I. ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO SACS ACCREDITATION

SACS Fifth-Year Interim Report
Due March 15, 2011 (Writing begins in 2010)
Template for the Fifth-Year Interim Report (included in Appendix A)

Abbreviated Compliance Certification
UWF must document and demonstrate an ongoing process for the continuous collection and use of assessment evidence
- Charter for an Academic Programs Assessment Council (Appendix A)
- Surveys conducted annually by Institutional Research (see Appendix A for list)
- Annual report process (including annual reporting on the collection of assessment of student learning and use of this evidence by departments)
- Making Way for Excellence

SACS is likely to give special attention to the following compliance standards in UWF’s Fifth-Year Interim Report
- Assessment of student learning in all academic areas:
  - General Education, Undergraduate Programs, Graduate Programs
- Institutional Effectiveness (includes assessment in all university units)

- Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan
  Formative Evaluation of the Quality Enhancement Plan (October 20, 2008) sent to the Steering Committee and Leadership Team (Appendix A)
  Need to begin thinking about the focus of future QEP initiatives and the processes involved in institutionalizing quality enhancement activities.
  Additional information about Fifth Year Reports and QEP Impact Reports may be available at the SACS Annual Meeting in December.

Other supporting evidence for sustained commitment to assessment at UWF:
- Executive Summary: CUTLA Activities in Support of Faculty Training Regarding Assessment of Student Learning, ALCs and ALPs, and Development of Instructional Strategies (December, 2007) (Appendix A)
- Updates on these activities are reported in the CUTLA 2007-2008 Annual Report (Appendix A)

II. BOARD OF GOVERNORS ISSUES AND MANDATES RELATED TO ASSESSMENT

- Academic Learning Compacts, annual reporting on assessment efforts
  Next report due January 16, 2009

  Relevant Resources (Appendix B)
  - Template for reporting to BOG on ALCs
  - Academic Learning Compacts Policies and Procedures
  - Academic Learning Plans Policies and Procedures – DRAFT (under Senate review)
  - Academic Program Review Policies and Procedures – DRAFT

Status of the University Compact initiative
- Memo from Dottie Minear (Dec 6, 2007) (Appendix B)
III. STRATEGIC PLANNING NEEDS

- Need to coordinate strategic planning efforts with assessment efforts. Identification of goals and measures is now underway (cf. Retreat held September 26, 2008)
- Director of University Planning / Institutional Research / Assessment

Issues related to this position and office:
- Institutional Research, function and administrative location (Academic Affairs or President’s Office)
- Need to ensure that data collected as part of the IR mission are used for decision making in academic and other units in the university
- Concerns with excessive focus on data archiving and data base management
- Status of surveys that had been conducted regularly by IR (student surveys, alumni surveys, etc.) (List included in Appendix B)

IV. RELATED ASSESSMENT NEEDS

- Common Data Set
  
  Documentation related to this is included in Appendix C

- Voluntary System of Accountability

Issues relevant to the status of UWF participation in the VSA:
- VSA project coordinator at UWF
- VSA includes data typically reported in the IPEDS reports
- VSA will also include NSSE data for UWF
- VSA includes a component for reporting assessment of student learning (possibly with a standardized national test such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment or the MAPP)
- All other SUS institutions are participating

  Documentation on the VSA included in Appendix C

- Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement

  - Value of this project to help document UWF’s ongoing community engagement (not well documented at present)
  - Documentation process will support the need for evidence related to Institutional Effectiveness and other assessment issues related to SACS accreditation
  - Obtaining the Carnegie classification will help marketing efforts and improve visibility of UWF community efforts with the larger community

  Description of Carnegie classification for community engagement is provided in Appendix C

- Sterling Award
- Baldridge Award

V. SACS REPORTING ON SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

- New and Terminated Degrees
- Distance Learning Expansion
- Additional Instructional Sites

  Reporting to SACS underway for December, 2008

VI. REFERENCES AND RESOURCES ON ASSESSMENT

- American Association for Higher Education: 9 Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning

  Copies of these resources are included in Appendix D
APPENDIX A
- Template for the Fifth-year Interim Report
- Charter for an Academic Programs Assessment Council
- Surveys Conducted Annually by Institutional Research
- Formative Evaluation of the Quality Enhancement Plan (October 20, 2008) Sent to the Steering Committee and Leadership Team
- Executive Summary: CUTLA Activities in Support of Faculty Training Regarding Assessment of Student Learning, ALCs and ALPs, and Development of Instructional Strategies (December, 2007)
- Updates These Activities are Reports in the CUTLA 2007-2008 Annual Report

APPENDIX B
- Template for Reporting to BOG on ALCs
- Academic Learning Compact Policies and Procedures
- Memo from Dottie Minear (December 6, 2007)

APPENDIX C
- Common Data Set
- Voluntary System of Accountability
- Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement

APPENDIX D
- American Association for Higher Education: 9 Principles for Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning
- Presidents and Chief Academic Officers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and the American Association for Higher Education
The Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

THE FIFTH-YEAR INTERIM REPORT

Name of Institution:

Address of the Institution:

Name, title, contact numbers of person(s) preparing the report:

The Fifth-Year Interim Report is divided into five parts:

- **Part I: Signatures Attesting to Integrity** *(applicable to all institutions).* Requests that the chief executive officer and accreditation liaison attest to the accuracy of institutional assessment and documentation supporting that assessment.

- **Part II: Abbreviated Institutional Summary Form Prepared for Commission Reviews** *(applicable to all institutions).* Requests that the institution complete the abbreviated "Institutional Summary Form Prepared for Commission Reviews."

- **Part III: Abbreviated Compliance Certification** *(applicable to all institutions).* Monitors continued compliance with identified Core Requirements and Comprehensive Standards at the decennial interval.

- **Part V: Additional requested information** *(applicable to select institutions).* Addresses issues identified in an action letter following a recent review of the institution. If applicable, issues are identified in an attached letter.

- **Part VI: Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan** *(applicable to all institutions reaffirmed since 2004 using the Principles of Accreditation).*
**General Directions:** Please follow the directions specific for each part and submit four copies to your assigned Commission staff member by ________________.

- Materials may be submitted in print form, on DVD/CD, or both. If an audit has been requested, it must be submitted in print form only.
- If print documents are submitted, copy all documents front and back, double space the copy, and use no less than a 10 point font. Staple or soft bind the document. Do not submit in a three-ring binder. Staple or soft bind the document.
- If electronic documents are submitted, documents must be included on the DVD/CD; web page references should be transferred to the DVD/CD. Be sure to check the electronic device before mailing to the Commission office to ensure that all intended documents are included.
- Provide a brief, clear, complete, and concise report. Ensure that documentation is appropriate to demonstrating fulfillment of the requirement. Specify actions that have been taken and, when possible, document their completion.
- When possible, excerpt passages from text and incorporate the narrative into the report instead of sending an entire document. Provide definitive evidence, not documents that only address the process.
  - Specify actions that have been taken and provide documentation that such actions have been completed.
  - When possible and appropriate, provide samples of evidence of compliance rather than all documents pertaining to all activities associated with compliance.
  - Reread the report before submission and eliminate all narrative that is not relevant to the focus of the report.

---

**Part I: Signatures Attesting to Integrity**

*(Applicable to all institutions)*

By signing below, we attest to the following:

That ____________ *(name of institution)* has conducted an honest assessment of compliance and has provided complete and accurate disclosure of timely information regarding compliance with the identified Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Requirements of the Commission on Colleges.

Date of Submission: ________________

**Accreditation Liaison**

Name of Accreditation Liaison

Signature

**Chief Executive Officer**

Name of Chief Executive Officer

Signature
Part II: The Abbreviated “Institutional Summary Form Prepared for Commission Reviews”
(Applicable to all institutions)

Directions: Please provide the following information on a separate document and attach it to the completed Fifth-Year Interim Report.

History and Characteristics

Provide a brief history of the institution, a description of its current mission, an indication of its geographic service area, and a description of the composition of the student population. Include a description of any unusual or distinctive features of the institution and a description of the admissions policies (open, selective, etc.).

List of Degrees

List all degrees currently offered (A. S., B.A., B.S., M.A., Ph.D., for examples) and the majors or concentrations within those degrees, as well as all certificates and diplomas.

Locations and Distance Education

1. List all new off-campus sites established since your previous reaffirmation where a student can be awarded a degree, certificate, or diploma at the site or where a student can obtain 50 percent or more of credits toward the educational program.

2. List all locations (country, state, and city) where coursework toward a degree, diploma, or certificate can be obtained primarily through traditional classroom instruction. For each site, indicate the partial or complete degree offered and, for each degree, certificate, or diploma, whether a student can obtain 50 percent of credits toward any of the educational programs.

3. Provide a brief description of distance education credit offerings that can be obtained primarily through electronic means and indicate where the students are located. Indicate any degree or certificate programs that can be completed primarily through electronic means. Please limit this brief description to one-half page.
Part III: The Abbreviated Compliance Certification
(Applicable to all institutions)

Directions: For each of the Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Requirements listed below, the institution should make a determination regarding compliance, place an “X” in the appropriate box, and explain the reason for the institution’s findings.

Compliance: The institution found that it meets the requirement and provides a convincing argument in support of its determination and a list of documents (or electronic access to the documents) demonstrating compliance.

Non-Compliance: The institution found that it does not meet the requirement and provides the reason for checking non-compliance, a description of plans to comply, and a list of documents that will be used to demonstrate future compliance.

General Note: (1) Unless an institution is required to submit financial documents requested in Part IV, no additional financial information is required due to the annual submission of Financial Institutional Profiles by all institutions. (2) The standards identified in this part of the report reflect the criteria of the U.S. Department of Education but do not necessarily include all the Federal Requirements listed in Section 4 of the Principles of Accreditation.

1. The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of its academic programs. (Core Requirement 2.8)

   Compliance  Non-Compliance

   Narrative:

2. The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience, competence, and capacity to lead the institution. (Comprehensive Standard 3.2.8)

   Compliance  Non-Compliance

   Narrative:

3. The institution publishes admissions policies that are consistent with its mission. (Comprehensive Standard 3.4.3)

   Compliance  Non-Compliance

   Narrative:
4. For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration. (Comprehensive Standard 3.4.11)

Compliance  Non-Compliance
Narrative:

5. The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission. (Core Requirement 2.10)

Compliance  Non-Compliance
Narrative:

6. The institution operates and maintains physical facilities, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities. (Comprehensive Standard 3.11.3)

Compliance  Non-Compliance
Narrative:

7. The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in the following area: (Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1)

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

Compliance  Non-Compliance
Narrative:

8. The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement including, as appropriate, consideration of course completion, State licensing examination, and job placement rates. (Federal Requirement 4.1)

Compliance  Non-Compliance
Narrative:

9. The institution's curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the purpose and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded. (Federal Requirement 4.2)

Compliance  Non-Compliance
Narrative:
10. The institution makes available to students and the public current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies. *(Federal Requirement 4.3)*

   ___ Compliance  Non-Compliance

   Narrative:

11. Program length is appropriate for each of the institution's educational programs. *(Federal Requirement 4.4)*

   ___ Compliance  Non-Compliance

   Narrative:

12. The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints. *(Federal Requirement 4.5)*

   Compliance  Non-Compliance

   Narrative:

13. Recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent the institution's practices and policies. *(Federal Requirement 4.6)*

   ___ Compliance  Non-Compliance

   Narrative:

14. The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the 1998 Higher Education Amendments. *(Federal Requirement 4.7)* The institution audits financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations. *(Comprehensive Standard 3.10.3)*

   ___ Compliance  Non-Compliance

   Narrative:
Directions: Please provide the following information on a separate document entitled "Additional Requested Information." Submit it with your completed Fifth-Year Interim Report.

Definition: An Additional Requested Report addresses an institution's continued compliance with standards and requirements specified in a letter by the President of the Commission normally at the time of an institution's last review. (Letter to institution is enclosed.)

Audience: The Additional Requested Report is reviewed by the Commission on Colleges and is subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the continuation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.

Elements: Structure the response so that it addresses the standards in the order that they appeared in the report. Tabs should separate each response to a recommendation.

For each accreditation standard noted in the letter, (1) restate the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement of the Principles of Accreditation (or in the case of the Criteria for Accreditation, the Condition of Eligibility or Criterion) and the recommendation exactly as it appeared in the visiting committee report; (2) provide a brief history of previous responses to the standard, if more than a first response (to include an accurate summary of the original concerns of the visiting committee; (3) cite verbatim the current request of the Commission (reference notification letter from the President of the Commission); and (4) prepare a response to the recommendation to include documentation supporting ongoing compliance.
Part V: The Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan
(Not applicable to all institutions)

Directions: Please provide the following information on a separate document entitled "Impact Report on the Quality Enhancement Plan." Submit it with your completed Fifth-Year Interim Report.

Definition: The Impact Report, submitted five years prior to the institution's next decennial review, is a report demonstrating the extent to which the QEP has affected outcomes related to student learning. It is part of the institution's Fifth-Year Interim Report. (Note: The Impact Report will be required of all institutions reaffirmed beginning in 2004 under the Principles of Accreditation. Institutions reaffirmed in 2002 and 2003 under the Criteria for Accreditation with reaffirmations scheduled next for 2012 and 2013 respectively will not be required to submit an Impact Report.)

Audience: The Impact Report is reviewed by the Commission on Colleges as part of the Fifth-Year Interim Report.

Elements: The following elements should be addressed in the narrative:

(1) a brief description of the institution, including a description of its current mission and its geographic service area, a description of the composition of the student population and enrollment, governance structure, and a description of any unusual or distinctive features of the institution;

(2) the title and a brief description of the institution’s Quality Enhancement Plan as initially presented;

(3) a succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the QEP;

(4) a discussion of significant changes made to the QEP and the reasons for making those changes; and

(5) a description of the QEP's direct impact on student learning including the achievement of goals and outcomes as outlined in item three above, and unanticipated outcomes of the QEP, if any.

The report should not exceed ten pages, including narrative and appendices.
CHARTER/POLICY PROPOSAL FORMS
Faculty Senate 10/12/2007

REQUIRED CHARTER/POLICY PROPOSAL COVER INFORMATION

In order to facilitate the Faculty Senate Governance Committee in the review of any proposal that comes before it, the Governance Committee requires that proposals be accompanied by the information listed below.

Note: By providing the requested explanatory information there will be little if any need for the Faculty Senate Governance Committee to second-guess the reasoning behind a submitted proposal. As a result, the review process will be expedited, and the likelihood of prompt approval will be increased.

Any proposal sent to the Governance Committee without the required accompanying information will be returned to the sender with a reminder.

1. Name of committee, task force, policy, etc. to be reviewed:

   Academic Programs Assessment Council

2. Name, position, e-mail address, and phone number of the individual primarily responsible for the proposal:

   Dr. Chula King, Interim Provost, cking@uwf.edu,
   Dr. Claudia Stanny, Director, Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, cstanny@uwf.edu, 857-6355
3. **Summary of the proposal (do not include rationale):**

The establishment of an Academic Programs Assessment Council (APAC) as a joint Faculty Senate/Provost Council is proposed. The Academic Programs Assessment Council will oversee and promote a culture of meaningful assessment of student learning within the context of faculty governance of the curriculum. The APAC will promote the establishment of a sustainable culture of assessment.

4. **Rationale for the proposal in general (not specific justifications):**

Effective and regular assessment of student learning for purposes of continuous improvement of academic and co-curricular programs is essential to comply with regulations issued by the Board of Governors (BOG) of the State of Florida and to maintain good standing and compliance with Comprehensive Standards described in the Principles of Accreditation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and a variety of discipline-specific accreditation bodies such as The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AASCB), Accreditation Board for Engineering & Technology (ABET), Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CNNE), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). Additionally, the University of West Florida now participates in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). The VSA was developed through a partnership between the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and is designed to help institutions demonstrate accountability and stewardship to the public, measure educational outcomes to identify effective educational practices, and assemble information that is accessible, understandable, and comparable. Participating institutions communicate information on the undergraduate student experience through a common web reporting template, the College Portrait.

The establishment of an Academic Programs Assessment Council will create institutional infrastructure to promote effective and sustainable assessment practices and establish policies and procedures to document this commitment to assessment for external and internal audiences. As a component of faculty governance, an Academic Programs Assessment Council ensures faculty ownership and responsibility of assessment practices that directly impact the direction and quality of the academic curriculum. The shared interest and responsibility for assessment provide the rationale for the structure of the membership of the APAC, which will be comprised of an equal number of faculty and administrative members as voting members.

5. **Justification for each specific, substantive component of the proposal:**
Membership on the Academic Programs Assessment Council provides voting rights to both faculty and administrative representatives. Although administrative members of committees are frequently identified as *ex officio*, non-voting members of committees, ensuring that the University of West Florida engages in regular, effective, and high quality assessment practices and clearly documents the use of assessment evidence for decisions made concerning curriculum are critical for maintaining good standing with regional and disciplinary accreditation bodies as well as with the Board of Governors. Because interest and responsibility for assessment practices rests equally with faculty and administration, the APAC should provide equal standing with respect to voting rights on these issues to its membership. The shared interest and responsibility for assessment provide the rationale for the structure of the membership of the APAC, which will be comprised of an equal number of faculty and administrative members as voting members. This structure will ensure faculty ownership and engagement in effective assessment practices directed specifically at the development and enhancement of academic curricula.
Proposed Charter is: New-X- or Revision

Proposal Date: ________________

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

PURPOSE

The Academic Programs Assessment Council (APAC) is established by the Faculty Senate and the Provost to establish expectations for the regular collection, analysis, and use of assessment data for continuous improvement of student learning in academic and co-curricular programs. The APAC will keep the university community informed about expectations for the procedures and quality of assessment, including expectations related to regional accreditation and requirements of the Board of Governors. The APAC will recommend timelines for the regular and timely collection, analysis, use, documentation, and dissemination of assessments of student learning for the purpose of continuous improvement of program quality. The APAC will provide formative feedback to departments and other units about the quality of assessment plans and use of assessment evidence for program improvement.

The Academic Programs Assessment Council will keep apprised of current expectations associated with maintaining good standing and compliance with Comprehensive Standards described in the Principles of Accreditation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Documentation related to these standards is provided on the SACS web site (http://www.sacscoc.org/principles.asp). Additionally, the APAC will keep apprised of regulations concerning Academic Learning Compacts, assessment of student learning, and related reporting requirements issues by the Board of Governors of the State of Florida (http://www.flboa.org/about/cod/asa/learningcompacts.php).

(Note: Policies, regulations, and guidelines that relate to the work of the Committee/Council should be specified in either the Purpose or Specific Responsibilities section, and they should be attached/linked to the Charter.)

SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Monitor the assessment expectations established by the Board of Governors (BOG) and the Commission on Colleges – Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (COC – SACS) and communicate these expectations in a timely manner to faculty, chairs, and relevant unit supervisors. Link to the Principles of Accreditation on SACS web site (http://www.sacscoc.org/principles.asp). Link to BOG regulation regarding ALCs and assessment on BOG web site (http://www.flboa.org/about/cod/asa/learningcompacts.php).
2. Assist the SACS Liaison with the establishment and coordination of timelines for the collection, analysis, and use of assessment evidence for improvement of student learning.

3. Monitor reports of assessments of student learning included in the Voluntary System of Accountability.

4. Contribute to the establishment and maintenance of a culture of assessment for continuous improvement at the University of West Florida by establishing faculty-driven expectations for regular, timely and high-quality assessment practices consistent with the principles of assessment established by the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE).

5. Recommend assessment-related faculty development activities to promote a culture of assessment.

6. Establish procedures for annual documentation of assessment work within all academic programs (Academic Foundations, undergraduate programs, graduate programs).

7. Provide formative feedback to departments and divisions on the quality of assessment activities and use of assessment evidence to ensure effective, high-quality, and sustainable assessment procedures campus-wide.

8. Provide an annual report to the Provost, Deans, and faculty about quality of assessment activities and the impact of assessment on quality of student learning.

9. Recognize units that engage in high-quality assessment practices that contribute to significant improvements in the quality of student learning at the University of West Florida.

MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATION

SACS Liaison, voting, (chair)
Director of University Planning, voting
Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, voting
Director for Assessment, Academic Technology Center, voting
Associate Dean or other administrative representative for each of the 3 Colleges (3), voting, shall be designated by the Dean from each of the relevant Colleges (College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business, and the College of Professional Studies)
Administrative representative for the Academic Foundations/General Studies curriculum.

