certain sub-content areas are below national means.&lt;br&gt;Need to increase the number of computer administered comprehensive/self assessment exams in preparation for the national Board certification exams&lt;br&gt;Computer administr-ered comprehensive/self assessment exams in preparation for the national Board certification exams will be increased</td>
<td>These areas will be strengthened in the coming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Apply methodological principles from clinical courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Recognize and apply principles of quality assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Use medical terminology accurately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC Domain</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
<td>Method of Assessment</td>
<td>Summary of Assessment Results</td>
<td>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program</td>
<td>Evaluation of Assessment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Critical thinking | 1. Distinguish abnormal from normal results  
2. Interpret and evaluate clinical procedures and results  
3. Make and confirm sound diagnostic conclusions  
4. Predict clinical course following diagnosis | National Board Certification Exam  
ASCP Board of Registry | **Pass rate**  
Program: 100%  
National: 78%  
**Mean Scaled Scores**  
Program: 527  
National: 493 | Increase the number of case studies and other critical thinking and decision making exercises in course work | 2006-2007 QEP Plan:  
Student’s performance in selected laboratory practical in Clinical Chemistry I will be assessed for achievement of SLO in critical thinking |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALC Domain</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Method of Assessment&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Summary of Assessment Results&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Evaluation of Assessment Plan&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1. Select, operate, and maintain appropriate strategies for recording and reporting results 2. Communicate effectively with other medical professionals and service providers 3. Interact effectively with patients using calm and reasoned judgment and sensitivity to patient characteristics 4. Make professional oral presentations of findings</td>
<td>1. Assessment of student’s ability to accurately use the laboratory information systems during clinical rotations 2 &amp; 3. Assess student’s skills in communication with patients, and other health care professionals while in hospital rotations 4. The ALC domain in communication was specifically addressed and assessed in 2005</td>
<td>1. Evaluations of students at the end of each major clinical rotation at the hospital indicate that they are successfully achieving this skill 2&amp;3. Evaluations of student’s interpersonal communication skills show that they achieve these skills for the most part by the end of their training. 4. Students were assessed during their presentation of a journal club to their peers. Students actively participated in peer review. 16% of the students (2) did not meet the minimum expectations of this exercise as they were unfamiliar with or vague about important aspects of the material. Only 8% (1) of the students were rated as in peer review.</td>
<td>Plan for improvement: practice talk in advance of the presentation to be made in front of a small group of peers. Designed a rubric for peer review</td>
<td>2006-2007 QEP Plan: student’s performance in journal club presentations will be assessed for achievement of SLO in communication by using the rubric of evaluation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC Domain</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
<td>Method of Assessment</td>
<td>Summary of Assessment Results</td>
<td>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program</td>
<td>Evaluation of Assessment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Project Management** | 1. Correlate results from various procedures with management of patient’s condition  
2. Research, develop, and perform new laboratory procedures and evaluate effectiveness  
3. Enact principles of best practice for lab management  
4. Enact principles of best practice for human resource management | 1. Through simulated exercises in laboratory management  
2. Monitoring of graduate’s performance in these areas upon job entry  
3. Scores obtained in the category of ‘lab operations’ in the certification exams | 1. From the certification exam results, it appears that students obtain basic principles of laboratory operation and management  
2. Through employer and graduate surveys indicate that those students who exhibit leadership qualities in training perform well in undertaking super-vision/management responsibilities. | The following components will be strengthened in the clinical year curriculum: Financial, operational, marketing and human resource management of the clinical laboratory to offer cost-effective, high quality, value-added laboratory services. | **2006-2007 QEP Plan**  
Student’s performance in project management will be assessed through seminar presentations as part of the course: MLS 4324L Special Clinical Methods. |
| **Integrity/Values** | 1. Articulate appropriate professional responsibility for patient’s welfare  
2. Recognize and adhere to applicable professional regulations, ethical standards, and program’s code of conduct  
3. Advocate for effective, timely, accurate, and | Students are evaluated in this area in each of the university based clinical courses and at the end of each clinical rotation at the hospital  
Employer surveys are also used to | A majority of students demonstrate satisfactory to excellent achievement of these professional characteristics  
Employer surveys show that UWF graduates in Clinical Laboratory Sciences are regarded as being well trained in these areas | **2006-2007 QEP Plan:**  
In the course MLS 4705 Special Clinical Topics achievement of SLOs in Integrity and Values will be assessed through a rubric specifically designed to |  