Eight (8) faculty members, voting, shall be recommended the Dean of the relevant College and appointed by the University President in consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Five (5) faculty members shall be recommended by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences as follows:

- one (1) from the Arts and Humanities,
- one (1) from Social Sciences,
- one (1) from Natural Sciences,
- one (1) to represent Academic Foundations/General Studies.
and one (1) to represent Honors.

One (1) faculty member shall be recommended by the Dean of the College of Business.

Two (2) faculty members shall be recommended by the Dean of the College of Professional Studies.

Two (2) student members, voting, shall be recommended by the Student Government Association President to the Vice President for Student Affairs, and appointed by the University President.

One (1) student member will be an undergraduate student.

One (1) student member will be a graduate student.

One (1) member, voting, shall be recommended by the Vice President for Student Affairs, and appointed by the University President.

(19 members total)

MEMBERSHIP AND MEETING POLICIES

Meetings will be conducted under the most current edition of Robert's Rules of Order, unless specified otherwise below.

The Chairperson shall be the individual appointed as the University SACS Liaison.

The Chairperson shall be responsible for calling meetings, setting agendas, relaying all necessary information relating to specific responsibilities and time lines, conducting meetings, and reporting outcomes.

The Chairperson shall vote only in the case of a tie.

Changes in a Chairperson should be reported to the Faculty Senate Office immediately so that records can be updated in the office and on the web.

Any member who misses all or part of any two (2) consecutive meetings or a total of any three (3) regularly scheduled meetings in a single academic year, without due cause and without providing written input to deliberations, will be considered remiss in executing his or her service commitment, and a replacement will be sought through the appropriate channels.

MEETING SCHEDULING, AGENDAS, AND MINUTES

The Council shall meet at least two (2) times a year. At least one meeting will be held in the Fall Semester and one meeting in the Spring Semester. Additional meetings will be scheduled as needed.

Agendas will be distributed at least three (3) days in advance of meetings, along with all pertinent documents to be considered at the meeting. Written minutes of meetings will be prepared and distributed to members within three (3) weeks after meetings and approved for public viewing within five (5) weeks. The Council must promptly forward to
the Faculty Senate Office an electronic copy of all documents, including all meeting schedules, agendas, minutes, and reports. The Faculty Senate Office Secretary will be responsible for posting these documents to Argus for public viewing.

**TERMS OF APPOINTMENT**

Faculty Members: Three-Year Staggered Terms  
Student Affairs Representatives: Three-Year Staggered Terms  
Student Representatives: One-Year Term  
Administrative Representatives: Three-Year Staggered Terms  

Terms begin with the next academic year, unless otherwise noted.

**REVIEW**

The Charter shall be reviewed annually by the Council, and recommendations for changes submitted to the Faculty Senate.

**LEGAL REFERENCES**

SACS Principles of Accreditation  

Florida Board of Governors (BOG)  
BOG Regulations/Policy concerning Academic Learning Compacts  
Regulation of the State University System of Florida Board of Governors, 6C-8.016: Academic Learning Compacts and Related Assessment Processes.  
http://www.flbog.org/about/cod/asq/learningcompacts.php

Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA)  
The VSA is a voluntary initiative for 4-year public colleges and universities. Developed through a partnership between the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the VSA is designed to help institutions meet the following objectives:  
- Demonstrate accountability and stewardship to public  
- Measure educational outcomes to identify effective educational practices  
- Assemble information that is accessible, understandable, and comparable  

The Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) communicates information on the undergraduate student experience through a common web reporting template, the College Portrait.  
http://www.voluntarysystem.org/index.cfm

**RECOMMENDATIONS REPORTED TO**

The Council shall report to the Provost.

Dates prepared/Modified by the Governance Committee
(Senate will insert)

Dates Approved by the Faculty Senate
(Senate will insert)

Approved by the Administration
(President will sign and date)

_________________________________________   
University President                          Date
## Institutional Research and Effectiveness Support Survey Report List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Name</th>
<th>Intended Audience</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduating FTIC Spring 2006</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>24.55% (68 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Transfer Student Spring 2006</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>25.11% (118 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Graduate Student Spring 2006</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>20.11% (36 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Master's Student Fall 2005</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>24.90% (62 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Transfer Students Fall 2005</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>21.54% (109 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Specialist's Student Fall 2005</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.18% (2 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating FTIC Student Spring 2005</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>29.13% (60 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Transfer Student Spring 2005</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>32.99% (130 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Graduate Student Spring 2005</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>34.78% (54 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Masters Degree Student Fall 2004</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>22.30% (94 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Specialist's Degree Student Fall 2004</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.67% (2 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Name: Graduating FTIC Spring 2006  
Graduating FTIC UWF Students  
Apr 20, 2006 - May 10, 2006  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Graduating Transfer Student Spring 2006  
Graduating Transfer UWF Students  
Apr 20, 2006 - May 10, 2006  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Graduating Graduate Student Spring 2006  
Graduating Graduate Level UWF Students (Master's, Specialist's, Doctoral)  
Apr 20, 2006 - May 10, 2006  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Entering Master's Student Fall 2005  
This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for those seeking a Master's degree.  
Sep 15, 2005 - Oct 02, 2005  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Entering Doctoral Students Fall 2005  
This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for those seeking a Doctoral's Degree.  
Sep 15, 2005 - Oct 02, 2005  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: AA Transfer Students Fall 2005  
This is the "Entering Community College Transfers" survey for those entering with an AA degree  
Sep 15, 2005 - Oct 02, 2005  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Entering Specialist's Student Fall 2005  
This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for those seeking a Specialist's Degree.  
Sep 15, 2005 - Oct 02, 2005  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Graduating FTIC Student Spring 2005  
Graduating FTIC UWF Students  
Mar 14, 2005 - Apr 07, 2005  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Graduating Transfer Student Spring 2005  
Graduating Transfer UWF Students  
Mar 14, 2005 - Apr 07, 2005  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Graduating Graduate Student Spring 2005  
Graduating Graduate Level UWF Students (Master's, Specialist's, Doctoral)  
Mar 14, 2005 - Apr 07, 2005  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Entering Masters Degree Student Fall 2004  
This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for those seeking a Master's degree.  
Nov 29, 2004 - Dec 15, 2004  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey

Report Name: Entering Specialists Degree Student Fall 2004  
This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for those seeking a Specialist's Degree.  
Nov 29, 2004 - Dec 15, 2004  
Open Question Summary  
Preview of this Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Name</th>
<th>Intended Audience</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incoming AA Transfer Student Fall 2004</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>22.12% (73 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering CC Transfers Without AA-AS-AAS Fall 2004</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>18.64% (63 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Doctoral Student Fall 2004</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53.85% (7 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Follow-Up Fall 2004</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>18.34% (124 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year Follow-Up Fall 2004</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>23.61% (127 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year Follow-Up Fall 2004</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>29.30% (118 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming AA Transfer Student Fall 2003</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>33.40% (172 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering FTIC Freshman Student Fall 2003</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>31.92% (203 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Masters Degree Student Fall 2003</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>25.82% (59 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering AS or AAS Transfer Student Fall 2003</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.59% (6 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering CC Transfer with Credits Student Fall 2003</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>27.81% (52 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Doctoral Degree Student Fall 2003</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.33% (8 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Specialists Degree Student Fall 2003</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.41% (5 Respondents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Name:
- **Incoming AA Transfer Student Fall 2004**: This is the "Entering Community College Transfers" survey for those entering with an AA degree.
- **Entering CC Transfers Without AA-AS-AAS Fall 2004**: This is the "Entering Community College Transfers" survey for students who have entered without an AA or AS degree.
- **Entering Doctoral Student Fall 2004**: This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for those seeking a Doctorate's Degree.
- **First Year Follow-Up Fall 2004**: Survey to follow up the freshmen respondents that are still enrolled after the first year to compare responses from the previous year.
- **Second Year Follow-Up Fall 2004**: Survey to follow up the freshmen one-year follow-up respondents that are still enrolled after the second year to compare responses from the previous year.
- **Third Year Follow-Up Fall 2004**: Survey to follow up the freshmen respondents that are still enrolled after the third year to compare responses from the previous year.
- **Entering FTIC Freshman Student Fall 2003**: This is the "Entering Freshmen" survey for those students classified at "First Time in College" or "Early Admit".
- **Entering Masters Degree Student Fall 2003**: This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for those seeking a Master's degree.
- **Entering AS or AAS Transfer Student Fall 2003**: Entering Community College Transfers with an AS or AAS degree.
- **Entering CC Transfer with Credits Student Fall 2003**: This is the "Entering Community College Transfers" survey for students who have entered without an AA or AS degree.
- **Entering Doctoral Degree Student Fall 2003**: This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for students who are seeking a Doctorate's Degree.
- **Entering Specialists Degree Student Fall 2003**: This is the "Entering Graduate Student" survey for those seeking a Specialist's Degree.
Formative Evaluation of the Quality Enhancement Plan
October 20, 2008

Overview of the Quality Enhancement Plan

The creation of a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is a requirement for continued SACS accreditation. Selection of a QEP theme and implementation of programs under a university QEP provides an opportunity for institutions to focus on well-defined issues or concerns directly related to the improvement of student learning. For its first Quality Enhancement Plan, the University of West Florida selected the theme, Enhancing Student Learning: Creating Communities of Learners through Active Learning and Student Engagement – Focus on Project Management. Project Management emerged as a focus for the QEP because it captured an important aspect of the undergraduate experience at UWF. First, the prevalence of smaller-enrollment classes (versus large lecture formats) enables students at UWF to complete projects as part of class assignments. Second, as a regional comprehensive university that values undergraduate education, students have opportunities to work closely with faculty on projects outside of class. Third, the project concept provided opportunities for co-curricular and extra-curricular experiences that contribute to student learning in the project management domain.

Quality Enhancement Plan Goals

The QEP was designed with three overarching goals:
- Improve student learning of knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to Project Management
- Increase the use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies, especially for the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities related to Project Management
- Provide opportunities for faculty and staff development related to improving student learning of Project Management.

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan

The organizational structure created for the QEP has evolved during the implementation of the QEP. Some of this evolution was the result of purposeful restructuring due to organizational learning but much was driven by environmental factors such as staffing changes and budget reductions.

Oversight of the QEP has been a continuing challenge. The initial management organization consisted of two co-directors (the AVP for Student Affairs and the Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment). Several changes occurred in the early years of this implementation. The Director of CUTLA retired and, after a failed search process which took several months, was replaced with an Interim Director and then a permanent Director. During this transition the AVP for Academic Affairs effectively became a third co-director. The AVP for Academic Affairs left the University and was not replaced. The QEP is now co-directed by the AVP for Student Affairs and the current Director of CUTLA. In addition to difficulties associated with turnover among QEP Directors, the QEP co-directors manage a variety of obligations related to their primary assignments. Management of day-to-day deadlines associated with QEP initiatives was improved by assigning administrative tasks to the Administrative Assistant for CUTLA. Since making this change, administration of routine tasks related to implementation of the QEP has improved considerably. We strongly recommend that all future Quality Enhancement Plans include provisions for appropriate professional and support staff to ensure that day-to-day operations associated with implementation of a QEP can be managed effectively.

Formative Evaluation of the QEP
The original organizational structure included four committees with specific responsibilities. This structure and the associated committee experienced mixed results. The QEP Request for Proposals Review Committee has been a fairly active committee whereas other committees have never met (Faculty/Staff Development Committee) or were never populated with members (Scholarship and Grants Committee). The QEP Evaluation Committee did meet but struggled with its assignment. As part of the formative evaluation of the QEP during the QEP Retreat (September 10, 2007) and the formative evaluation meeting (April 29, 2008), participants discussed the intended role of these committees and how well this role had been communicated to committee members. Communications about the expectations for QEP project proposals need to be improved. Normal turnover of committee membership needs to be addressed. Recruiting additional faculty onto these committees could serve as an additional mechanism for engaging a broader group of faculty in the work of the QEP. Committees that had never met or were never populated were disbanded.

The University underwent a series of budget exercises during 2007-2008 that severely reduced funding for the QEP. The budget cuts reduced funding for the CUTLA Fellows program (funds remain for only one Fellow position to continue through 2008-2009). All funding for additional QEP projects was lost. Because the QEP is moving into its final years and the focus will shift from implementation to evaluation of impact, no additional QEP projects will be budgeted. The Proposals Review Committee was disbanded. These budget cuts also generated staffing reductions which created additional work load issues for the co-directors, each of whom assumed additional duties within their respective divisions due to unfilled positions.

**Recommendations for changes and rationale**

**Evaluation of Evidence Regarding Achievement of QEP Goals**

The original QEP document identified three related sets of strategies for achieving these goals and objectives. Specific data related to the strategies employed to achieve each of the three goals are provided in Appendix A: Strategies and Goals of the QEP.

**Goal 1: Improve student learning of knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to Project Management.**

**Strategies related to the Academic Learning Compacts**

1. Develop Academic Learning Compact (ALC) documents that include student learning outcomes in each of five domains (content, critical thinking, communication, integrity/values, and project management) for all undergraduate programs. ALC documents will include an assessment plan that specifies direct measures used to assess student learning. ALCs will be posted to the CUTLA web site. Departments will provide links from their web site to the relevant ALC.

2. Develop Academic Learning Plan (ALP) documents that include student learning outcomes in each of five domains (content, critical thinking, communication, integrity/values, and project management) for all graduate programs. ALP documents will include an assessment plan that specifies direct measures used to assess student learning. ALPs will be posted to the CUTLA web site. Departments will provide links from their web site to the relevant ALP.

3. Assessment of changes in student learning will be reported yearly in departmental Annual Reports. As relevant, departments will report on the assessment of student learning in
courses offered as part of the Academic Foundations/General Studies curriculum, undergraduate degree programs, and graduate programs. Reports will include documentation of the use of assessment evidence for continuous improvement of programs and improvement of assessment strategies.

**Goal 2: Increase the use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies, especially for the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities related to Project Management.**

**Strategies related to Faculty Development**

1. Fellows program housed in the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. Fellows are appointed for up to two years in one of three areas: mentoring, instructional strategies, and assessment. Fellows assist the Director of CUTLA with the creation and delivery of faculty development activities to promote professional development and expertise with instructional strategies and assessment practices.
2. On-campus workshops offered for faculty, adjunct faculty, and graduate teaching assistants.
3. Resources provided to send faculty to regional and national workshops and conferences that emphasize active learning and assessment.
4. External consultants will be brought to campus to provide workshops and other faculty development activities. Consultations will focus on active learning, student engagement, project management, and assessment strategies.
5. Implement opportunities for UWF faculty to exchange best practices for active learning and student engagement.
6. Showcase pilot projects funded under the QEP (dissemination of new programs to the larger campus community).
7. Develop faculty resources on the CUTLA web site.
8. Establish Faculty Learning Communities to promote new instructional strategies and project management skill. (This strategy is a new initiative that was not identified in the original or revised QEP Report. FLCs were initiated by the new CUTLA director.)

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

**Strategies related to Quality Enhancement Projects**

1. Fund QEP projects that promote student engagement with an emphasis on project management.
2. Disseminate findings from QEP projects in a campus-wide forum.
3. Post final reports from completed QEP projects to the CUTLA web site.
4. Dissemination of work related to the QEP projects to the larger academic community through conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications.

The attached matrix lists these strategies describes the evidence of their implementation, and the evidence of the impact of these strategies. This matrix will serve as the general plan for the summative evaluation of the QEP for the Fifth Year Report to SACS.

**Recommendations for Remainder of the Quality Enhancement Plan (2008-2010)**

The QEP Steering Committee and Leadership Team made the following recommendations for completion of work related to the current Quality Enhancement Plan:

**Formative Evaluation of the QEP**
1. Within the current budget constraints, any funding that might be reinstated to the QEP budget should be held in reserve against future budget reductions. If funding is still intact in the spring of 2009, the co-directors should consider sending a team of faculty from Academic Foundations/General Studies to a conference related to reform of the General Education curriculum.

2. One additional QEP project was identified for funding in 2008-2009. This will be the final QEP-funded faculty project. The remainder of work related to the current QEP will be directed toward supervising the completion of current projects, ongoing faculty development activities, and completion of the summative assessment of the QEP.

3. The RFP Committee (Proposal Review Committee) was disbanded as no future projects will be funded.

4. The next year will be devoted to planning and collecting data relevant to the impact of the QEP on student learning. Because the QEP focuses on project management, assessment reports from departmental Annual Reports of assessments that address student learning outcomes in the project management domain will be harvested for evaluating the impact of the QEP. The Annual Report template will be modified to improve the ability to capture evidence of changes in student learning related to project management skills that occur over time. At present, departments are asked to identify strengths and weaknesses in student learning and describe curriculum changes motivated by this information. The new template will ask departments to make specific comparisons of performance in the current year to performance in previous years.

5. Establish a timeline for creating committees, identifying relevant data, and writing the Impact Report that will accompany the Fifth Year Report to SACS.
## Goals Identified for the QEP (Revised Quality Enhancement Plan, September, 2005)

1. Improve student learning of knowledge, skills, and values relevant to Project Management
2. Increase use of active learning and student engagement instructional strategies for development of Project Management skills, knowledge, and values
3. Provide opportunities for faculty and staff development related to improving student learning of Project Management

## Strategies for Achieving Goals and Objectives
(Identified in Revised Quality Enhancement Plan, September, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Academic Learning Compacts</th>
<th>Action Plan for Implementation</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate program ALC documents &amp; assessment</td>
<td>ALC Documents with assessment plans posted to CUTLA web site</td>
<td>All current undergraduate programs had ALC documents posted to the CUTLA web site by December 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate program ALP documents &amp; assessment</td>
<td>ALP Documents with assessment plans posted to CUTLA web site</td>
<td>83% complete for existing programs April 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review all Curriculum Change Requests (CCRs) for new programs for inclusion of appropriate and measurable program SLOs</td>
<td>All new CCRs (program and course CCRs) reviewed at the College and Provost level for language used in program SLOs; edits requested when needed.</td>
<td>2007: 184 course CCRs and 104 program CCRs reviewed\Edits requested on 14.7% of course and 28.8% of program CCRs\2008: 233 course CCRs and 64 program CCRs reviewed\Edits requested on 10.3% course and 4.7% of program CCRs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Create web resources for writing Student Learning Outcomes for CCRs, ALCs and ALPs | Post workshop power point and assessment tip sheets to the CUTLA web site | <strong>Hits / month on ALC &amp; ALP pages</strong>\2007: 2,175\2008: 2,663**File Downloads (Power Point materials on Assessment)**\2007: 1,123 General Workshops (2005)\878 CCR Workshop (2007)\70 All Chairs Workshop on Assessment (Nov 2007)\2008: 640 General Workshops (2005)\1,750 CCR Workshops (2007, 2008)\301 All Chairs Workshop on Assessment (Nov 2007) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action Plan for Implementation</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellows program housed in CUTLA (Year 1)</td>
<td>2 Fellows (2005-2006) (Mentoring, Assessment)</td>
<td>Fellows submit annual narratives that summarize and evaluate their work as a Fellow. CUTFLA Annual Report summarizes activities of the Fellows. Fellow initiatives: 2005-2006 Writer's Hothouse – mentoring faculty in the publication process Classroom observation and feedback to junior faculty on the Pensacola and Emerald Coast campuses 4 Campus-wide faculty workshops on writing student learning outcomes for CCRs, assessment practices, and development of rubrics 3 Conference presentations on faculty development and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellows program housed in CUTLA (Year 3)</td>
<td>3 Fellows (2007-2008) (2 Mentoring, 1 Assessment &amp; instructional Strategies)</td>
<td>Fellow initiatives: 2007-2008 Revise New Faculty Orientation (12 new faculty attendees - 63% of 19 new hires) Reframe New Faculty Series as Faculty Fridays (open to all faculty and adjunct faculty) (6 workshops, 119 attendees) Adjunct Faculty Orientation (2 sessions planned – 7 attendees) Brown Bag and Roundtable Discussions (faculty development events) (10 sessions, 69 attendees) Mini-Conference on best practices in active learning &amp; student engagement (64 attendees) Mini-Conference on best practices in assessment (50 attendees) Initiate a Faculty Learning Community: Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Interest Group (3-8 attendees per meeting) Conduct a needs assessment survey for faculty development activities in next year (2008-2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Action Plan for Implementation</td>
<td>Evidence of Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Faculty Orientation (12 new faculty attendees – 86% of 14 new hires)  
Faculty Friday Series (6 workshops planned)  
2 mini-conferences planned (active learning/student engagement & assessment/SoTL)  
Assist in development of Innovative Teaching at UWF (newsletter)  
Continue SoTL Interest Group |
| Fellows program housed in CUTLA (Year 5) | ? Fellow (2009-2010) (funding uncertain) | 2005-2006: 6 Events: 5 faculty workshops (98 attendees); adjunct faculty celebration (37 attendees); 135 total attendees  
2006-2007: 21 Events: 10 faculty & TA workshops; 6 brown bag sessions; 5 departmental consultations (163 total attendees)  
2007-2008: 34 Events: 11 faculty, adjunct, & TA workshops (215 attendees); 10 brown bag sessions (69 attendees); 13 department consultations (147 attendees); 431 total attendees (as of April 18, 2008)  
2008-2009: 9 Events currently scheduled: 9 faculty, adjunct, & TA workshops |
| On-campus workshops for faculty, adjuncts, and graduate teaching assistants. | Offer a variety of workshops and consultations with departments | |
| Resources to send faculty to regional and national workshops and conferences that emphasize active learning and assessment. | Attend and make presentations at regional and national conferences related to faculty development, assessment, and strategies for using active learning and improving student engagement. | 2005-2006: 4 Conferences Attended  
5 attendees; 2 presentations (VAG, FFDC)  
2006-2007: 8 Conferences Attended  
14 attendees; 6 presentations (IARC, New Faculty Learning Community Conference, Academic Affairs Conference - BOG, FFDC, Live Text Conference, POD, SACS, AAC&U)  
2007-2008: 7 Conferences Attended  
16 attendees; 11 presentations (IARC, SACS Summer Inst, Lilly North, CAMPP, AAC&U, SACS, Gulf South Conference)  
2008-2009: X Conferences Attended  
Xx attendees; 3 presentations: SACS, Improving University |
| External consultants. (NOTE: External Consultant workshop data are not included in data reported above for CUTLA workshops) | Host external consultants on campus to conduct workshops and engage in departmental consultations. | 2004-2005  
Dr. Barbara Walvoord (61 attendees)  
2005-2006  
Dr. Barbara Walvoord (51); Dr. Richard Felder (35) - (86 total attendees)  
2006-2007  
Dr. Peggy Maki (1 2-day visit) - (58 attendees)  
2007-2008  
Dr. Peggy Maki (2 visits - 3 days) - (75 in Fall, 48 in Spring - 123 total attendees)  
2008-2009  
Dr. George Kuh (TBA) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action Plan for Implementation</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Faculty-teaching-faculty sessions on best practices in active student learning. | Develop mini-conferences to showcase best practices used by faculty at UWF. Hose one mini-conference each year to focus on active learning and student engagement and a second conference to focus on assessment and effective use of assessment evidence for program improvement. | 2006-2007: 1 Mini-Conference (61 attendees)  
2007-2008: 2 Mini-Conferences (114 total attendees)  
2008-2009: 2 Mini-Conferences scheduled  
2009-2010: 2 Mini-Conferences planned |
| Pilot project reports to the university community. | QEP Symposium Spring 2005; subsequent QEP projects presented at annual QEP Symposium | Data based on a Jan - Dec Calendar Year  
2005:  
5,554 Hits per month  
1,957 Visitor sessions per month  
849 Unique visitors per month  
2006:  
8,267 Hits per month  
2,562 Visitor sessions per month  
1,085 Unique visitors per month  
2007:  
16,164 Hits per month  
5,979 Visitor sessions per month  
2,189 Unique visitors per month  
2008 (Jan – August only)  
23,757 Hits  
8,302 Visitor sessions  
3,371 Unique visitors  
150 Get Engaged Tips (archive new in January) |
| Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Web site. | Reorganize web site, create additional web resources, monitor frequency of access:  
Page hits  
Number of visitor sessions  
Number of unique visitors  
Hits on specific documents:  
Get Engaged Tips  
Emails began Fall 2007  
Archive began January 2008  
Innovative Teaching at UWF  
Newsletter initiated August 2008  
Archive began August 2008 | |
| Establish Faculty Learning Communities (FLC)  
(NOTE: This strategy is a new initiative not identified in the Revised QEP Report that was initiated by the new CUTLA Director) | Create Faculty Learning Communities | FLC: Reframing Theses & Dissertations (group generated a funded QEP Project) (2006-2007)  
FLC: Scholarship of Teaching & Learning Interest Group (2007-2008)  
FLC: (2008-2009)  
FLC: (2009-2010) |

3. Quality Enhancement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action Plan for Implementation</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Projects Funded | 4 Pilot Projects (2004-2005); 5 applicants  
5 QEP Projects (2005-2006); 8 applicants  
6 QEP Projects (2006-2007); 9 applicants  
3 QEP Projects (2007-2008); 5 applicants  
1 QEP Projects (2008-2009); 4 applicants (funding budget reduced)  
QEP Projects (2009-2010) suspended due to budget reductions | Summary of changes in student learning reported in final reports, posted on the CUTLA web (http://uwf.edu/cutla/qep-finalreport.cfm) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Action Plan for Implementation</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PIs present findings at QEP Symposium | QEP Symposium held annually | 13 Presentations across 3 annual QEP Symposia  
Fall 2005: 3 presentations; no data on attendance  
Spring 2006: 4 presentations; 36 attendees  
Spring 2007: 6 presentations; 34 attendees  
Hits/Month on QEP Symposium Page  
2007: 39  
2008: 64 |
| Completed projects file final report posted to QEP web site within the CUTLA web site | Final Reports posted to QEP web site | 12 Final Reports Posted  
Hits/Month on QEP Final Reports Page  
2007: 52  
2008: 78 |
| PIs disseminate work through conference presentations and peer-reviewed publications | Encourage presentation of work at conferences and publication in peer-reviewed journal | 4 conference presentations based on QEP projects (SACS, Gulf South Conference; COB National Conference)  
4 peer-reviewed publications based on QEP projects |

**Evidence of Impact of the QEP on Student Learning**  
(Project Management Skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Evidence of Change in Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSSE reports of student engagement</td>
<td>summary of NSSE - link to power point presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTLA survey of Faculty Perception of Impact of QEP</td>
<td>summary of 2008 survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus review (Academic Foundations courses)</td>
<td>summary of findings presented to AF faculty in Jan 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Measures:**

- assessment measures reported by departments in Annual Reports (identified in the Academic Learning Compacts)  
- assessment measures identified in Student Affairs Planning and Assessment documents (Annual Reports)  
- each QEP project will include measures of student learning as targeted by the individual project

*NOTE: This strategy is a new initiative not identified in the Revised QEP that has been added as a result of consultations with Dr. Peggy Maki during the formative evaluation of the QEP in 2007-2008*
Executive Summary
CUTLA Activities in Support of Faculty Training Regarding Assessment of Student Learning, ALCs and ALPs, and Development of Instructional Strategies
Claudia Stanny, Director, CUTLA
December, 2007

The Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CUTLA) facilitates the efforts of faculty and academic units to develop and sustain practices that promote the highest quality of teaching and learning. To achieve this mission, the Center has adopted the following goals:

- Promote the development of effective teaching strategies by providing workshops and other activities that enhance teaching expertise
- Support the exploration of new approaches to teaching and learning
- Assist in the development and use of assessment evidence to evaluate new and existing teaching strategies and curricula
- Encourage the scholarship of teaching and learning
- Communicate to internal and external audiences on the efforts of faculty at the University of West Florida to provide high quality teaching and learning

The Center advocates for the position that the proper role of assessment in a university culture is to serve as the mechanism by which faculty can identify strengths and weaknesses in academic programs. Good assessment practices enable faculty to preserve effective aspects of curriculum and instructional strategies and discover areas where curriculum reform or adoption of innovative teaching strategies might improve student learning. Assessment also provides the evidence by which these changes can be evaluated. Thus, development of skill with assessment practices provides a set of tools by which faculty can engage in development of their teaching strategies and evaluate the effectiveness of their curriculum. As such, good assessment practices are the heart of a faculty development program.

Although CUTLA does not directly generate FTE or other revenue, the work of the Center is essential for maintaining the good standing of the University with SACS accreditation as well as the good standing of departments with discipline-based accrediting bodies. The ability of FTE-generating units to continue their work would be severely compromised if their accreditation status were put in jeopardy.

The University of West Florida was given a two-year monitoring period following the SACS site visit in which it was required to establish compliance with SACS accreditation standards related to the establishment of a meaningful and ongoing process of assessment and use of assessment for continuous improvement of programs. CUTLA identified two goals as primary priorities for its activities during this period: (1) develop faculty expertise with assessment methods and (2) provide administrative support to ensure that effective assessments were completed in a timely fashion. These extensive efforts are documented in materials presented in the Overview and in the Annual Reports for CUTLA sections of the notebook of documentation. Both of these sections detail CUTLA efforts to bring UWF into compliance with SACS accreditation standards related to assessment. Following submission of the Second Monitoring Report to SACS in Fall 2007, CUTLA adopted a broader focus on faculty development while maintaining a high level of support for the continued implementation of high-quality assessment practices. Dr. Michael Johnson, the SACS liaison for the State of Florida informally notified Dr. Barbara Lyman during the SACS Annual Meeting in New Orleans (Dec 8-11) that the SACS Commission on Colleges finds that we have now successfully addressed the final two of the original six recommendations of the Visiting Committee. Formal notification of the Commission's decision will be made in a letter from SACS in January 2008.

The work of the Center is interwoven with the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which includes significant efforts to provide faculty development related to the use of active learning strategies and the promotion of student engagement. The Director of CUTLA also serves as a Co-Director of the QEP. Many programs sponsored by CUTLA are co-sponsored by the QEP. Administrative support of QEP programs is provided through the work of CUTLA staff. The Fellows program at CUTLA is funded
through the QEP. The Mentoring Fellows developed initiatives that focus on faculty development in
general (e.g., the New Faculty and Adjunct Faculty Orientations and Faculty Friday series). The
Instructional Strategies and Assessment Fellow works with the Director to develop initiatives that focus
on faculty development of assessment skill and new instructional strategies that promote active learning
and student engagement, which are directly connected to the theme of the Quality Enhancement Plan.
These initiatives include organization of mini-conferences (Best Practices in Active Learning and Student
Engagement, hosted in spring 2007 and fall 2007, Best Practices for Assessment and Curricular Reform,
scheduled for spring 2008), a series of brown bag and roundtable discussions, facilitation of a Scholarship
of Teaching and Learning Interest Group, and coordination of workshops provided by external
consultants (Barbara Walvoord and Peggy Maki).

Much effort has been devoted to transforming the CUTLA web site into a useful resource on assessment
and instructional practices. As demonstrated by usage statistics, this effort produced dramatic increases in
the amount of activity on the CUTLA web site. The current monthly averages for the CUTLA site are
16,952 hits/month from 2,433 unique visitors. These data are based on the period following the June 2007
launch of the newly-organized site, built with the new UWF templates. In 2004, when the original
CUTLA web site was launched, the monthly average for these two indexes was 1,897 hits/month from
175 unique visitors. Review of data on document downloads indicates that the materials from workshops
on student learning outcomes and assessment and TIP Sheets on assessment are frequently downloaded.
In addition, the frequency of ALC and ALP document downloads each month indicates that students and
faculty access these documents from the CUTLA site.

The Center plays a role in the development of policies and procedures and other administrative changes
that support the development of Academic Learning Compacts and Academic Learning Plans, the
appropriate description and inclusion of student learning outcomes in the Curriculum Change Request
review process, and the development of TIP Sheets and workshops for development of faculty expertise
with student learning outcomes and assessment. The Center identifies suitable external consultants and
organizes and promotes their workshops on campus. Materials from these workshops are posted to the
CUTLA web site.

The Center provides support to individual departments and colleges for their work toward discipline-
based accreditation (e.g., the College of Business and the School of Allied Health Sciences) and
curriculum reform (e.g., Academic Foundations/General Studies, a faculty learning community for the
examination of the Ed.D., examination of the multicultural requirement at UWF). In addition, the Director
participates in several task forces and committees concerned with issues related to instructional quality
and academic integrity.

CUTLA provides service to the community by inviting faculty from Pensacola Junior College and
Okaloosa Walton College to all CUTLA workshops and mini-conferences. The Center actively
disseminates its work on a national basis by making presentations at conferences such as the International
Assessment and Retention Conference (NASPA), the Association of American Colleges and Universities
(AAC&U), the Council of Applied Master’s Programs in Psychology (CAMPP), the Southern
Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and the Virginia Assessment Group (VAG).

In summary, the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment is engaged in a large number
of initiatives that promote each of the goals associated with its mission. This work has made important
contributions toward preserving the academic standing of the University in the larger academic
community though accreditation processes. The Center also contributes to the ongoing development of a
culture of assessment, scholarly inquiry into effective teaching practices, and commitment to continuous
improvement of student learning. This work is vital to the University mission to be “the best regional
comprehensive university in America” and the University strategic priorities to “inspire and achieve the
highest levels of student learning, creativity, and success that encourage the development of individual
potential in students, faculty, and staff,” “create and deliver the highest quality of educational, research,
and service programs that meet the needs of the communities we serve,” and “provide excellent
educational, student, and administrative support services and facilities.”
### Part I-SP, Summary Report on Status of Strategic Planning Goals/Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Function/Service</th>
<th>Strategic Goal/Objective</th>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
<th>Summary of Assessment Results&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results to Improve Program/Function/Service&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Facilitate implementation and sustainability of the QEP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire new faculty fellows (for mentoring) as part of QEP to replace 2 fellows who will complete terms at end of spring 2008 term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fellows renewed or hired</td>
<td>One fellow retained for 2008-2009 (two fellows lost in budget reduction exercises)</td>
<td>Decided that funding must be protected to retain at least 1 fellow in future years to protect programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructure day-to-day management of details of the QEP as part of Mary Halford’s work assignment</td>
<td>Timely management of QEP workflow</td>
<td>Review and revision of Mary Halford’s work assignment</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Regular meetings of QEP co-directors arranged and minutes maintained. Timely announcement of QEP functions, feedback on grants, etc. Will retain this administrative structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term Formative Evaluation of the QEP (work with Peggy Maki as external evaluator)</td>
<td>Collection of appropriate assessment data Decisions made based on report from Peggy Maki Attendance at workshops in September and April related to this evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met Maki: September — 98 attendees Maki: April — 48 attendees Workshop evaluations on file (all positive)</td>
<td>See QEP minutes for summary of decisions made. End of QEP projects (funding issues &amp; wrap-up of QEP). Desire for a full-time QEP director (not implemented because of funding issues). Desire for funding QEP SoTL project (not funded due to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize a QEP Symposium for the Spring Term 2008</td>
<td>Attendance at QEP Symposium</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Only one QEP project was at a point suitable for presentation; will delay the symposium and combine with a best practices mini-conference in 2008-2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit the QEP On-Line Monographs</td>
<td>Number of monographs published</td>
<td>10 Final Reports now posted online (19 funded projects – remainder still underway; one completed pilot project still has no final report)</td>
<td>Decision made to post &quot;final reports&quot; instead of &quot;monographs&quot; because of the variability in format of reports associated with QEP projects and need to post reports from all projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops with external consultants on active learning strategies and student engagement</td>
<td>Attendance at workshops Evaluations of workshops</td>
<td>Maki: September – 98 attendees Delano: November – 60 attendees Maki: April – 48 attendees Workshop evaluations on file (all positive)</td>
<td>Will continue to seek opportunities to bring external experts to campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a symposium on teaching strategies for student engagement (in conjunction with Academic Technologies Center).</td>
<td>Attendance at workshops Evaluations of workshops</td>
<td>Met November mini-conference (active learning): 60 attendees February mini-conference (assessment): 49 attendees Workshop evaluations on file (all positive)</td>
<td>Will continue best practices mini-conference on an annual basis – will coordinate with Student Affairs to organize the George Kuh visit in fall 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Enhance teaching effectiveness by adding to existing services and programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Orientation (before onset of fall term)</td>
<td>Workshop attendance Workshop evaluation</td>
<td>Met 12 new faculty attendees 8 campus representatives at Service Fair component Workshop evaluations on file (all positive)</td>
<td>Service Fair format will be repeated for 2008 New Faculty Orientation with modifications to address crowding and noise problems experienced in 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide development activities for adjunct faculty</td>
<td>Attendance by adjunct faculty at CUTLA events Attendance at events designed specifically for adjunct faculty</td>
<td>Met Workshop for AFS (8/1): 5 attendees HLES TA workshop (8/23): 13 attendees</td>
<td>Adjunct faculty attendance at special events is weak. Need to address other methods for reaching adjunct faculty (online training via the CUTLA web site)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Report, 2007-2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Key Details</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Workshops (year-long series)</td>
<td>Workshop attendance&lt;br&gt;Workshop evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue work with Faculty Learning Community on Dissertation and Theses (with Thomas Kramer &amp; Richard Podemski).</td>
<td>Number of workshops held&lt;br&gt;Attendance at workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate a series of brown bag and roundtable discussions on teaching strategies and professional development</td>
<td>Number of workshops held&lt;br&gt;Attendance at workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Interest Group</td>
<td>Attendance at meetings&lt;br&gt;SoTL projects developed by group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training and support for use of the turnitin software.</td>
<td>Number of faculty requesting information and accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify recurrent funding for renewal of the turnitin software</td>
<td>Creation of recurring funds for turnitin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide workshops and consultations to individual faculty members and departments as needed.</td>
<td>Number of workshops and consultations offered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Initiate assessment activities of CUTL A</td>
<td>Qualitative data from needs assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Adjunct Orientation (8/25): 7 attendees<br>Workshop evaluations on file (all positive) | is planned for 2008-2009. Will continue to invite adjunct faculty to all CUTL A events. |       |
| 6 Workshops<br>Total attendance: 119<br>Workshops evaluated individually: all evaluations were positive | |       |
| Met<br>Configured as a QEP project to sponsor a mini-conference (see QEP Final Report) | Renamed this series Faculty Fridays to clarify that these are intended for all faculty (and adjunct faculty). |       |
| 10 workshops held<br>Attendance: 4-14 per session<br>Total Attendance: 69 | FLC completed its work, sponsored a conference on the dissertation in November and has disbanded. |       |
| 6 meetings (3-8 attendees per meeting)<br>2 ms developed for submission by group members; 1 poster submission (SACS) | Given the reduced budget and reduced Fellows programs, decided to eliminate the brown bag sessions and focus on Faculty Fridays and mini-conferences. |       |
| New accounts requested: 22<br>Total number of active accounts: 118 | SoTL group will continue to meet during 2008-2009. |       |
| Met: Funding provided by Academic Affairs | Legal issues (re: FERPA) and cost of Turnitin may lead to the termination of this service. |       |
| 12 consultations/workshops<br>125 participants total<br>(1 – 30 attendees per consultation/workshop) | Service appears to be useful; will continue to provide as needed. |       |
| Based on the positive response to the Get Engaged Tips, these will continue. Used feedback from this survey to identify topics for 2008-2009 Faculty | |       |