<p>| 192 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALC Domain</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
<th>Summary of Assessment Results</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program</th>
<th>Evaluation of Assessment Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazard and Risk Management</td>
<td>cost effective service to demonstrate commitment to patient's welfare 4. Maintain confidentiality of patient information</td>
<td>assess the UWF graduates performance in this area</td>
<td>Students demonstrate excellent lab safety practices Students are knowledgeable in precautionary methods to prevent laboratory errors</td>
<td>Lab safety information needs to be continuously updated. Practice of safety methods is to be enforced in the laboratory at all times.</td>
<td>2006-2007 QEP Plan: In the course MLS 4550 Immunohematology achievement of SLOs in this area will be assessed through a rubric designed for this evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Recognize and describe principles and regulations regarding lab safety 2. Practice lab safety procedures and protocols 3. Identify and prevent medical error or minimize consequences of medical error</td>
<td>1. Departmental evaluations include assessment of student's lab safety practices 2. Student's receive instruction and are tested in an area titled “Prevention of Medical Errors “ in the course Special Clinical Topics 3. National Board exams include questions in this knowledge area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

SAMPLES OF RUBRICS USED FOR DIRECT MEASURES BASED ON EMBEDDED COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

Marine Biology (B.S.)

Rubric included in Appendix of Annual Report

Psychology (B.A.)

Rubric obtained directly from department
BS.MARINE-BIOLOGY
DIRECT EMBEDDED ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT
FOR DOMAIN(S): PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Program(s): B.S. Marine Biology
             B.S. Interdisciplinary Sciences/Biology
             B.S. Interdisciplinary Sciences/Zoo

Science
Course in Capstone Pathway: Comparative Animal Physiology
Instructor: Dr. Wayne Bennett
Emphasized Programmatic SLOs: Project Management
Tangible Course Product to be Evaluated: Selected writing assignment and lab report assignment

Suggested Implementation for Embedded Assessment:
Select one writing assignment and lab report assignment that emphasizes project-management based skills. Grade the assignment as you would normally. For 10 randomly selected students, complete the following rubric and note characteristics contributing to your rating in the comment section below the rubric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT MANAGEMENT-BASED SKILLS TO BE ASSESSED</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (D/F)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (C)</th>
<th>Very Good-Excellent (A/B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Conceptualization:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student was able to design and execute a project that incorporates a reasonable time line to address a problem in the biological sciences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student was able to draw and defend conclusions related to the results of the study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Work Skills or Self-Regulation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student was able to collaborate effectively with others on team projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General characteristics leading to ratings of UNSATISFACTORY:
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

General characteristics leading to ratings of SATISFACTORY:
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

195
General characteristics leading to ratings of VERY GOOD-EXCELLENT:

______________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________

How will these results influence your course design next time?

______________________________________________________________________

What recommendations can you make to the department to improve the quality of this experience for future students?

______________________________________________________________________
Rubric for Assessment of Project Management – Psychology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Fails to Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate and sufficient resources identified to complete the project; realistic and relevant psychological question identified as a focus; logical and practical sequence of phases identified; reasonable and achievable small goals set to ensure progress toward final outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable time allotted to achieve small goals; Small goals and final outcome achieved within deadlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective application of resources to achieve goals; Adherence to code(s) of ethical conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective, clear, and professional oral and/or written communication (APA style); Effective use of material and technical resources for communication; Delivery of final project outcome within time limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teamwork (Optional Component)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable distribution of individual contributions and responsibilities; Appropriate adaptation of responsibilities to individual skills and talents; Effective coordination of individual efforts; Effective management of interpersonal relations and conflict; Responsible leadership and motivation; Responsible delivery of and response to feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Evaluation of Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student established measurable criteria to define and assess success of project; Student identified and responded effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements within a rubric component are suggested elements that an instructor might use when evaluating student performance on the rubric component. Not all elements will be relevant to all projects evaluated.
Appendix H