Annual Report, 2007-2008
| Assess CUTLA workshops | Workshop attendance | Workshop evaluation (develop evaluations that capture changes in learning as well as satisfaction with workshop) | Faculty Friday workshops & mini-conference (total attendance): 367  
Other workshops & consultations (total attendance): 279  
Workshops are evaluated individually (data kept on file) and as part of the QEP Impact Survey. Evaluations are positive. Feedback from the QEP Impact Survey indicates that actually attendees have much more positive perception of these workshops than non-attendees  
Friday workshops and other CUTLA events.  
Workshops appear to serve faculty development needs. Based on this feedback, certain workshops (e.g., academic integrity, engagement, T&H preparation, establishing a research program) will be offered annually.  
Will develop online versions of some workshops (e.g. syllabus construction, writing SLOs for CCRs) to create “just in time” faculty development and improve access for adjunct faculty. Comments on evaluations are used for revision of future events and suggestions for new topics. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Create an advisory group to assist in the identification of needs and set priorities for development of programs offered by the Center. (Conversion of QEP faculty development committee?) | Creation of advisory group | Minutes of meetings | Created late spring 2008; members still being identified  
Advisory Board will begin work in fall 2008. |
| 4. Provide faculty development and support for work related to assessment | Attendance at meetings | Minutes of meetings | 3 meetings held (minutes kept)  
9/24 – planning: 3 attendees  
10/11 – fall meeting: 19 attendees  
2/12 – making sense meeting: 17 attendees  
Group activity at the “making sense” meeting was successful and will be repeated next year: formed groups to address strengths and weaknesses in student learning in each AF domain & share best practices. Departments will provide documentation of collection and use of assessment data in their annual reports. |
<p>| Organize, support, and help document assessment activities for General Education/Academic Foundations | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organize, support, and help document assessment activities for Undergraduate Programs</th>
<th>Attendance at meetings Minutes of meetings</th>
<th>Handled through All Chairs Council and College Chairs meetings this year</th>
<th>May be more efficient to continue this work through the All Chairs Council rather than through special meetings. Departments will provide documentation of collection and use of assessment data in their annual reports.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organize, support, and help document assessment activities for Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Attendance at meetings Minutes of meetings</td>
<td>Not needed this year (see above)</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate work on assessment and reform of the multicultural requirement (General Studies)</td>
<td>Attendance at meetings Minutes of meetings</td>
<td>3 meetings held (19 attendees in total), proposal sent to Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Faculty Senate decided to form an ad hoc committee chaired by Mary Rogers to define and identify SLOs related to multiculturalism/diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide workshops and customized consultations with departments to promote assessment activity and expertise</td>
<td>Participant attendance Workshop evaluations</td>
<td>7 workshops Attendance included in consultation/workshop information (above)</td>
<td>Workshops and consultations customized to meet the needs of specific departments are useful and will be continued.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Encourage pedagogical research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide support for online survey research to faculty (Perseus)</th>
<th>Number of surveys created in Perseus</th>
<th>11 surveys created</th>
<th>Continue to work with existing license (no further costs for this). Decided that future surveys will be created only for faculty projects (not student projects) and CUTLA needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support faculty involved in SoTL projects and grants</td>
<td>Number of departments/faculty assisted</td>
<td>4 consultations on SoTL grants CUTLA provides faculty development support documented in these grants</td>
<td>Work will continue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Dissemination of work on assessment and faculty development

| Attend regional and national conferences related to faculty development (Florida Faculty Development Consortium Conference, POD Network Conference). Make | Number and identity of conferences attended Number of professional development workshops attended Number of presentations made | 9 conferences (SACS, AAC&U, POD, IARC, CAMPP, Lilly North, AP Psych Reading, ABET) 7 conferences included professional development | UWF is developing a strong identity for its work on the development of faculty skill with assessment (the CAMPP presentation was an invited address). CUTLA will continue |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentations related to assessment or faculty development at additional conferences as appropriate.</th>
<th>Presentations at conferences</th>
<th>Workshops that were attended 10 presentations made at these conferences 3 submissions accepted for presentation next year</th>
<th>To promote and disseminate work on assessment and faculty development on a regional and national level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and improve the web site for the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment</td>
<td>Revision of CUTLA web pages Number and type of new teaching resource documents posted Web Statistics: Total Hits: 2006: 8,267/month 2007: 16,164/month 2008: 22,446/month Unique Visitors: 2006: 1,084/month 2007: 2,188/month 2008: 3,377/month File Downloads: 2006: 1,964/month 2007: 5,610/month 2008: 7,793/month Get Engaged Archive Hits (5 months of data) 354 total hits (50-100 hits/month)</td>
<td>Continuous revision and expansion of CUTLA pages Added more information on SoTL and links to other sites, Created an archive page for the Get Engaged Tips; Hit rates and visitor stats for pages show steady increases</td>
<td>Will continue to monitor web statistics as an evaluation of the impact of CUTLA via its web site. The web site organization and content were revised and launched in June 2007. The new web site has experienced a steady increase in web traffic (hit rates doubled from 2006 to 2007; the first 6 months of 2008 showed an additional 50% increase in the number of hits and unique visitors). Will develop web-based faculty development tutorial/modules and monitor usage of these modules and other new web content through web statistics. Data on hits to ALC and ALP pages clearly indicates that these documents are getting attention and are downloaded regularly. CUTLA keeps data on downloads of individual ALC and ALP documents (but web stats provide incomplete hit data on individual pages – ITS provides individual page stats for only the top 40% of page hits &amp; downloads).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain ALC and ALP documents on CUTLA web site</td>
<td>Currency of assessment data posted to CUTLA pages ALC documents: all are posted ALP documents: all</td>
<td>Continue yearly inventory of ALC and ALP documents for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and post other documents related to assessment activities.</td>
<td>departments except MSA and Teacher Education are posted</td>
<td>currency and linkage to departmental web pages. Monitor CCRs for program to ensure most current SLO information is included in the ALC and ALP documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review CCRs, ALCs, and ALPs for appropriate description of student learning outcomes</td>
<td>Number of CCRs, ALCs, and ALPs reviewed and edited</td>
<td>233 course CCRs reviewed (10.3% needed one or more SLOs revised); 64 program CCRs reviewed (edits requested for SLOs for 4.7% of these CCRs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make recommendations for improved services for faculty development to Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.</td>
<td>Number and type of new faculty development initiatives recommended</td>
<td>The quality of SLOs written for CCRs is improving, requiring fewer revisions than in previous years. (In 2006-2007 CCR cycle, edits were requested for 14.7% of course CCRs and 28.8% of program CCRs in previous cycle).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform department chairs and deans of faculty development and curriculum issues that are under discussion in the faculty development community.</td>
<td>Communications to chairs and deans</td>
<td>Get Engaged Tips (weekly e-mail) Advisory Board for CUTLA Creation of a University Assessment Council by Faculty Senate Faculty Partners Group (volunteer work by Patti Spaniola) CUTLA newsletter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist the Vice President for</td>
<td>Submission of SACS</td>
<td>Second Monitoring Report</td>
<td>Requested that CUTLA director be invited to attend all future All Chairs meetings as a guest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs in the drafting of the second SACS Monitoring Report. Maintain data on the status of Quality Enhancement Program projects. Assist in the development of reports to the Board of Governors as needed.</th>
<th>Monitoring Reports Post a tracking matrix for QEP projects for 2006-2007 Reports created at the request of the BoG</th>
<th>submitted in fall 2007; favorably received by SACS Update QEP tracking matrix Submitted ALC Inventory to BoG Dec 2007</th>
<th>Provide assistance for the transition of new interim administrators and new permanent administrators as needed. Continue work on the summative evaluation of the impact of the QEP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to agencies external to UWF</td>
<td>Presentations to BoG Consultations with other academic institutions</td>
<td>BoG web conferences for ALCs and Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Continue current practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Location of CUTLA in appropriate physical space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek appropriate space for housing the CUTLA offices &amp; move into that space when available</td>
<td>Successful move into appropriate permanent quarters</td>
<td>Move to BLDG 53 completed in Dec 2007 and Jan 2008</td>
<td>No future moves anticipated. Current space in BLDG 53 is satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From unit's 2007-2008 strategic or action plan. Add lines as necessary.  
Data/information used to determine goal/objective status.  
Can comment on status of goal as “met,” “not met,” or “in progress.”  
Describe decisions made based on assessment results to improve program
Department/Division: Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment
College: N/A – Academic Affairs

Part II-A, Major Unit Accomplishments and Changes in Programs and Services

This section of the annual report replaces the Notable Accomplishments report that was required in past years.

List major department/division accomplishments and changes in programs and services for 2007-2008. (Add lines as needed.)

1. The Second Monitoring Report was submitted to SACS in August, 2007. The report was favorably reviewed at the December 2007 meeting of SACS, successfully completing the monitoring period following the SACS reaffirmation of accreditation visit in 2005. Informal feedback from our SACS liaison (Dr. Michael Johnson) indicated that the Commission was especially pleased with the manner in which UWF had implemented a sustainable assessment program that emphasized continuous improvement based on assessment evidence.

2. Disseminated the center’s work on faculty development related to teaching and assessment with 10 presentations at 9 professional conferences (a list of these is provided in section II-B). The presentation to the Council on Applied Masters Programs in Psychology was an invited address.

3. The CUTLA web site was completely rebuilt and restructured with additional content during the conversion to the new UWF template. The new site was launched in June 2007. Web statistics indicate a dramatic and continuing increase in traffic on the site.

4. Completed the move to permanent space in Building 53.

5. Completed a formative evaluation of the QEP with the assistance of Dr. Peggy Maki. The co-directors (Jim Hurd and Claudia Stanny) now have a clear sense of the ongoing impact of the QEP. We identified relevant data needed for the impact report that will be submitted with the Fifth Year Mini-Compliance Report to SACS in 2010 and established an action plan for completing this work.

6. Initiated a weekly Get Engaged teaching tips e-mail. The tips appear to be a success based on responses to individual mailings and faculty evaluations obtained with the spring needs assessment survey. In addition, hit rates for the archive of Get Engaged teaching tips on the CUTLA web site (launched in January 2008) indicate that this resource is used.

7. Provided workshops for training faculty and chairs with writing student learning outcomes and understanding the assessment process to meet specific needs associated with the revised Workload Assignment letter (and associated discussions with United Faculty of Florida).

8. Organized two mini-conferences: “best practices” on active and student engagement learning in online and face-to-face courses (fall) and “best practices” for assessment and curricular reform (spring).

9. Established a faculty learning community on the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL).

10. Coordinated a faculty development program for the Articulation Meeting organized by Enrollment Services.

11. Provided a faculty development workshop on assessment for Pensacola Junior College.

12. Established an Advisory Board for CUTLA (actual work will begin in fall 2008).

13. Launched an informal series of brown bag and roundtable sessions on topics of teaching and professional development. (Will be discontinued due to limitations on funding and Fellows staff.)
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Department/Division: Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment
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Part II-B, Distinguished Individual (Faculty, Staff, and Student) Accomplishments

List college/departmental distinctions earned by faculty, staff, and students during 2007-2008. 
(University- and Academic Affairs-level recognitions—such as promotion, tenure, Distinguished Teaching Award—need not be listed. This information is already available in the Provost’s Office.)

A. Faculty

Claudia Stanny, CUTLA Director

*Instructional activity (teaching regularly is not a part of the standard duties for the CUTLA Director)*

Taught **Advanced Cognitive Psychology** (graduate seminar) during the spring 2008 term for the department of psychology

Served on the committees of two thesis students who successfully defended their thesis under the supervision of Dr. J. Arruda (W. Aue, Fall 2007; H. McGee, Spring 2008)

*Editorial Review*

Reviewed a grant proposal for NSF

Served on the program committee for the AAC&U Network for Academic Renewal Conference

Reviewed conference program submissions:

- AAC&U (Network for Academic Renewal Conference)
- Div 2 (Teaching of Psychology)/American Psychological Association
- Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Conference

Reviewed two manuscript submissions for the *American Journal of Psychology*

*Professional Service*

Served as a Reader for the AP Psychology reading (ETS) in June 2007 (Louisville, KY)

Was promoted to Table Leader for the reading in June, 2008 (Kansas City, MO) (Table Leaders train Readers, manage work during the reading, and conduct back reading to establish reliability of Reader scoring.)

Nominated by UWF to serve as a member of a SACS accreditation visiting team

*Scholarly work completed during 2007-2008:*

Chapter in an edited book in print


Manuscript in review


Conference submissions accepted for presentation in 2008-2009


Conference presentations (2007-2008)


Eman EI-Sheikh, CUTLA Fellow

Co-author on two conference presentations (listed above):
AAC&U (Sharing Responsibility for Essential Learning Outcomes Conference)
International Assessment & Retention Conference

Co-author on manuscript for a book chapter submitted for review (Peggy Maki edited book, listed above)

Co-author on concurrent session submission accepted for presentation at the SACS Annual Meeting in December 2008.
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Attended conferences on assessment and faculty development (AAC&U, IARC, ABET) to develop expertise in faculty development of assessment skill.

Coordinated Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) Interest Group
Assisted with the organization and facilitation of Brown Bag and Roundtable sessions
Organized two mini-conferences (Best Practices in Active Learning and Best Practices in Assessment and Curricular Reform)
Coordinated with CUTLA Fellows to organize the Faculty Friday series
Assisted Fellows with the facilitation of CUTLA workshops and events
Coordinated with CUTLA Director to assess workshops and other CUTLA activities and identify improvements and needs for future programming

Kathy Johnson, CUTLA Fellow

Coordinated with CUTLA Fellows with the development and implementation of the New Faculty Orientation and Faculty Friday series
Was instrumental in the development of initial New Faculty Orientation series
Assisted Fellows with the facilitation of CUTLA workshops and events
Coordinated with CUTLA Director to assess workshops and other CUTLA activities and identify improvements and needs for future programming

F. Stephen Bridges, CUTLA Fellow

Coordinated with CUTLA Fellows with the development and implementation of the New Faculty Orientation and Faculty Friday series
Was instrumental in the development of initial New Faculty Orientation series
Assisted Fellows with the facilitation of CUTLA workshops and events
Coordinated with CUTLA Director to assess workshops and other CUTLA activities and identify improvements and needs for future programming

B. Staff

Mary Hallford
Completed a course in Dreamweaver 8 to provide supplemental support for development and maintenance of the CUTLA web site

Connie Works
Completed training on new program review procedures
Coordinated efforts of new procedures for posting SAI summaries online through Argus in the Grade Roll Review
Learned Elluminate procedures for use in CUTLA workshops
Taught "Introduction to Computers for Senior Citizens" through Leisure Learning
Became member of the UPC Program and Resources Committee
Attended training for eClassrooms
Wrote ColdFusion program to automatically rotate months on the CUTLA calendars using an Excel spreadsheet

C. Students

N/A
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List strategic plan goals/objectives for 2008-2009 and planned method of assessment (if applicable).

* Denotes new action item for 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Goal/Objective</th>
<th>Method(s) of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Facilitate implementation and sustainability of the QEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify funding for continuation of the Fellows program</td>
<td>Establish stable budget for Fellows program Fellows renewed or hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Gather data relevant to the QEP Impact Report</td>
<td>Collection of appropriate assessment data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine QEP Symposium presentation with the Spring mini-conference (2009)</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the QEP Final Reports</td>
<td>Number of final reports posted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops with external consultants on active learning strategies and student engagement</td>
<td>Attendance at workshops Evaluations of workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organize annual mini-conference on teaching strategies for student engagement</td>
<td>Attendance at workshops Evaluations of workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enhance teaching effectiveness by adding to existing services and programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Orientation (before onset of fall term)</td>
<td>Workshop attendance Workshop evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide development activities for adjunct faculty</td>
<td>Attendance by adjunct faculty at CUTLA events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Friday Workshops (year-long series)</td>
<td>Workshop attendance Workshop evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Engaged Tips for Teaching (weekly e-mail)</td>
<td>Hits on Get Engaged archive web page Evaluation in needs assessment survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* CUTLA Newsletter (fall and spring terms)</td>
<td>Evaluation in needs assessment survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Develop Web-based tutorials for faculty development to meet needs of busy faculty and adjunct faculty</td>
<td>Number of tutorials developed Statistics on tutorial usage (web hits, quizzes completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Broadcast Faculty Friday sessions through Elluminate</td>
<td>Elluminate logins Evaluation in needs assessment survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Implement use of personal response system in workshops (pending purchase of clickers by ITS)</td>
<td>Evaluation of system in workshop evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Support faculty work-life balance by sponsoring a Faculty Partners group (collegiality for faculty and faculty spouse/partners)</td>
<td>Participation in the Faculty Partners Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue activity of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Interest Group</td>
<td>Attendance at meetings SoTL projects &amp; scholarly work developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training and support for use of the Turnitin software</td>
<td>Number of faculty requesting information and accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide workshops and consultations to individual faculty members and departments as needed</td>
<td>Number of workshops and consultations offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustain assessment activities related to CUTLA functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct needs assessment for workshops and other faculty development activities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess CUTLA workshops</td>
<td>Workshop attendance Workshop evaluation (develop evaluations that capture changes in learning as well as satisfaction with workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Create an advisory group to assist in the identification of needs and set priorities for development of programs offered by the Center.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Provide faculty development and support for work related to assessment

| Organize, support, and help document assessment activities for General Education/Academic Foundations | Attendance at meetings Minutes of meetings |
| Support assessment activities in undergraduate and graduate programs | Attendance (of CUTLA Director) at All Chairs meetings |
| Support work on the assessment and reform of the multicultural requirement (General Studies) | Meetings scheduled for Faculty Senate Group |
| Provide workshops and customized consultations with departments to promote assessment activity and expertise | Workshops created Participant attendance |

### 5. Encourage pedagogical research

| Provide support for online survey research to faculty (Perseus) | Number of surveys created in Perseus |
| Support faculty involved in SoTL projects and grants | Number of departments/faculty assisted |

### 6. Dissemination of work on assessment and faculty development

| Attend regional and national conferences related to faculty development (Florida Faculty Development Consortium Conference, POD Network Conference). Make presentations related to assessment or faculty development at additional conferences as appropriate | Number and identity of conferences attended Number of professional development workshops attended Number of presentations made at conferences or publications |
| Maintain and improve the web site for the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment | Web Statistics: Hits/Month Unique Visitors/Month Documents Downloaded/Month |
| Maintain ALC and ALP documents on CUTLA web site and post other documents related to assessment activities | Currency of assessment data posted to CUTLA pages |
| Review CCRs, ALCs, and ALPs for appropriate description of student learning outcomes | Number of CCRs, ALCs, and ALPs reviewed and edited |
| Make recommendations for improved services for faculty development to Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost | Identify new faculty development initiatives recommended |
| Inform department chairs and deans of faculty development and curriculum issues that are under discussion in the faculty development community | Communications to chairs and deans |
| Maintain data on the status of Quality Enhancement Program projects Assist in the development of reports to the Board of Governors as needed | Post a tracking matrix for QEP projects for 2006-2007 Reports created at the request of the BoG |

| Report to UWF Board of Trustees as needed | N/A |
| Presentations to agencies external to UWF | Presentations to BoG Consultations with other academic institutions |

*Add lines as needed

“If applicable.”

Annual Report, 2007-2008
### Academic Learning Compacts – Status Report (Due by January 16, 2009)

The University must construct clearly defined POLICIES AND PROCEDURES (aligned with System policies and including elements required in Policy Guidelines) for developing, implementing, and reviewing Academic Learning Compacts and associated activities. A current copy of each university’s policies and procedures regarding Academic Learning Compacts shall remain on file in the Office of the Board of Governors.

1. **PROCESS:** Program faculty have identified expected core student learning outcomes in the areas of communication, critical thinking, and content/discipline knowledge and skills.

2. **PRODUCT:** Program faculty have made core learning expectations in the areas of communication, critical thinking, and content/discipline knowledge and skills readily available to prospective and enrolled students.

3. **PROCESS:** Program faculty have identified the different ways in which individual students are assessed within the context of the program to determine if they have mastered the articulated core learning expectations.

4. **PRODUCT:** Program faculty have included EXAMPLES of the kinds of assessments individual students will encounter in the program to determine if they have mastered these core learning expectations.

5. **PROCESS:** Program faculty have developed a system of program assessment/evaluation, including external validations, (which can involve sampling) to corroborate that graduates have truly attained the expected core competencies.

6. **PRODUCT:** Program Faculty have submitted a Seven-Year Program Review Summary Report to the Board of Governors Office - Must include a hyperlink to the Academic Learning Compact for each baccalaureate degree program under review.

7. **PROCESS:** Program faculty have used information from the periodic review of Student Learning Outcomes, as well as from the evaluation of corresponding assessment mechanisms to improve student achievement and program effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP CODE</th>
<th>DEGREE TYPE(S) (e.g., BA, BS, BFA, BED, BBA, BAA)</th>
<th>PROGRAM TITLE</th>
<th>1. PROCESS: Expected core student learning outcomes</th>
<th>2. PRODUCT: Core learning expectations POSTED ON THE WEB</th>
<th>3. PROCESS: How expectations are assessed in program</th>
<th>4. PRODUCT: EXAMPLES of how expectations are assessed in the program POSTED ON THE WEB</th>
<th>5. PROCESS: System of program assessment/evaluation</th>
<th>6. PRODUCT: Seven-Year Program Review Summary Report SUBMITTED TO BOG VIA THE WEB</th>
<th>7. PROCESS: Use of information to improve student achievement and program effectiveness</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE 26.0101</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>NS (2008-09)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE USE THIS DESIGNATED KEY TO PROVIDE STATUS REPORT ON EACH PROGRAM:

- **NS** = No Evidence That Process/Product is Started.
- **PC** = Evidence That Process/Product Is Partially Completed.
- **CI** = Evidence That Process/Product is Completed and in Continuous Improvement Mode.
The University of West Florida (UWF) has adopted the Board of Governors’ (BOG’s) mandate to develop an “Academic Learning Compact (ALC)” to identify student learning outcomes and relevant assessment strategies for UWF’s undergraduate degree programs. Our faculty and administration concurred that developing the reporting requirements to satisfy the ALC mandate would also effectively address accountability demands related to the SACS review. Our approach adheres to Policy Guideline #PG 05.02.15, issued by the Board of Governors, State University System/Division of Colleges and Universities.

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Academic departments are responsible for developing student learning outcomes, completing a curriculum audit, and designing an assessment plan to generate evidence regarding the quality of their programs. The department chair or program director has formal responsibility for submitting the Academic Learning Compact for a baccalaureate degree program to the Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment for review and the appropriate College Dean for approval. Department members are responsible for incorporating relevant elements of the Academic Learning Compact in new course proposals as well as new degree programs. Relevant student learning outcomes related to the ALC should be included in the design of course syllabi.

The UWF Academic Learning Compact incorporates student learning outcome activity across five domains that should characterize the skills and abilities of a UWF graduate, regardless of major. Every ALC will address the three domains specified by the Board of Governors:

- discipline knowledge and skills
- communication
- critical thinking

and two additional domains as follows:

- integrity/values
- project management.

These five domains represent student learning outcomes identified by faculty as essential to the UWF baccalaureate degree. Departments may elect to include a sixth domain that uniquely characterizes work in their major (e.g., “risk/hazard management” in chemistry).

Academic Learning Compacts should be written in jargon-free language that will be understandable to potential students. Each department or program will generate a two-sided handout that includes the following elements:

- Mission statement of the department
- Student learning outcomes associated with each ALC domain
- Roster of possible kinds of employment related to completion of the major
- Summary of the assessment plan by which the students would demonstrate the outcomes
- URL address for the web site of the program or major.

Physical copies of the ALC handouts will be made available to students through the department and electronic copies will be available online at the web sites of the program/department and of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. The UWF Catalog will address the role of Academic Learning Compacts in general terms.

Each program will identify a minimum of one direct (e.g., portfolio analysis, capstone performance) and one indirect (e.g., exit survey, alumni satisfaction survey) measure as the foundation of its assessment plan. The commitment of the Academic Learning Compact is that students who graduate from any baccalaureate program will have had the experiences designed to develop competence in the targeted
domains of the university plan.

The department chair or program director of the major or a designee will systematically review and revise the outcomes as influenced by the data generated by the respective departmental assessment plans. At minimum, departments or programs will devote at least one formal meeting per year to review of their assessment data and planning for curricular refinement.

Academic departments will ensure that the ALC is a current representation of the curriculum and goals of the undergraduate program. Departments will create an ALC for each new undergraduate program proposal and make appropriate revisions to the ALC of existing programs that undergo significant program revision. New and revised ALCs will be submitted prior to final approval of new programs or program revisions.

**STATEMENT OF PROCEDURES**

**Posting Current ALC Documents on the Web**
To ensure that all representations of ALC documents on the web are consistent, the current electronic copy of department ALC documents will be archived on the web site of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. Departments should provide a link to these documents from the departmental web page(s). All other web sites (including the departmental web site) should access this electronic document by linking to the appropriate file maintained on the CUTLA web site.

**Content of an ALC**
Academic Learning Compact will include the following elements:
- Mission statement of the department
- Student learning outcomes across five domains:
  1. discipline knowledge and skills (content)
  2. communication
  3. critical thinking
  4. integrity/values
  5. project management
  6. (optional sixth domain elected by departments that uniquely characterizes discipline-specific skills in the major not identified by the other domains).
- Roster of possible kinds of employment related to completion of the major
- Summary of the assessment plan by which the students would demonstrate the outcomes
- URL address for the web site of the program or major.

**Assessment and Review of Student Learning**
Each program or department will identify a minimum of one direct (e.g., portfolio analysis, capstone performance) and one indirect (e.g., exit survey, alumni satisfaction survey) measure as the foundation of the program assessment plan. The commitment of the Academic Learning Compact is that students who graduate from any baccalaureate program will have had the experiences designed to develop competence in the targeted domains of the university plan. The assessment plan must be submitted to the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment or its designee for approval and feedback.

**Curriculum Maps/Matrices**
Each program will create a curriculum map/matrix in which the location of learning activities related to student learning outcomes for ALC domains and program-related embedded assessments are identified. Curriculum maps/matrices should clearly identify the program-level student learning outcomes and embedded assessment activities in terms of specific courses and other curriculum components. Curriculum maps/matrices will be housed on departmental web sites with a link to the CUTLA web site.

**Reporting of Assessment Activity**
Programs and departments will make progress reports on their insights from assessment in the annual report submitted to Academic Affairs and posted on the university’s planning information system (UPIC).
These reports will include a description of assessment methods and activities, examples of assessment methods used, and descriptions of the improvements in undergraduate programs and/or assessment processes motivated by the review and interpretation of assessment evidence.

The Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment will develop and post an annual overarching assessment report to the university information system to summarize activity, highlight particular achievements, and facilitate appropriate institutional planning related to curriculum development.

**Yearly Audit**
The Office of Academic Affairs and the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment will conduct a yearly audit to ensure that current ALCs are posted on the CUTLA web site and that links from departmental web pages to these documents are functional.

**Validation of Assessment Strategies**
UWF programs and departments will seek external validation of the selected outcomes and assessment plans. Evaluation of the assessment program will be a standard feature of the seven-year program review. Departments may also pursue other venues of confirmation (e.g., comparisons with national test data, comparisons against benchmarks for comparable programs).

**Regular Review of Assessment Data**
The department chair or program director or a designee (such as an assessment or curriculum committee) will systematically review the student learning outcomes, review data generated by their respective assessment plans, and make recommendations for ALC revisions and/or program modifications based on the evidence from assessment activity. At a minimum, departments or programs will devote at least one formal meeting per year to review of their assessment data and planning for curricular refinement.

**Use of Assessment Data**
The university is committed to the recursive nature of assessment. The information gained through measuring student achievement should influence department curricular design, which should in turn influence student achievement. As such, student learning outcomes and assessment plans will be in continuous improvement mode.

**Periodic Review of ALCs and Assessment Data**
- At minimum, departments or programs will devote at least one formal meeting per year to review of their assessment data, planning for curricular refinement, and evaluation of instructional strategies. This review may include revision of the ALC document.
- When departments initiate changes to degree programs, the student learning outcomes from their current ALC will be imported into the CCR system. The CCR review process will include an evaluation of whether program changes require alteration of the SLOs and ALC document.
- Departments undergoing periodic program reviews or discipline-specific accreditation reviews will include an evaluation of program SLOs to ensure that the current ALC is representative of the goals of the program at the time of the program review.
- Data from periodic assessment activities, review of assessment data, and associated modifications of programs, teaching strategies, and assessment methods will be used to meet SACS standards concerning continuous assessment, review, and improvement of program effectiveness.

**Revision of ALC Documents**
- Initiation of ALC revisions will reside with the individual departments.
- Once a revision has been made by a department, the revised document should be sent to CUTLA, where it will be reviewed for language (including ensuring that all student learning outcomes are measurable) and formatting.
- The document will then be routed to the appropriate College Dean for approval.
- Documents that have been approved by the College Dean will then be posted to the CUTLA web site.
- The previous version of the document will be archived by CUTLA.
Note:
We are indebted to our colleagues at Florida Atlantic University and the University of North Florida for providing useful models. The ALC Policies and Procedures developed by Thomas Pusateri when he served as Assessment Director at Florida Atlantic University provided a thoughtful overview on the critical issues related to ALC implementation. Robert A. Smallwood, Associate Provost for Assessment at the University of North Florida, also provided useful insights into the appropriate components of these Policies and Procedures. We have adapted their reporting structure to address policies and procedures related to the design and use of ALCs at UWF.
STATEMENT OF POLICY

Academic departments are responsible for developing student learning outcomes, completing a curriculum audit, and designing an assessment plan to generate evidence regarding the quality of their programs. The department chair or program director has formal responsibility for submitting the Academic Learning Plan for all advanced degree programs to the Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment for review and the appropriate College Dean for approval. Department members are responsible for incorporating relevant elements of the Academic Learning Plan in new course proposals as well as new degree programs. Relevant student learning outcomes related to the ALP should be included in the design of course syllabi.

The UWF Academic Learning Plan incorporates student learning outcome activity across five domains that should characterize the skills and abilities of graduates from a master's or doctoral program at UWF, regardless of discipline. Every ALP will address the following five domains:

- discipline knowledge and skills
- communication
- critical thinking
- integrity/values
- project management.

These five domains represent student learning outcomes identified by faculty as essential to advanced degrees conferred by UWF. Departments may elect to include a sixth domain that uniquely characterizes work in their master's or doctoral program.

Academic Learning Plans should be written in jargon-free language that will be understandable to potential students. Each department or program will generate a two-sided handout that includes the following elements:

- Mission statement of the department
- Student learning outcomes associated with each ALP domain
- Roster of possible kinds of employment related to completion of the major
- Summary of the assessment plan by which the students would demonstrate the outcomes
- URL address for the web site of the program.

Physical copies of the ALP handouts will be made available to students through the department and electronic copies will be available online at the web sites of the program/department and of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. The UWF Catalog will address the role of Academic Learning Plans in general terms.

Each program will identify a minimum of one direct (e.g., portfolio analysis, capstone performance) and one indirect (e.g., exit survey, alumni satisfaction survey) measure as the foundation of its assessment plan. The commitment of the Academic Learning Plan is that students who complete any advanced degree program will have had the experiences designed to develop competence in the targeted domains of the university plan.

The department chair or program director of a graduate program or a designee will systematically review and revise the outcomes as influenced by the data generated by the respective departmental assessment plans. At minimum, departments or programs will devote at least one formal meeting per year to review of their assessment data and planning for curricular refinement.

Academic departments will ensure that the ALP is a current representation of the curriculum and goals of the master's or doctoral program. Departments will create an ALP for each new master's or doctoral
program proposal and make appropriate revisions to the ALP of existing programs that undergo significant program revision. New and revised ALPs will be submitted prior to final approval of new programs or program revisions.

**STATEMENT OF PROCEDURES**

**Posting Current ALP Documents on the Web**
To ensure that all representations of ALP documents on the web are consistent, the current electronic copy of department ALP documents will be archived on the web site of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment. Departments should provide a link to these documents from the departmental web page(s). All other web sites (including the departmental web site) should access this electronic document by linking to the appropriate file maintained on the CUTLA web site.

**Content of an ALP**
Academic Learning Plan will include the following elements:
- Mission statement of the department
- Student learning outcomes across five domains:
  1. discipline knowledge and skills (content)
  2. communication
  3. critical thinking
  4. integrity/values
  5. project management
  6. (optional sixth domain elected by departments that uniquely characterizes discipline-specific skills in the major not identified by the other domains)
- Roster of possible kinds of employment related to completion of the major
- Summary of the assessment plan by which the students would demonstrate the outcomes
- URL address for the web site of the graduate program.

**Assessment and Review of Student Learning**
Each program or department will identify a minimum of one direct (e.g., portfolio analysis, capstone performance) and one indirect (e.g., exit survey, alumni satisfaction survey) measure as the foundation of the program assessment plan. The commitment of the Academic Learning Plan is that students who graduate from any master’s or doctoral program will have had the experiences designed to develop competence in the targeted domains of the university plan. The assessment plan must be submitted to the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment or its designee for approval and feedback.

**Curriculum Maps/Matrices**
Each program will create a curriculum map/matrix in which the location of learning activities related to student learning outcomes for ALP domains and program-related embedded assessments are identified. Curriculum maps/matrices should clearly identify the program-level student learning outcomes and embedded assessment activities in terms of specific courses and other curriculum components. Curriculum maps/matrices will be housed on departmental web sites with a link to the CUTLA web site.

**Reporting of Assessment Activity**
Programs and departments will make progress reports on their insights from assessment in the annual report submitted to Academic Affairs and posted on the university’s planning information system (UPIC). These reports will include a description of assessment methods and activities, examples of assessment methods used, and descriptions of the improvements in master’s or doctoral programs and/or assessment processes motivated by the review and interpretation of assessment evidence.

The Director of the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment will develop and post an annual overarching assessment report to the university information system to summarize activity, highlight particular achievements, and facilitate appropriate institutional planning related to curriculum development.
Yearly Audit
The Office of Academic Affairs and the Center for University Teaching, Learning, and Assessment will conduct a yearly audit to ensure that current ALPs are posted on the CUTLA web site and that links from departmental web pages to these documents are functional.

Validation of Assessment Strategies
Graduate programs and departments at UWF will seek external validation of the selected outcomes and assessment plans. Evaluation of the assessment program will be a standard feature of the seven-year program review. Departments may also pursue other venues of confirmation (e.g., comparisons with national test data, comparisons against benchmarks for comparable programs).

Regular Review of Assessment Data
The department chair or program director or a designee (such as an assessment or curriculum committee) will systematically review the student learning outcomes, review data generated by their respective assessment plans, and make recommendations for ALP revisions and/or program modifications based on the evidence from assessment activity. At a minimum, departments or programs will devote at least one formal meeting per year to review of their assessment data and planning for curricular refinement.

Use of Assessment Data
The university is committed to the recursive nature of assessment. The information gained through measuring student achievement should influence department curricular design, which should in turn influence student achievement. As such, student learning outcomes and assessment plans will be in continuous improvement mode.

Periodic Review of ALPs and Assessment Data
- At minimum, departments or programs will devote at least one formal meeting per year to review of their assessment data, planning for curricular refinement, and evaluation of instructional strategies. This review may include revision of the ALP document.
- When departments initiate changes to degree programs, the student learning outcomes from their current ALP will be imported into the CCR system. The CCR review process will include an evaluation of whether program changes require alteration of the SLOs and ALP document.
- Departments undergoing periodic program reviews or discipline-specific accreditation reviews will include an evaluation of program SLOs to ensure that the current ALP is representative of the goals of the program at the time of the program review.
- Data from periodic assessment activities, review of assessment data, and associated modifications of programs, teaching strategies, and assessment methods will be used to meet SACS standards concerning continuous assessment, review, and improvement of program effectiveness.

Revision of ALP Documents
- Initiation of ALP revisions will reside with the individual departments.
- Once a revision has been made by a department, the revised document should be sent to CUTLA, where it will be reviewed for language (including ensuring that all student learning outcomes are measurable) and formatting.
- The document will then be routed to the appropriate College Dean for approval.
- Documents that have been approved by the College Dean will then be posted to the CUTLA web site.
- The previous version of the document will be archived by CUTLA.
Academic Program Review

(1) Statement of Intent

(a) Academic program reviews are designed to periodically analyze how degree programs provide students with high quality education and preparation for success in our global economy. Well aligned with regional and discipline-specific accreditation expectations, program review processes in the State University System emphasize the assessment of student learning outcomes and continuous program improvement.

(b) The Board of Governors requires the cyclic review of all academic degree programs in State universities at least every seven years. Program reviews must document how individual academic programs are achieving stated student learning and program objectives within the context of the university’s mission, as illustrated in the academic learning compacts. The results of the program reviews are expected to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level and, when appropriate, at the state level.

(c) The Board of Governors expects university personnel to ensure that program review processes and summary reports are of high quality and that they comply with the expectations outlined in Board of Governors and university regulations.

(2) Program Review Schedule

(a) The University of West Florida, hereinafter referred to as the university, shall establish and maintain a seven-year schedule for submission of program review summary reports for every degree program within the cycles established by the Board of Governors.

(b) The university’s program review schedule shall ensure that all programs receive sufficient review, with appropriate input from external experts, within the established seven-year cycle. Exceptions to the seven-year cycle may be negotiated with the Board of Governors to align a review with a specialized accreditation cycle. The university shall submit its program review schedule to the Office of Academic and Student Affairs of the Board of Governors according to the timetable established by the Board of Governors.

(3) Program Review Procedures and Guidelines

(a) The university must establish and publish clearly defined procedures and guidelines for reviewing academic degree programs during each seven-year cycle for the purpose of ensuring continuous program improvement.

(b) The university’s program review and continuous improvement processes must include the following components as identified in the Board of Governors program review regulation:

1. The review of the mission(s) and purpose(s) of the program within the context of the university mission and the Board of Governors’ Strategic Plan;
2. The establishment of teaching, research, service, and other program goals and objectives, including expected outcomes, particularly in the area of student learning;
3. An assessment of:
   a. how well program goals/objectives are being met;
   b. how well students are achieving expected learning outcomes;
   c. how the results of these assessments are used for continuous program improvement; and
   d. the sufficiency of resources and support services to achieve the program goals/objectives.

   (c) The university may require additional components for program reviews beyond those required by the Board of Governors. Such additional program review components shall be identified in the university's program review procedures and guidelines.

4. For baccalaureate programs, a review of lower level prerequisite courses to ensure that the program is in compliance with State-approved common prerequisites and (if appropriate) a review of the limited access status of the program to determine if such status is still warranted.

   (c) The university shall submit its program review procedures and guidelines to the Office of Academic and Student Affairs of the Board of Governors for review.

   (d) The university must electronically submit revisions to its program review procedures and guidelines to the Office of Academic and Student Affairs of the Board of Governors by December 15 of each year of the cycle.

(4) Program Review Summary Reports
   (a) A program review summary report must be completed for every program review that is conducted during each program review cycle. Each summary report must include the following components identified in the Board of Governors program review regulation:
      1. The CIP/degree combinations for the program that is reviewed.
      2. An electronic copy of the current Academic Learning Compact for each reviewed baccalaureate program.
      3. An indicator identifying whether or not the program review was conducted in conjunction with any external reviews (e.g., accreditation reviews).
      4. The date of the last review of this program.
      5. A brief description of major changes made since the previous program review.
      6. A summary and evaluation of assessment procedures used by the program.
      7. A summary and evaluation of the use of assessment evidence for continuous improvement of the program.
      8. A summary of the current strengths of the program.
      9. A summary of the current weaknesses of the program.
     10. A summary of the recommendations and/or proposed action plans made as a result of the review.
     11. An official signature of the university provost that will verify that the program review included all of the processes outlined in the Board of Governors
program review regulation and was conducted according to approved university regulations, procedures, and guidelines.

(b) The university may require additional components for program review reports beyond those required by the Board of Governors. Such additional program review report components shall be identified in the university's program review procedures and guidelines.

(c) A copy of all full program review reports must be maintained at a campus location specified by the university provost.

(5) Program Review Summary Report Submission

(a) The university must provide its schedule for submission of program review summary reports in a prescribed electronic format to the Office of Academic and Student Affairs of the Board of Governors by December 15 of each year of the cycle.

(b) For each program review conducted during a program review cycle, a program review summary report must be electronically submitted to the Office of Academic and Student Affairs of the Board of Governors during the year in which the summary report is scheduled for submission.

Authority: Section 7(d), Art. IX, Fla. Const., 1001.705(1)(b)8, F.S.; History: New 3-29-07.

Reference:
Board of Governor’s Regulation

Draft at 10-20-08 revised 11-3-08
Carl A. Backman
Assistant to the Provost
Alignment of Goals, Priorities, and Plans

- Goals for the Economy and Society.
- State Needs and Goals for Higher Education.
- Board of Governors Strategic Plan and System Initiatives.
- University Strategic Plans – Aligned with System Goals & Priorities.
- University Compacts – Aligned with University and System Strategic Plans and Initiatives, Accountability Expectations, and Budget Planning.