Summary of Assessment Plans for General Education / Academic Foundations

Described in Annual Reports

(2005-2006)
Appendix H


August 7, 2006

Prepared by: Claudia Stanny

KEY:  Y = Yes, Task completed, Information provided in annual report
NI = No information provided in annual report, no evidence task is completed
IP = Information provided in annual report, work is incomplete but progressing
NR = No Annual Report submitted
? = Information in annual report is ambiguous, progress might be underway but status is unclear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Academic Foundation Domains Identified</th>
<th>Ideas for Assessment?</th>
<th>Type of Assessment Proposed (Material Quoted from Annual Report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Analysis/Evaluation, Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Creativity, Expression of Cultural Values</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>final project (embedded assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Critical Thinking, Project Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Rubric used to evaluate class assignment. (Future years will include NSSE data as an indirect measure.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>IP (fall)</td>
<td>Plans to begin this process in the fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Academic Foundation Domains Identified</td>
<td>Ideas for Assessment?</td>
<td>Type of Assessment Proposed (Material Quoted from Annual Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>Communication, Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>plans to conduct a Capstone Speech Contest (SPC 2016) - embedded assessment; MMC 2000 plant to assess communication by evaluating 10 randomly chosen students' answers when asked to identify, without warning, important terms and concepts in mass communication. We plan to assess critical thinking by evaluating 10 randomly chosen students' answers to essay questions demonstrating critical thinking about how the mass media in both the United States and other countries operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>English &amp; Foreign Languages</td>
<td>Communication (Writing Skills), Critical Thinking (Analysis/Evaluation)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>INSTRUCTORS WILL CREATE RUBRICS FOR THE ABOVE-LISTED COURSES THAT SPECIFY THE CRITERIA USED TO EVALUATE STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS/CRITICAL THINKING. THESE RUBRICS WILL BE INCORPORATED INTO THE SYLLABI. INSTRUCTORS OF THE ACADEMIC FOUNDATIONS COURSES WILL SUBMIT OUTCOME REPORTS BASED ON THE LEVEL OF STUDENT SUCCESS IN FULFILLING THE RUBRIC CRITERIA AT THE END OF FALL SEMESTER. THESE REPORTS WILL BE DISCUSSED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT MADE DURING AN OPEN FACULTY MEETING DURING SPRING SEMESTER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Section omitted from Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Academic Foundation Domains Identified</td>
<td>Ideas for Assessment?</td>
<td>Type of Assessment Proposed (Material Quoted from Annual Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Information Literacy, Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Dr. Williams will assess Information Literacy in the CPO 2000 Comparative Politics course. She's been doing this already for years anyway. As for the Civic Engagement dimension, we are thinking of requiring students in either POS 2041 American Politics or INR 2002 International Politics to write a letter to a newspaper expressing a well-informed, well-argued, and clearly articulated opinion on some issue of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Critical Thinking, Information Literacy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>This summer, Dr. Matt Clavin has experimented with two methods of assessing critical thinking--online quizzes (pre and post lecture with interpretive questions that were automatically graded) and document analyses-in AMH 2020 U.S. History Since 1877. The first, online quizzes, proved unfeasible due to limitations of the web-based product used and the second unfeasible due to time requirements and the inability to produce quantitative data. In the analyses of four historical documents over six weeks, students demonstrated improvement in their critical thinking skills, but the measure proved very time consuming to grade and hard to quantify; it does not appear to be a strategy likely to be embraced by all faculty teaching surveys. History continues to experiment with measuring this domain in an efficient and effective manner. History will explore with Ms. Melissa Finley, Associate Librarian extraordinaire, the possibility of developing a freshman/sophomore-level tutorial/exercise on information literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Academic Foundation Domains Identified</td>
<td>Ideas for Assessment?</td>
<td>Type of Assessment Proposed (Material Quoted from Annual Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning, Problem Solving</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>A uniform, comprehensive final exam is the method of assessment. The final exam contains questions that address directly the specified student learning outcomes, upon which a uniform syllabus is formulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Creativity, Expression of Cultural Values</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>The Department of Music forged forward with assessment data of all three General Education course offerings this Spring, 2006. The Chair met with the three faculty members associated with these courses agreeing upon the rubric, the two domains, and sub-domains. Though the subject matter and course delivery are very different with each course, we were able to utilize