The University Compact Process

- An on-going, iterative, and collaborative process of communication.
- Includes a multi-year, reciprocal agreement between an institution and the System which outlines the institution’s top priorities, strategic directions, and performance expectations on a negotiated set of indicators.
- Includes a “Dashboard” with updates and measures of progress (perhaps annually).
- Allows the Board of Governors and System leadership to use the results to inform resource and planning decisions.

Examples of What a University Compact Could Include

- University mission.
- Top university priorities that align with University and System Strategic Plans.
- Short-term and ongoing initiatives to support top priorities.
- Financial plans to support top priorities and initiatives.
- Progress metrics for identified initiatives.
- Enrollment plans.
- Academic program development plans.
- Major capital investment priorities.
- University performance on BOG/SUS strategic priorities.
- Performance on additional indicators identified for each individual university.
- University’s funding trends (State, tuition, fund-raising).
- Identifiable benefits from special System and State investments/contributions.
- Responses to unexpected opportunities and crises.
Proposed Timeline

- March 27, 2008: Presentation to the Board of Governors:
  - Multi-Year Timeline for Related Activities.
  - Template for Phase I of Process to Be Implemented in 2008-09.
- April - June, 2008: Development of Phase I Compacts for Individual Institutions.
- June or July, 2008: Presentation of 2008-09 Phase I University Compacts to the Board of Governors.
- Multi-Year Activities to Include Review of SUS Strategic Plan; Approval of Individual University Strategic Plans; More Developed Compacts.

Potential Benefits of University Compact Process*

* Based on input from other systems and institutions utilizing compacts.
- Helps create a shared vision and plan.
- Improves alignment of broad system goals and the directions, investments, and actions of institutions.
- Encourages cooperation, negotiation, and information sharing.
- As public document, further heightens trust and accountability.
- Imposes obligations on both sides and builds relationships that are more horizontal, cooperative, & reciprocal.
- Integrates planning, budgeting, and assessment.
GENERAL INFORMATION

A0. Respondent Information (Not for Publication)
Name
Title
Office
Mailing Address, City/State/Zip/Country
Phone
Fax
E-mail Address

Are your responses to the CDS posted for reference on your institution’s Web site?  □ Yes  □ No
If yes, please provide the URL of the corresponding Web page:

A0A. We invite you to indicate if there are items on the CDS for which you cannot use the requested analytic
convention, cannot provide data for the cohort requested, whose methodology is unclear, or about which you
have questions or comments in general. This information will not be published but will help the publishers
further refine CDS items.

A1. Address Information
Name of College or University
Mailing Address, City/State/Zip/Country
Street Address (if different), City/State/Zip/Country
Main Phone Number
WWW Home Page Address
Admissions Phone Number
Admissions Toll-free Number
Admissions Office Mailing Address, City/State/Zip/Country
Admissions Fax Number
Admissions E-mail Address
If there is a separate URL for your school’s online application, please specify:  ______________
If you have a mailing address other than the above to which applications should be sent, please provide:

A2. Source of institutional control (check one only)
□ Public
□ Private (nonprofit)
□ Proprietary

A3. Classify your undergraduate institution:
□ Coeducational college
□ Men’s college
□ Women’s college

A4. Academic year calendar
□ Semester  □ 4-1-4
□ Quarter  □ Continuous
□ Trimester  □ Differs by program (describe):
□ Other (describe):
A5. Degrees offered by your institution

- Certificate
- Diploma
- Associate
- Transfer
- Terminal
- Bachelor’s
- Postbachelor’s certificate
- Master’s
- Post-master’s certificate
- Doctoral
- First professional
- First professional certificate

B. ENROLLMENT AND PERSISTENCE

B1. Institutional Enrollment—Men and Women  Provide numbers of students for each of the following categories as of the institution’s official fall reporting date or as of October 15, 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FULL-TIME</th>
<th></th>
<th>PART-TIME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree-seeking, first-time freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other first-year, degree-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other degree-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total degree-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other undergraduates enrolled in credit courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, first-professional students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other first-professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total first-professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree-seeking, first-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other degree-seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other graduates enrolled in credit courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total all undergraduates: ______________

Total all graduate and professional students: ____________
GRAND TOTAL ALL STUDENTS: ___________
B2. Enrollment by Racial/Ethnic Category. Provide numbers of undergraduate students for each of the following categories as of the institution’s official fall reporting date or as of October 15, 2008. Include international students only in the category "Nonresident aliens." Complete the “Total Undergraduates” column only if you cannot provide data for the first two columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Degree-seeking First-time First year</th>
<th>Degree-seeking Undergraduates (include first-time first-year)</th>
<th>Total Undergraduates (both degree- and non-degree-seeking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident aliens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persistence
B3. Number of degrees awarded by your institution from July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2008.

- Certificate/diploma __________
- Associate degrees __________
- Bachelor’s degrees __________
- Postbachelor’s certificates __________
- Master’s degrees __________
- Post-master’s certificates __________
- Doctoral degrees __________
- First professional degrees __________
- First professional certificates __________

Graduation Rates
The items in this section correspond to data elements collected by the IPEDS Web-based Data Collection System’s Graduation Rate Survey (GRS). For complete instructions and definitions of data elements, see the IPEDS GRS instructions and glossary on the 2008 Web-based survey.

For Bachelor’s or Equivalent Programs
Please provide data for the fall 2002 cohort if available. If fall 2002 cohort data are not available, provide data for the fall 2001 cohort.

**Fall 2001 Cohort**

Report for the cohort of full-time first-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who entered in fall 2001. Include in the cohort those who entered your institution during the summer term preceding fall 2001.

**Fall 2002 Cohort**

Report for the cohort of full-time first-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who entered in fall 2002. Include in the cohort those who entered your institution during the summer term preceding fall 2002.

B4. Initial 2001 cohort of first-time, full-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students;
total all students: ________________

**B5.** Of the initial **2001** cohort, how many did not persist and did not graduate for the following reasons: death, permanent disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government, or official church missions; total allowable exclusions:

__________

**B6.** Final **2001** cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions:

(Subtract question B5 from question B4)

__________

**B7.** Of the initial **2001** cohort, how many completed the program in four years or less (by August 31, 2005):

__________

**B8.** Of the initial **2001** cohort, how many completed the program in more than four years but in five years or less (after August 31, 2005 and by August 31, 2006):

__________

**B9.** Of the initial **2001** cohort, how many completed the program in more than five years but in six years or less (after August 31, 2006 and by August 31, 2007):

__________

**B10.** Total graduating within six years (sum of questions B7, B8, and B9): ______________

**B11.** Six-year graduation rate for **2001** cohort (question B10 divided by question B6): __________ %

**B12.** Initial **2004** cohort, total of first-time, full-time degree/certificate-seeking students:

__________

**B13.** Of the initial **2004** cohort, how many did not persist and did not graduate for the following reasons: death, permanently disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government, or official church missions; total allowable exclusions:

__________

**B14.** Final **2004** cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions

(Subtract question B13 from question B12)

__________

**B15.** Completers of programs of less than two years duration (total): ______________

**B16.** Final **2004** cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions:

(Subtract question B13 from question B12)

__________

**B17.** Of the initial **2002** cohort, how many completed the program in four years or less (by August 31, 2006):

__________

**B18.** Of the initial **2002** cohort, how many completed the program in more than four years but in five years or less (after August 31, 2006 and by August 31, 2007):

__________

**B19.** Of the initial **2002** cohort, how many completed the program in more than five years but in six years or less (after August 31, 2007 and by August 31, 2008):

__________

**B20.** Total graduating within six years (sum of questions B7, B8, and B9): ______________

**B21.** Six-year graduation rate for **2002** cohort (question B20 divided by question B6): __________ %

**For Two-Year Institutions**

Please provide data for the **2005** cohort if available. If **2005** cohort data are not available, provide data for the **2004** cohort.

**2004 Cohort**

**B12.** Initial **2004** cohort, total of first-time, full-time degree/certificate-seeking students:

__________

**B13.** Of the initial **2004** cohort, how many did not persist and did not graduate for the following reasons: death, permanently disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government, or official church missions; total allowable exclusions:

__________

**B14.** Final **2004** cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions

(Subtract question B13 from question B12)

__________

**B15.** Completers of programs of less than two years duration (total): ______________

**2005 Cohort**

**B12.** Initial **2005** cohort, total of first-time, full-time degree/certificate-seeking students:

__________

**B13.** Of the initial **2005** cohort, how many did not persist and did not graduate for the following reasons: death, permanently disability, or service in the armed forces, foreign aid service of the federal government, or official church missions; total allowable exclusions:

__________

**B14.** Final **2005** cohort, after adjusting for allowable exclusions

(Subtract question B13 from question B12)

__________

**B15.** Completers of programs of less than two years duration (total): ______________
B16. Completers of programs of less than two years within 150 percent of normal time: __________

B17. Completers of programs of at least two but less than four years (total): ______________

B18. Completers of programs of at least two but less than four-years within 150 percent of normal time: __________

B19. Total transfers-out (within three years) to other institutions: ______________

B20. Total transfers to two-year institutions: ______________

B21. Total transfers to four-year institutions: ______________

B22. For the cohort of all full-time bachelor’s (or equivalent) degree-seeking undergraduate students who entered your institution as freshmen in fall 2007 (or the preceding summer term), what percentage was enrolled at your institution as of the date your institution calculates its official enrollment in fall 2008? __________ %
C. FIRST-TIME, FIRST-YEAR (FRESHMAN) ADMISSION

Applications

C1. First-time, first-year (freshman) students: Provide the number of degree-seeking, first-time, first-year students who applied, were admitted, and enrolled (full- or part-time) in fall 2008. Include early decision, early action, and students who began studies during summer in this cohort. Applicants should include only those students who fulfilled the requirements for consideration for admission (i.e., who completed actionable applications) and who have been notified of one of the following actions: admission, non-admission, placement on waiting list, or application withdrawn (by applicant or institution). Admitted applicants should include wait-listed students who were subsequently offered admission.

Total first-time, first-year (freshman) men who applied __________
Total first-time, first-year (freshman) women who applied __________
Total first-time, first-year (freshman) men who were admitted __________
Total first-time, first-year (freshman) women who were admitted __________
Total full-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) men who enrolled __________
Total part-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) men who enrolled __________
Total full-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) women who enrolled __________
Total part-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) women who enrolled __________

C2. Freshman wait-listed students (students who met admission requirements but whose final admission was contingent on space availability)
Do you have a policy of placing students on a waiting list? □ Yes □ No
If yes, please answer the questions below for fall 2008 admissions:

Number of qualified applicants offered a place on waiting list ______
Number accepting a place on the waiting list ______
Number of wait-listed students admitted ______

Is your waiting list ranked?
If yes, do you release that information to students?
Do you release that information to school counselors?

Admission Requirements

C3. High school completion requirement
Check the appropriate box to identify your high school completion requirement for degree-seeking entering students:
□ High school diploma is required and GED is accepted
□ High school diploma is required and GED is not accepted
□ High school diploma or equivalent is not required

C4. Does your institution require or recommend a general college-preparatory program for degree-seeking students?
□ Require
□ Recommend
□ Neither require nor recommend
C5. Distribution of high school units required and/or recommended. Specify the distribution of academic high school course units required and/or recommended of all or most degree-seeking students using Carnegie units (one unit equals one year of study or its equivalent). If you use a different system for calculating units, please convert.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units Required</th>
<th>Units Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total academic units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of these, units that must be lab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic electives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual/Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basis for Selection
C6. Do you have an open admission policy, under which virtually all secondary school graduates or students with GED equivalency diplomas are admitted without regard to academic record, test scores, or other qualifications? If so, check which applies:

- Open admission policy as described above for all students ___
- Open admission policy as described above for most students, but selective admission for out-of-state students ___
- Selective admission to some programs ___
- Other (explain) ________________________________________________________________________

C7. Relative importance of each of the following academic and nonacademic factors in your first-time, first-year, degree-seeking (freshman) admission decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Considered</th>
<th>Not Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigor of secondary school record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized test scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonacademic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent/ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character/personal qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni/ae relation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation/commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work experience
Level of applicant’s interest

SAT and ACT Policies

C8. Entrance exams

A. Does your institution make use of SAT, ACT, or SAT Subject Test scores in admission decisions for first-time, first-year, degree-seeking applicants? Yes No

If yes, place check marks in the appropriate boxes below to reflect your institution’s policies for use in admission for Fall 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT or ACT</th>
<th>Require</th>
<th>Recommend</th>
<th>ADMISSION Require for Some</th>
<th>Consider If Submitted</th>
<th>Not Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT and SAT Subject Tests or ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Subject Tests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. If your institution will make use of the ACT in admission decisions for first-time, first-year, degree-seeking applicants for fall 2010, please indicate which ONE of the following applies (regardless of whether the writing score will be used in the admissions process):

___ ACT with Writing component required
___ ACT with Writing component recommended.
___ ACT with or without Writing component accepted

C. Please indicate how your institution will use the SAT or ACT essay component; check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT essay</th>
<th>ACT essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For admission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In place of an application essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a validity check on the application essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No college policy as of now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not using essay component</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. In addition, does your institution use applicants' test scores for academic advising?

___ yes ___ no

E. Latest date by which SAT or ACT scores must be received for fall-term admission

Latest date by which SAT Subject Test scores must be received for fall-term admission

F. If necessary, use this space to clarify your test policies (e.g., if tests are recommended for some students, or if tests are not required of some students):

G. Please indicate which tests your institution uses for placement (e.g., state tests):
Freshman Profile

Provide percentages for ALL enrolled, degree-seeking, full-time and part-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) students enrolled in fall 2008, including students who began studies during summer, international students/nonresident aliens, and students admitted under special arrangements.

C9. Percent and number of first-time, first-year (freshman) students enrolled in fall 2008 who submitted national standardized (SAT/ACT) test scores. Include information for ALL enrolled, degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted test scores. Do not include partial test scores (e.g., mathematics scores but not critical reading for a category of students) or combine other standardized test results (such as TOEFL) in this item. Do not convert SAT scores to ACT scores and vice versa.

The 25th percentile is the score that 25 percent scored at or below; the 75th percentile score is the one that 25 percent scored at or above.

Percent submitting SAT scores ______ Number submitting SAT scores _____
Percent submitting ACT scores ______ Number submitting ACT scores _____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT Critical Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Essay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of first-time, first-year (freshman) students with scores in each range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SAT Critical Reading</th>
<th>SAT Math</th>
<th>SAT Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700-800</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>ACT Composite</th>
<th>ACT English</th>
<th>ACT Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-36</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100%
C10. Percent of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who had high school class rank within each of the following ranges (report information for those students from whom you collected high school rank information).

- Percent in top tenth of high school graduating class: _____
- Percent in top quarter of high school graduating class: _____
- Percent in top half of high school graduating class: _____
- Percent in bottom half of high school graduating class: _____
- Percent in bottom quarter of high school graduating class: _____

Top half + bottom half = 100%.

Percent of total first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted high school class rank: _______

C11. Percentage of all enrolled, degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who had high school grade-point averages within each of the following ranges (using 4.0 scale). Report information only for those students from whom you collected high school GPA.

- Percent who had GPA of 3.75 and higher: _____
- Percent who had GPA between 3.50 and 3.74: _____
- Percent who had GPA between 3.25 and 3.49: _____
- Percent who had GPA between 3.00 and 3.24: _____

- Percent who had GPA between 2.50 and 2.99: _____
- Percent who had GPA between 2.0 and 2.49: _____

- Percent who had GPA between 1.0 and 1.99: _____
- Percent who had GPA below 1.0: _____

100%

C12. Average high school GPA of all degree-seeking, first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted GPA: _____

Percent of total first-time, first-year (freshman) students who submitted high school GPA: _____%  

Admission Policies

C13. Application fee

Does your institution have an application fee? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Amount of application fee: __________

Can it be waived for applicants with financial need? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If you have an application fee and an on-line application option, please indicate policy for students who apply on-line:

Same fee: ____

Free: ______

Reduced: ____

Can on-line application fee be waived for applicants with financial need? Yes/no

C14. Application closing date

Does your institution have an application closing date? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Application closing date (fall): __________

Priority date: __________

C15. Are first-time, first-year students accepted for terms other than the fall? ☐ Yes ☐ No

C16. Notification to applicants of admission decision sent (fill in one only)

On a rolling basis beginning (date): __________

By (date): __________
C17. **Reply policy for admitted applicants (fill in one only)**

Must reply by (date): ____________
No set date: ____________
Must reply by May 1 or within ____ weeks if notified thereafter
Other: ____________

Deadline for housing deposit (MMDD): ____________
Amount of housing deposit: ____________
Refundable if student does not enroll?
___ Yes, in full
___ Yes, in part
___ No

C18. **Deferred admission:** Does your institution allow students to postpone enrollment after admission?

☐ Yes   ☐ No
If yes, maximum period of postponement: _______

C19. **Early admission of high school students:** Does your institution allow high school students to enroll as full-time, first-time, first-year (freshman) students one year or more before high school graduation?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

C20. **Common Application:** Question removed from CDS. (Initiated during 2006-2007 cycle)

**Early Decision and Early Action Plans**

C21. **Early decision:** Does your institution offer an early decision plan (an admission plan that permits students to apply and be notified of an admission decision well in advance of the regular notification date and that asks students to commit to attending if accepted) for first-time, first-year (freshman) applicants for fall enrollment?

☐ Yes   ☐ No
If “yes,” please complete the following:
First or only early decision plan closing date ____________
First or only early decision plan notification date ____________
Other early decision plan closing date ____________
Other early decision plan notification date ____________

For the **Fall 2008 entering class**:
Number of early decision applications received by your institution ____________
Number of applicants admitted under early decision plan ____________
Please provide significant details about your early decision plan: ________________________________

C22. **Early action:** Do you have a nonbinding early action plan whereby students are notified of an admission decision well in advance of the regular notification date but do not have to commit to attending your college?

☐ Yes   ☐ No
If “yes,” please complete the following:
Early action closing date ____________
Early action notification date ____________

Is your early action plan a “restrictive” plan under which you limit students from applying to other early plans?
D. TRANSFER ADMISSION

Fall Applicants

D1. Does your institution enroll transfer students? □ Yes □ No  
(If no, please skip to Section E)  
If yes, may transfer students earn advanced standing credit by transferring credits earned from course work completed at other colleges/universities? □ Yes □ No

D2. Provide the number of students who applied, were admitted, and enrolled as degree-seeking transfer students in fall 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Admitted Applicants</th>
<th>Enrolled Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application for Admission

D3. Indicate terms for which transfers may enroll:  
□ Fall □ Winter □ Spring □ Summer

D4. Must a transfer applicant have a minimum number of credits completed or else must apply as an entering freshman?  
□ Yes □ No  
If yes, what is the minimum number of credits and the unit of measure? ________________

D5. Indicate all items required of transfer students to apply for admission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Required of All</th>
<th>Recommended of All</th>
<th>Recommended of Some</th>
<th>Required of Some</th>
<th>Not required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school transcript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College transcript(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay or personal statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized test scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of good standing from prior institution(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D6. If a minimum high school grade point average is required of transfer applicants, specify  
(on a 4.0 scale): ________________

D7. If a minimum college grade point average is required of transfer applicants, specify  
(on a 4.0 scale): ________________

D8. List any other application requirements specific to transfer applicants:  
___________________________________________________________________________________________  
___________________________________________________________________________________________
D9. List application priority, closing, notification, and candidate reply dates for transfer students. If applications are reviewed on a continuous or rolling basis, place a check mark in the “Rolling admission” column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Priority Date</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
<th>Notification Date</th>
<th>Reply Date</th>
<th>Rolling Admission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D10. Does an open admission policy, if reported, apply to transfer students? □ Yes □ No

D11. Describe additional requirements for transfer admission, if applicable:
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

Transfer Credit Policies

D12. Report the lowest grade earned for any course that may be transferred for credit: ____________

D13. Maximum number of credits or courses that may be transferred from a two-year institution:
    Number ______  Unit type __________

D14. Maximum number of credits or courses that may be transferred from a four-year institution:
    Number ______  Unit type __________

D15. Minimum number of credits that transfers must complete at your institution to earn an associate degree: ____________

D16. Minimum number of credits that transfers must complete at your institution to earn a bachelor’s degree: ____________

D17. Describe other transfer credit policies:
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
E. ACADEMIC OFFERINGS AND POLICIES

E1. Special study options: Identify those programs available at your institution. Refer to the glossary for definitions.

☐ Accelerated program  ☐ Honors program
☐ Cooperative education program  ☐ Independent study
☐ Cross-registration  ☐ Internships
☐ Distance learning  ☐ Liberal arts/career combination
☐ Double major  ☐ Student-designed major
☐ Dual enrollment  ☐ Study abroad
☐ English as a Second Language (ESL)  ☐ Teacher certification program
☐ Exchange student program (domestic)  ☐ Weekend college
☐ External degree program
☐ Other (specify):

E2. Has been removed from the CDS.

E3. Areas in which all or most students are required to complete some coursework prior to graduation:

☐ Arts/fine arts  ☐ Humanities
☐ Computer literacy  ☐ Mathematics
☐ English (including composition)  ☐ Philosophy
☐ Foreign languages  ☐ Sciences (biological or physical)
☐ History  ☐ Social science
☐ Other (describe):

Library Collections: The CDS publishers will collect library data again when a new Academic Libraries Survey is in place.

F. STUDENT LIFE

F1. Percentages of first-time, first-year (freshman) degree-seeking students and degree-seeking undergraduates enrolled in Fall 2008 who fit the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>First-time, first-year (freshman) students</th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent who are from out of state (exclude international/nonresident aliens from the numerator and denominator)</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of men who join fraternities</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of women who join sororities</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who live in college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who live off campus or commute</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students age 25 and older</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of full-time students</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of all students (full- and part-time)</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F2. **Activities offered** Identify those programs available at your institution.

- [ ] Campus Ministries
- [ ] Choral groups
- [ ] Concert band
- [ ] Dance
- [ ] Drama/theater
- [ ] International Student Organization
- [ ] Jazz band
- [ ] Literary magazine
- [ ] Marching band
- [ ] Model UN
- [ ] Music ensembles
- [ ] Musical theater
- [ ] Opera
- [ ] Pepp band
- [ ] Radio station
- [ ] Student government
- [ ] Student newspaper
- [ ] Student-run film society
- [ ] Symphony orchestra
- [ ] Television station
- [ ] Yearbook

F3. **ROTC** (program offered in cooperation with Reserve Officers’ Training Corps)

Army ROTC is offered:
- [ ] On campus
- [ ] At cooperating institution (name): ________________________________

Naval ROTC is offered:
- [ ] On campus
- [ ] At cooperating institution (name): ________________________________

Air Force ROTC is offered:
- [ ] On campus
- [ ] At cooperating institution (name): ________________________________

F4. **Housing:** Check all types of college-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing available for undergraduates at your institution.

- [ ] Coed dorms
- [ ] Men’s dorms
- [ ] Women’s dorms
- [ ] Apartments for married students
- [ ] Apartments for single students
- [ ] Other housing options (specify): ________________________________

- [ ] Special housing for disabled students
- [ ] Special housing for international students
- [ ] Fraternity/sorority housing
- [ ] Cooperative housing
- [ ] Theme housing
- [ ] Wellness housing
G. ANNUAL EXPENSES

Provide 2009-2010 academic year costs of attendance for the following categories that are applicable to your institution.

☐ Check here if your institution's 2009-2010 academic year costs of attendance are not available at this time and provide an approximate date (i.e., month/day) when your institution's final 2009-2010 academic year costs of attendance will be available: ________________

G1. Undergraduate full-time tuition, required fees, room and board
List the typical tuition, required fees, and room and board for a full-time undergraduate student for the FULL 2009-2010 academic year (30 semester hours or 45 quarter hours for institutions that derive annual tuition by multiplying credit hour cost by number of credits). A full academic year refers to the period of time generally extending from September to June; usually equated to two semesters, two trimesters, three quarters, or the period covered by a four-one-four plan. Room and board is defined as double occupancy and 19 meals per week or the maximum meal plan. Required fees include only charges that all full-time students must pay that are not included in tuition (e.g., registration, health, or activity fees.) Do not include optional fees (e.g., parking, laboratory use).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIRST-YEAR</th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIVATE INSTITUTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC INSTITUTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-district:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state (out-of-district):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONRESIDENT ALIEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUIRED FEES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROOM AND BOARD:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on-campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROOM ONLY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on-campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOARD ONLY:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on-campus meal plan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive tuition and room and board fee (if your college cannot provide separate tuition and room and board fees): _______________________

Other: ___________________________________________________________________________________________

G2. Number of credits per term a student can take for the stated full-time tuition

___minimum  ___maximum

G3. Do tuition and fees vary by year of study (e.g., sophomore, junior, senior)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

G4. If tuition and fees vary by undergraduate instructional program, describe briefly: ________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________
G5. Provide the estimated expenses for a typical full-time undergraduate student:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Commuters (living at home)</th>
<th>Commuters (not living at home)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books and supplies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room only:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board only:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room and board total (if your college cannot provide separate room and board figures for commuters not living at home):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G6. Undergraduate per-credit-hour charges (tuition only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS:</th>
<th>PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-district:</td>
<td>In-state (out-of-district):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Out-of-state:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NONRESIDENT ALIENS:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. FINANCIAL AID

Please refer to the following financial aid definitions when completing Section H.

**Awarded aid:** The dollar amounts offered to financial aid applicants.

**Financial aid applicant:** Any applicant who submits any one of the institutionally required financial aid applications/forms, such as the FAFSA.

**Indebtedness:** Aggregate dollar amount borrowed through any loan program (federal, state, subsidized, unsubsidized, private, etc.; excluding parent loans) while the student was enrolled at an institution. Student loans co-signed by a parent are assumed to be the responsibility of the student and should be included.

**Institutional scholarships and grants:** Endowed scholarships, annual gifts and tuition funded grants for which the institution determines the recipient.

**Financial need:** As determined by your institution using the federal methodology and/or your institution's own standards.

**Need-based aid:** College-funded or college-administered award from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must have financial need to qualify. This includes both institutional and noninstitutional student aid (grants, jobs, and loans).

**Need-based scholarship or grant aid:** Scholarships and grants from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must have financial need to qualify.

**Need-based self-help aid:** Loans and jobs from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must demonstrate financial need to qualify.

**Non-need-based scholarship or grant aid:** Scholarships and grants, gifts, or merit-based aid from institutional, state, federal, or other sources (including unrestricted funds or gifts and endowment income) awarded solely on the basis of academic achievement, merit, or any other non-need-based reason. When reporting questions H1 and H2, non-need-based aid that is used to meet need should be counted as need-based aid.

**Note:** Suggested order of precedence for counting non-need money as need-based:

- Non-need institutional grants
- Non-need tuition waivers
- Non-need athletic awards
- Non-need federal grants
- Non-need state grants
- Non-need outside grants
- Non-need student loans
- Non-need parent loans
- Non-need work

**Non-need-based self-help aid:** Loans and jobs from institutional, state, or other sources for which a student need not demonstrate financial need to qualify.

**External scholarships and grants:** Scholarships and grants received from outside (private) sources that students bring with them (e.g., Kiwanis, National Merit scholarships). The institution may process paperwork to receive the dollars, but it has no role in determining the recipient or the dollar amount awarded.

**Work study and employment:** Federal and state work study aid, and any employment packaged by your institution in financial aid awards.
Aid Awarded to Enrolled Undergraduates

H1. Enter total dollar amounts awarded to enrolled full-time and less than full-time degree-seeking undergraduates (using the same cohort reported in CDS Question B1, “total degree-seeking” undergraduates) in the following categories. (Note: If the data being reported are final figures for the 2007-2008 academic year (see the next item below), use the 2007-2008 academic year's CDS Question B1 cohort.) Include aid awarded to international students (i.e., those not qualifying for federal aid). Aid that is non-need-based but that was used to meet need should be reported in the need-based aid column. (For a suggested order of precedence in assigning categories of aid to cover need, see the entry for “non-need-based scholarship or grant aid” on the last page of the definitions section.)

Indicate the academic year for which data are reported for items H1, H2, H2A, and H6 below:

☐ 2008-2009 estimated or ☐ 2007-2008 final

Which needs-analysis methodology does your institution use in awarding institutional aid? (Formerly H3)

☐ Federal methodology (FM)
☐ Institutional methodology (IM)
☐ Both FM and IM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need-based (Include non-need-based aid use to meet need.)</th>
<th>Non-need-based (Exclude non-need-based aid use to meet need.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/Grants</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (i.e., all states, not only the state in which your institution is located)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional: Endowed scholarships, annual gifts and tuition funded grants, awarded by the college, excluding athletic aid and tuition waivers (which are reported below).</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships/grants from external sources (e.g., Kiwanis, National Merit) not awarded by the college</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scholarships/Grants</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Help</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loans from all sources (excluding parent loans)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work-Study</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and other (e.g., institutional) work-study/employment (Note: Excludes Federal Work-Study captured above.)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Self-Help</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Loans</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Waivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Reporting is optional. Report tuition waivers in this row if you choose to report them. Do not report tuition waivers elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H2. Number of Enrolled Students Awarded Aid: List the number of degree-seeking full-time and less-than-full-time undergraduates who applied for and were awarded financial aid from any source. **Aid that is non-need-based but that was used to meet need should be counted as need-based aid.** Numbers should reflect the cohort awarded the dollars reported in H1. Note: In the chart below, students may be counted in more than one row, and full-time freshmen should also be counted as full-time undergraduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>First-time Full-time Freshmen</th>
<th>Full-time Undergrad (Incl. Fresh)</th>
<th>Less Than Full-time Undergrad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Number of degree-seeking undergraduate students (CDS Item B1 if reporting on Fall 2008 cohort)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Number of students in line a who applied for need-based financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Number of students in line b who were determined to have financial need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Number of students in line c who were awarded any financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Number of students in line d who were awarded any need-based scholarship or grant aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Number of students in line d who were awarded any need-based self-help aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Number of students in line d who were awarded any non-need-based scholarship or grant aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Number of students in line d whose need was fully met (exclude PLUS loans, unsubsidized loans, and private alternative loans)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>On average, the percentage of need that was met of students who were awarded any need-based aid. Exclude any aid that was awarded in excess of need as well as any resources that were awarded to replace EFC (PLUS loans, unsubsidized loans, and private alternative loans)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>The average financial aid package of those in line d. Exclude any resources that were awarded to replace EFC (PLUS loans, unsubsidized loans, and private alternative loans)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Average need-based scholarship or grant award of those in line e</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>Average need-based self-help award (excluding PLUS loans, unsubsidized loans, and private alternative loans) of those in line f</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>Average need-based loan (excluding PLUS loans, unsubsidized loans, and private alternative loans) of those in line f who were awarded a need-based loan</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H2A. Number of Enrolled Students Awarded Non-need-based Scholarships and Grants: List the number of degree-seeking full-time and less-than-full-time undergraduates who had no financial need and who were awarded institutional non-need-based scholarship or grant aid. Numbers should reflect the cohort awarded the dollars reported in H1. Note: In the chart below, students may be counted in more than one row, and full-time freshmen should also be counted as full-time undergraduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>First-time Full-time Freshmen</th>
<th>Full-time Undergrad (Incl. Fresh)</th>
<th>Less Than Full-time Undergrad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>Number of students in line a who had no financial need and who were awarded institutional non-need-based scholarship or grant aid (exclude those who were awarded athletic awards and tuition benefits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o)</td>
<td>Average dollar amount of institutional non-need-based scholarship and grant aid awarded to students in line n</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p)</td>
<td>Number of students in line a who were awarded an institutional non-need-based athletic scholarship or grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td>Average dollar amount of institutional non-need-based athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholarships and grants awarded to students in line p</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Data Set 2008-2009

Note: These are the graduates and loan types to include and exclude in order to fill out CDS H4, H4a, H5 and H5a.

Include:
* 2008 undergraduate class who graduated between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008 who started at your institution as first-time students and received a bachelor's degree between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008.
* only loans made to students who borrowed while enrolled at your institution.
* co-signed loans.

Exclude:
* those who transferred in.
* money borrowed at other institutions.

H4. Provide the percentage of the class (defined above) who borrowed at any time through any loan programs (institutional, state, Federal Perkins, Federal Stafford Subsidized and Unsubsidized, private loans that were certified by your institution, etc.; exclude parent loans). Include both Federal Direct Student Loans and Federal Family Education Loans. _______%

H4a. Provide the percentage of the class (defined above) who borrowed at any time through federal loan programs--Federal Perkins, Federal Stafford Subsidized and Unsubsidized. Include both Federal Direct Student Loans and Federal Family Education Loans. NOTE: exclude all institutional, state, private alternative loans and parent loans. _____%

H5. Report the average per-borrower cumulative undergraduate indebtedness of those in line H4. $____________

H5a. Report the average per-borrower cumulative undergraduate indebtedness through federal loan programs--Federal Perkins, Federal Stafford Subsidized and Unsubsidized. Include both Federal Direct Student Loans and Federal Family Education Loans. These are listed in line H4a. NOTE: exclude all institutional, state, private alternative loans and exclude parent loans.
$ ______

Aid to Undergraduate Degree-seeking Nonresident Aliens  (Note: Report numbers and dollar amounts for the same academic year checked in item H1.)

H6. Indicate your institution’s policy regarding institutional scholarship and grant aid for undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens:
☐ Institutional need-based scholarship or grant aid is available
☐ Institutional non-need-based scholarship or grant aid is available
☐ Institutional scholarship and grant aid is not available

If institutional financial aid is available for undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens, provide the number of undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens who were awarded need-based or non-need-based aid: ______

Average dollar amount of institutional financial aid awarded to undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens: $ ______________

Total dollar amount of institutional financial aid awarded to undergraduate degree-seeking nonresident aliens: $ ______________

H7. Check off all financial aid forms nonresident alien first-year financial aid applicants must submit:
☐ Institution’s own financial aid form
☐ CSS/Financial Aid PROFILE
☐ International Student’s Financial Aid Application
Process for First-Year/Freshman Students

H8. Check off all financial aid forms domestic first-year (freshman) financial aid applicants must submit:

☐ FAFSA
☐ Institution’s own financial aid form
☐ CSS/Financial Aid PROFILE
☐ State aid form
☐ Noncustodial PROFILE
☐ Business/Farm Supplement
☐ Other: ____________________________________________

H9. Indicate filing dates for first-year (freshman) students:

Priority date for filing required financial aid forms: __________
Deadline for filing required financial aid forms: __________
No deadline for filing required forms (applications processed on a rolling basis): __________
H10. Indicate notification dates for first-year (freshman) students (answer a or b):

a.) Students notified on or about (date): ____________

b.) Students notified on a rolling basis: yes/no If yes, starting date: _______

H11. Indicate reply dates:

Students must reply by (date): ____________ or within _______ weeks of notification.

Types of Aid Available

Please check off all types of aid available to undergraduates at your institution:

H12. Loans

- FEDERAL DIRECT STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM (DIRECT LOAN)
  - Direct Subsidized Stafford Loans
  - Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans
  - Direct PLUS Loans

- FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOAN PROGRAM (FFEL)
  - FFEL Subsidized Stafford Loans
  - FFEL Unsubsidized Stafford Loans
  - FFEL PLUS Loans

- Federal Perkins Loans
- Federal Nursing Loans
- State Loans
- College/university loans from institutional funds
- Other (specify): _____________________________________________

H13. Scholarships and Grants

- NEED-BASED:
  - Federal Pell
  - SEOG
  - State scholarships/grants
  - Private scholarships
  - College/university scholarship or grant aid from institutional funds
  - United Negro College Fund
  - Federal Nursing Scholarship
  - Other (specify): _____________________________________________

H14. Check off criteria used in awarding institutional aid. Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-need</th>
<th>Need-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H15. If your institution has recently implemented any major financial aid policy, program, or initiative to make your institution more affordable to incoming students such as replacing loans with grants, or waiving costs for families below a certain income level please provide details below:

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
I. INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY AND CLASS SIZE

I-1. Please report the number of instructional faculty members in each category for fall 2008. Include faculty who are on your institution’s payroll on the census date your institution uses for IPEDS/AAUP.

The following definition of full-time instructional faculty is used by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in its annual Faculty Compensation Survey (the part time definitions are not used by AAUP). Instructional Faculty is defined as those members of the instructional-research staff whose major regular assignment is instruction, including those with released time for research. Use the chart below to determine inclusions and exclusions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) instructional faculty in preclinical and clinical medicine,</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td>Include only if they teach one or more non-clinical credit courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty who are not paid (e.g., those who donate their services or are in the military),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or research-only faculty, post-doctoral fellows, or pre-doctoral fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) administrative officers with titles such as dean of students,</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>librarian, registrar, coach, and the like, even though they may devote part of their time to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom instruction and may have faculty status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) other administrators/staff who teach one or more non-clinical credit courses even though</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they do not have faculty status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) undergraduate or graduate students who assist in the instruction of courses, but have</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>titles such as teaching assistant, teaching fellow, and the like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) faculty on sabbatical or leave with pay</td>
<td>Include</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) faculty on leave without pay</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) replacement faculty for faculty on sabbatical leave or leave with pay</td>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td>Include</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full-time instructional faculty:* faculty employed on a full-time basis for instruction (including those with released time for research)

*Part-time instructional faculty:* Adjuncts and other instructors being paid solely for part-time classroom instruction. Also includes full-time faculty teaching less than two semesters, three quarters, two trimesters, or two four-month sessions. Employees who are not considered full-time instruction faculty but who teach one or more non-clinical credit courses may be counted as part-time faculty.

*Minority faculty:* includes faculty who designate themselves as black, non-Hispanic; American Indian or Alaskan native; Asian or Pacific Islander; or Hispanic.

*Doctorate:* includes such degrees as Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Juridical Science, and Doctor of Public Health in any field such as arts, sciences, education, engineering, business, and public administration.

*First-professional:* includes the fields of dentistry (DDS or DMD), medicine (MD), optometry (OD), osteopathic medicine (DO), pharmacy (DPharm or BPharm), podiatric medicine (DPM), veterinary medicine (DVM), chiropractic (DC or DCM), law (JD) and theological professions (MDiv, MHL).

*Terminal master’s degree:* a master’s degree that is considered the highest degree in a field: example, M. Arch (in architecture) and MFA (master of fine arts in art or theater).
### I-2. Student to Faculty Ratio

Report the fall 2008 ratio of full-time equivalent students (full-time plus 1/3 part time) to full-time equivalent instructional faculty (full time plus 1/3 part time). In the ratio calculations, exclude both faculty and students in stand-alone graduate or professional programs such as medicine, law, veterinary, dentistry, social work, business, or public health in which faculty teach virtually only graduate level students. Do not count undergraduate or graduate student teaching assistants as faculty.

**Fall 2008** Student to Faculty ratio: _______ to 1 (based on _______ students and _______ faculty).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) Total number of instructional faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) Total number who are members of minority groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) Total number who are women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.) Total number who are men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.) Total number who are nonresident aliens (international)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.) Total number with doctorate, first professional, or other terminal degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.) Total number whose highest degree is a master’s but not a terminal master’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.) Total number whose highest degree is a bachelor’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.) Total number whose highest degree is unknown or other (Note: Items f, g, h, and i must sum up to item a.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.) Total number in stand-alone graduate/professional programs in which faculty teach virtually only graduate-level students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-3. Undergraduate Class Size

In the table below, please use the following definitions to report information about the size of classes and class sections offered in the fall 2008 term.

*Class Sections*: A class section is an organized course offered for credit, identified by discipline and number, meeting at a stated time or times in a classroom or similar setting, and not a subsection such as a laboratory or discussion session. Undergraduate class sections are defined as any sections in which at least one degree-seeking undergraduate student is enrolled for credit. Exclude distance learning classes and noncredit classes and individual instruction such as dissertation or thesis research, music instruction, or one-to-one readings. Exclude students in independent study, co-operative programs, internships, foreign language taped tutor sessions, practicums, and all students in one-on-one classes. Each class section should be counted only once and should not be duplicated because of course catalog cross-listings.