objective multiple choice testing identifying specific test questions that would supply the assessment data. Provided below are two detailed assessment reports from the Department of Music. (1) Brief description of the Basis of Performance: The questions from the mid-term exam and the final exam. Because these are online exams multiple choice and true false questions were used. Therefore, the students either meet the expectation or fail to meet the expectation. It is impossible to judge if they exceed the expectation with multiple choice and true false questions. (2) Brief Description of Basis of Performance: On-line multiple choice quizzes and exams dealing with the special issues of the History of Western Music were utilized to provide the assessment data. Therefore, the students either meet the expectation or fail to meet the expectation. It is impossible to judge if they exceed the expectation with multiple choice questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Academic Foundation Domains Identified</td>
<td>Ideas for Assessment?</td>
<td>Type of Assessment Proposed (Material Quoted from Annual Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Critical Thinking, Project Management</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>We have designed an assessment matrix for each course, to be filled by the instructor. The matrix will contain data on the performance of the students in each domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religious Studies</td>
<td>Values/Integrity &amp; Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>We have already met with our regular and adjunct faculty that teach in General Studies, and solicited some feedback on embedding assessment measures in their respective courses, which include Introduction to Logic, Introduction to Philosophy, Intro to Religion, and Ethics and Contemporary Society. We have decided to begin with the Introduction to Logic sections in the fall, and will work with those faculty to develop a specific assignment or two which measures student success in ethical reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Academic Foundation Domains Identified</td>
<td>Ideas for Assessment?</td>
<td>Type of Assessment Proposed (Material Quoted from Annual Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Critical Thinking (Analysis/Evaluation); Values/Integrity (Ethical Reasoning)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>In considering the assessment process, we have two basic approaches to consider. Plan A is a formal, data-based approach that would entail defining specific items of student work (test question responses, papers, presentations, etc.) that the instructor would compile related to the 2 areas of focus. The instructor would then produce a report of student performance on those items of student work, to define the rate of success in achieving the SLOs, along with at least one action item to be implemented in the course to enhance student learning. Plan B is a less formal approach that would entail a periodic meeting of the instructors of the course to discuss their observations and experiences of student learning in their courses. This discussion would include possible approaches to enhance student learning and yield a recommendation in this regard. The group would then write a brief report in the form of minutes for the meeting, to include at least one recommendation for an action item to improve one aspect of student learning in the course. There are advantages and disadvantages to each approach, but the instructors can choose which basic approach to take. With either approach, it is critical that we document that we use this assessment information to make decisions designed to enhance student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Section omitted from Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Academic Foundation Domains Identified</td>
<td>Ideas for Assessment?</td>
<td>Type of Assessment Proposed (Material Quoted from Annual Report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Economics</td>
<td>Problem Solving &amp; Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Two sections of ECO 2013 will be targeted for assessment. The tool for assessment will concentrate on specific assignments to be designed by the instructors in those sections to assess the competency in some aspects of problems solving and quantitative reasoning. The instructors will design a rubric to use in the evaluation of students’ work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COB</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Section omitted from Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice / Legal Studies</td>
<td>Critical Thinkins (CJ course); Critical Thinking (Legal Studies course) - need to ID second domain? IP</td>
<td>IP (fall)</td>
<td><strong>CJ Course:</strong> Students’ success in critical thinking will be assessed with writing assignments (both in class and take-home) and objective examination questions. Writing assignments will ask students to evaluate popular and academic characterizations of crime and criminal justice. Exam questions will require students to apply knowledge to scenarios. <strong>Legal Studies Course:</strong> Use of multiple choice, matching, essay questions in which students are asked to make choices based on hypothetical factual situations. Answer questions related to understanding of the law, ethics and legal authorities based on reading of a hypothetical factual situation. The Faculty who teach this course use the same text and have built a bank of exam questions that will be categorized based on the student learning outcome that each question measures. Data can be collected from student performance on the exams using these questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>