*Class Subsections*: A class subsection includes any subsection of a course, such as laboratory, recitation, and discussion subsections that are supplementary in nature and are scheduled to meet separately from the lecture portion of the course. Undergraduate subsections are defined as any subsections of courses in which degree-seeking undergraduate students enrolled for credit. As above, exclude noncredit classes and individual instruction such as dissertation or thesis research, music instruction, or one-to-one readings. Each class subsection should be counted only once and should not be duplicated because of cross-listings.

Using the above definitions, please report for each of the following class-size intervals the number of *class sections* and *class subsections* offered in fall 2008. For example, a lecture class with 800 students who met at another time in 40 separate labs with 20 students should be counted once in the “100+” column in the class section column and 40 times under the “20-29” column of the class subsections table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Class Sections with Undergraduates Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Class Size (provide numbers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS SECTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS SUBSECTIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Disciplinary areas of DEGREES CONFERRED

Degrees conferred between **July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008**

For each of the following discipline areas, provide the percentage of diplomas/certificates, associate, and bachelor’s degrees awarded. To determine the percentage, use majors, not headcount (e.g., students with one degree but a double major will be represented twice). Calculate the percentage from your institution’s IPEDS Completions by using the sum of 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) majors for each CIP code as the numerator and the sum of the Grand Total by 1st Majors and the Grand Total by 2\(^{nd}\) major as the denominator. If you prefer, you can compute the percentages using 1\(^{st}\) majors only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Diploma/ Certificates</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Bachelor’s</th>
<th>CIP 2000 Categories to Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources/environmental science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area and ethnic studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer and information sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and culinary services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign languages and literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and consumer sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law/legal studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts/general studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological/life sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military science and technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy and religious studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology and religious vocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and protective services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and social services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic and repair technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and materials moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and performing arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health professions and related sciences</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/marketing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Data Set Definitions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ All definitions related to the financial aid section appear at the end of the Definitions document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Items preceded by an asterisk (*) represent definitions agreed to among publishers which do not appear on the CDS document but may be present on individual publishers’ surveys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Academic advisement:</em> Plan under which each student is assigned to a faculty member or a trained adviser, who, through regular meetings, helps the student plan and implement immediate and long-term academic and vocational goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accelerated program:</strong> Completion of a college program of study in fewer than the usual number of years, most often by attending summer sessions and carrying extra courses during the regular academic term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admitted student:</strong> Applicant who is offered admission to a degree-granting program at your institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adult student services:</em> Admission assistance, support, orientation, and other services expressly for adults who have started college for the first time, or who are re-entering after a lapse of a few years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Indian or Alaska native:</strong> A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant (first-time, first year):</strong> An individual who has fulfilled the institution’s requirements to be considered for admission (including payment or waiving of the application fee, if any) and who has been notified of one of the following actions: admission, nonadmission, placement on waiting list, or application withdrawn (by applicant or institution).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application fee:</strong> That amount of money that an institution charges for processing a student’s application for acceptance. This amount is <em>not</em> creditable toward tuition and required fees, nor is it refundable if the student is not admitted to the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian or Pacific Islander:</strong> A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, or Pacific Islands. This includes people from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, American Samoa, India, and Vietnam.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate degree:</strong> An award that normally requires at least two but less than four years of full-time equivalent college work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor’s degree:</strong> An award (baccalaureate or equivalent degree, as determined by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education) that normally requires at least four years but <em>not</em> more than five years of full-time equivalent college-level work. This includes ALL bachelor’s degrees conferred in a five-year cooperative (work-study plan) program. (A cooperative plan provides for alternate class attendance and employment in business, industry, or government; thus, it allows students to combine actual work experience with their college studies.) Also, it includes bachelor’s degrees in which the normal four years of work are completed in three years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black, non-Hispanic:</strong> A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa (except those of Hispanic origin).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board (charges):</strong> Assume average cost for 19 meals per week or the maximum meal plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books and supplies (costs):</strong> Average cost of books and supplies. Do not include unusual costs for special groups of students (e.g., engineering or art majors), unless they constitute the majority of students at your institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calendar system:</strong> The method by which an institution structures most of its courses for the academic year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Ministry:</strong> Religious student organizations (denominational or nondenominational) devoted to fostering religious life on college campuses. May also refer to Campus Crusade for Christ, an interdenominational Christian organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Career and placement services:* A range of services, including (often) the following: coordination of visits of employers to campus; aptitude and vocational testing; interest inventories, personal counseling; help in resume writing, interviewing, launching the job search; listings for those students desiring employment and those seeking permanent positions; establishment of a permanent reference folder; career resource materials.

**Carnegie units:** One year of study or the equivalent in a secondary school subject.

**Certificate:** See *Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma.*

**Class rank:** The relative numerical position of a student in his or her graduating class, calculated by the high school on the basis of grade-point average, whether weighted or unweighted.

**College-preparatory program:** Courses in academic subjects (English, history and social studies, foreign languages, mathematics, science, and the arts) that stress preparation for college or university study.

**Common Application:** The standard application form distributed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals for a large number of private colleges who are members of the Common Application Group.

*Community service program:* Referral center for students wishing to perform volunteer work in the community or participate in volunteer activities coordinated by academic departments.

**Commuter:** A student who lives off campus in housing that is not owned by, operated by, or affiliated with the college. This category includes students who commute from home and students who have moved to the area to attend college.

**Contact hour:** A unit of measure that represents an hour of scheduled instruction given to students. Also referred to as clock hour.

**Continuous basis (for program enrollment):** A calendar system classification that is used by institutions that enroll students at any time during the academic year. For example, a cosmetology school or a word processing school might allow students to enroll and begin studies at various times, with no requirement that classes begin on a certain date.

**Cooperative education program:** A program that provides for alternate class attendance and employment in business, industry, or government.

**Cooperative housing:** College-owned, -operated, or -affiliated housing in which students share room and board expenses and participate in household chores to reduce living expenses.

*Counseling service:* Activities designed to assist students in making plans and decisions related to their education, career, or personal development.

**Credit:** Recognition of attendance or performance in an instructional activity (course or program) that can be applied by a recipient toward the requirements for a degree, diploma, certificate, or other formal award.

**Credit course:** A course that, if successfully completed, can be applied toward the number of courses required for achieving a degree, diploma, certificate, or other formal award.

**Credit hour:** A unit of measure representing an hour (50 minutes) of instruction over a 15-week period in a semester or trimester system or a 10-week period in a quarter system. It is applied toward the total number of hours needed for completing the requirements of a degree, diploma, certificate, or other formal award.

**Cross-registration:** A system whereby students enrolled at one institution may take courses at another institution without having to apply to the second institution.

**Deferred admission:** The practice of permitting admitted students to postpone enrollment, usually for a period of one academic term or one year.
Degree: An award conferred by a college, university, or other postsecondary education institution as official recognition for the successful completion of a program of studies.

Degree-seeking students: Students enrolled in courses for credit who are recognized by the institution as seeking a degree or formal award. At the undergraduate level, this is intended to include students enrolled in vocational or occupational programs.

Differs by program (calendar system): A calendar system classification that is used by institutions that have occupational/vocational programs of varying length. These schools may enroll students at specific times depending on the program desired. For example, a school might offer a two-month program in January, March, May, September, and November; and a three-month program in January, April, and October.

Diploma: See Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma.

Distance learning: An option for earning course credit at off-campus locations via cable television, internet, satellite classes, videotapes, correspondence courses, or other means.

Doctoral degree: The highest award a student can earn for graduate study. The doctoral degree classification includes such degrees as Doctor of Education, Doctor of Juridical Science, Doctor of Public Health, and the Doctor of Philosophy degree in any field such as agronomy, food technology, education, engineering, public administration, ophthalmology, or radiology. For the Doctor of Public Health degree, the prior degree is generally earned in the closely related field of medicine or in sanitary engineering.

Double major: Program in which students may complete two undergraduate programs of study simultaneously.

Dual enrollment: A program through which high school students may enroll in college courses while still enrolled in high school. Students are not required to apply for admission to the college in order to participate.

Early action plan: An admission plan that allows students to apply and be notified of an admission decision well in advance of the regular notification dates. If admitted, the candidate is not committed to enroll; the student may reply to the offer under the college’s regular reply policy.

Early admission: A policy under which students who have not completed high school are admitted and enroll full time in college, usually after completion of their junior year.

Early decision plan: A plan that permits students to apply and be notified of an admission decision (and financial aid offer if applicable) well in advance of the regular notification date. Applicants agree to accept an offer of admission and, if admitted, to withdraw their applications from other colleges. There are three possible decisions for early decision applicants: admitted, denied, or not admitted but forwarded for consideration with the regular applicant pool, without prejudice.

English as a Second Language (ESL): A course of study designed specifically for students whose native language is not English.

Exchange student program-domestic: Any arrangement between a student and a college that permits study for a semester or more at another college in the United States without extending the amount of time required for a degree. See also Study abroad.

External degree program: A program of study in which students earn credits toward a degree through independent study, college courses, proficiency examinations, and personal experience. External degree programs require minimal or no classroom attendance.

Extracurricular activities (as admission factor): Special consideration in the admissions process given for participation in both school and nonschool-related activities of interest to the college, such as clubs, hobbies, student government, athletics, performing arts, etc.
**First professional certificate (postdegree):** An award that requires completion of an organized program of study designed for persons who have completed the first professional degree. Examples could be refresher courses or additional units of study in a specialty or subspecialty.

**First professional degree:** An award in one of the following fields: Chiropractic (DC, DCM), dentistry (DDS, DMD), medicine (MD), optometry (OD), osteopathic medicine (DO), rabbinical and Talmudic studies (MHL, Rav), Pharmacy (BPharm, PharmD), podiatry (PodD, DP, DPM), veterinary medicine (DVM), law (LLB, JD), divinity/ministry (BD, MDiv).

**First-time student:** A student attending any institution for the first time at the level enrolled. Includes students enrolled in the fall term who attended a postsecondary institution for the first time at the same level in the prior summer term. Also includes students who entered with advanced standing (college credit earned before graduation from high school).

**First-time, first-year (freshman) student:** A student attending any institution for the first time at the undergraduate level. Includes students enrolled in the fall term who attended college for the first time in the prior summer term. Also includes students who entered with advanced standing (college credits earned before graduation from high school).

**First-year student:** A student who has completed less than the equivalent of 1 full year of undergraduate work; that is, less than 30 semester hours (in a 120-hour degree program) or less than 900 contact hours.

**Freshman:** A first-year undergraduate student.

*Freshman/new student orientation:* Orientation addressing the academic, social, emotional, and intellectual issues involved in beginning college. May be a few hours or a few days in length; at some colleges, there is a fee.

**Full-time student (undergraduate):** A student enrolled for 12 or more semester credits, 12 or more quarter credits, or 24 or more contact hours a week each term.

**Geographical residence (as admission factor):** Special consideration in the admission process given to students from a particular region, state, or country of residence.

**Grade-point average (academic high school GPA):** The sum of grade points a student has earned in secondary school divided by the number of courses taken. The most common system of assigning numbers to grades counts four points for an A, three points for a B, two points for a C, one point for a D, and no points for an E or F. Unweighted GPA’s assign the same weight to each course. Weighting gives students additional points for their grades in advanced or honors courses.

**Graduate student:** A student who holds a bachelor’s or first professional degree, or equivalent, and is taking courses at the post-baccalaureate level.

*Health services:* Free or low cost on-campus primary and preventive health care available to students.

**High school diploma or recognized equivalent:** A document certifying the successful completion of a prescribed secondary school program of studies, or the attainment of satisfactory scores on the Tests of General Educational Development (GED), or another state-specified examination.

**Hispanic:** A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

**Honors program:** Any special program for very able students offering the opportunity for educational enrichment, independent study, acceleration, or some combination of these.

**Independent study:** Academic work chosen or designed by the student with the approval of the department concerned, under an instructor’s supervision, and usually undertaken outside of the regular classroom structure.

**In-state tuition:** The tuition charged by institutions to those students who meet the state’s or institution’s residency requirements.

**International student:** See Nonresident alien.
**International student group:** Student groups that facilitate cultural dialogue, support a diverse campus, assist international students in acclimation and creating a social network.

**Internship:** Any short-term, supervised work experience usually related to a student’s major field, for which the student earns academic credit. The work can be full- or part-time, on- or off-campus, paid or unpaid.

**Learning center:** Center offering assistance through tutors, workshops, computer programs, or audiovisual equipment in reading, writing, math, and skills such as taking notes, managing time, taking tests.

**Legal services:** Free or low cost legal advice for a range of issues (personal and other).

**Liberal arts/career combination:** Program in which a student earns undergraduate degrees in two separate fields, one in a liberal arts major and the other in a professional or specialized major, whether on campus or through cross-registration.

**Master’s degree:** An award that requires the successful completion of a program of study of at least the full-time equivalent of one but not more than two academic years of work beyond the bachelor’s degree.

**Minority affiliation (as admission factor):** Special consideration in the admission process for members of designated racial/ethnic minority groups.

**Minority student center:** Center with programs, activities, and/or services intended to enhance the college experience of students of color.

**Model United Nations:** A simulation activity focusing on conflict resolution, globalization, and diplomacy. Assuming roles as foreign ambassadors and “delegates,” students conduct research, engage in debate, draft resolutions, and may participate in a national Model UN conference.

**Nonresident alien:** A person who is not a citizen or national of the United States and who is in this country on a visa or temporary basis and does not have the right to remain indefinitely.

**On-campus day care:** Licensed day care for students’ children (usually age 3 and up); usually for a fee.

**Open admission:** Admission policy under which virtually all secondary school graduates or students with GED equivalency diplomas are admitted without regard to academic record, test scores, or other qualifications.

**Other expenses (costs):** Include average costs for clothing, laundry, entertainment, medical (if not a required fee), and furnishings.

**Out-of-state tuition:** The tuition charged by institutions to those students who do not meet the institution’s or state’s residency requirements.

**Part-time student (undergraduate):** A student enrolled for fewer than 12 credits per semester or quarter, or fewer than 24 contact hours a week each term.

**Personal counseling:** One-on-one or group counseling with trained professionals for students who want to explore personal, educational, or vocational issues.

**Post-baccalaureate certificate:** An award that requires completion of an organized program of study requiring 18 credit hours beyond the bachelor’s; designed for persons who have completed a baccalaureate degree but do not meet the requirements of academic degrees carrying the title of master.

**Post-master’s certificate:** An award that requires completion of an organized program of study of 24 credit hours beyond the master’s degree but does not meet the requirements of academic degrees at the doctoral level.

**Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma:** Includes the following three IPEDS definitions for postsecondary awards, certificates, and diplomas of varying durations and credit/contact hour requirements—

- **Less Than 1 Academic Year:** Requires completion of an organized program of study at the postsecondary level (below the baccalaureate degree) in less than 1 academic year (2 semesters or 3 quarters) or in less than 900 contact hours by a student enrolled full-time.
- **At Least 1 But Less Than 2 Academic Years:** Requires completion of an organized program of study at the postsecondary level (below the baccalaureate degree) in at least 1 but less than 2 full-time equivalent academic
Common Data Set 2008-2009

years, or designed for completion in at least 30 but less than 60 credit hours, or in at least 900 but less than 1,800 contact hours.

At Least 2 But Less Than 4 Academic Years: Requires completion of an organized program of study at the postsecondary level (below the baccalaureate degree) in at least 2 but less than 4 full-time equivalent academic years, or designed for completion in at least 60 but less than 120 credit hours, or in at least 1,800 but less than 3,600 contact hours.

Private institution: An educational institution controlled by a private individual(s) or by a nongovernmental agency, usually supported primarily by other than public funds, and operated by other than publicly elected or appointed officials.

Private for-profit institution: A private institution in which the individual(s) or agency in control receives compensation, other than wages, rent, or other expenses for the assumption of risk.

Private nonprofit institution: A private institution in which the individual(s) or agency in control receives no compensation, other than wages, rent, or other expenses for the assumption of risk. These include both independent nonprofit schools and those affiliated with a religious organization.

Proprietary institution: See Private for-profit institution.

Public institution: An educational institution whose programs and activities are operated by publicly elected or appointed school officials, and which is supported primarily by public funds.

Quarter calendar system: A calendar system in which the academic year consists of three sessions called quarters of about 12 weeks each. The range may be from 10 to 15 weeks. There may be an additional quarter in the summer.

Race/ethnicity: Category used to describe groups to which individuals belong, identify with, or belong in the eyes of the community. The categories do not denote scientific definitions of anthropological origins. A person may be counted in only one group.

Race/ethnicity unknown: Category used to classify students or employees whose race/ethnicity is not known and whom institutions are unable to place in one of the specified racial/ethnic categories.

Religious affiliation/commitment (as admission factor): Special consideration given in the admission process for affiliation with a certain church or faith/religion, commitment to a religious vocation, or observance of certain religious tenets/lifestyle.

*Religious counseling: One-on-one or group counseling with trained professionals for students who want to explore religious problems or issues.

*Remedial services: Instructional courses designed for students deficient in the general competencies necessary for a regular postsecondary curriculum and educational setting.

Required fees: Fixed sum charged to students for items not covered by tuition and required of such a large proportion of all students that the student who does NOT pay is the exception. Do not include application fees or optional fees such as lab fees or parking fees.

Resident alien or other eligible non-citizen: A person who is not a citizen or national of the United States and who has been admitted as a legal immigrant for the purpose of obtaining permanent resident alien status (and who holds either an alien registration card [Form I-551 or I-151], a Temporary Resident Card [Form I-688], or an Arrival-Departure Record [Form I-94] with a notation that conveys legal immigrant status, such as Section 207 Refugee, Section 208 Asylee, Conditional Entrant Parolee or Cuban-Haitian).

Room and board (charges)—on campus: Assume double occupancy in institutional housing and 19 meals per week (or maximum meal plan).
**Secondary school record (as admission factor):** Information maintained by the secondary school that may include such things as the student’s high school transcript, class rank, GPA, and teacher and counselor recommendations.

**Semester calendar system:** A calendar system that consists of two semesters during the academic year with about 16 weeks for each semester of instruction. There may be an additional summer session.

**Student-designed major:** A program of study based on individual interests, designed with the assistance of an adviser.

**Study abroad:** Any arrangement by which a student completes part of the college program studying in another country. Can be at a campus abroad or through a cooperative agreement with some other U.S. college or an institution of another country.

**Summer session:** A summer session is shorter than a regular semester and not considered part of the academic year. It is not the third term of an institution operating on a trimester system or the fourth term of an institution operating on a quarter calendar system. The institution may have 2 or more sessions occurring in the summer months. Some schools, such as vocational and beauty schools, have year-round classes with no separate summer session.

**Talent/ability (as admission factor):** Special consideration given to students with demonstrated talent/abilities in areas of interest to the institution (e.g., sports, the arts, languages, etc.).

**Teacher certification program:** Program designed to prepare students to meet the requirements for certification as teachers in elementary, middle/junior high, and secondary schools.

**Transfer applicant:** An individual who has fulfilled the institution’s requirements to be considered for admission (including payment or waiving of the application fee, if any) and who has previously attended another college or university and earned college-level credit.

**Transfer student:** A student entering the institution for the first time but known to have previously attended a postsecondary institution at the same level (e.g., undergraduate). The student may transfer with or without credit.

**Transportation (costs):** Assume two round trips to student’s hometown per year for students in institutional housing or daily travel to and from your institution for commuter students.

**Trimester calendar system:** An academic year consisting of 3 terms of about 15 weeks each.

**Tuition:** Amount of money charged to students for instructional services. Tuition may be charged per term, per course, or per credit.

**Tutoring:** May range from one-on-one tutoring in specific subjects to tutoring in an area such as math, reading, or writing. Most tutors are college students; at some colleges, they are specially trained and certified.

**Unit:** a standard of measurement representing hours of academic instruction (e.g., semester credit, quarter credit, contact hour).

**Undergraduate:** A student enrolled in a four- or five-year bachelor’s degree program, an associate degree program, or a vocational or technical program below the baccalaureate.

**Veteran’s counseling:** Helps veterans and their dependents obtain benefits for their selected program and provides certifications to the Veteran’s Administration. May also provide personal counseling on the transition from the military to a civilian life.

**Visually impaired:** Any person whose sight loss is not correctable and is sufficiently severe as to adversely affect educational performance.

**Volunteer work (as admission factor):** Special consideration given to students for activity done on a volunteer basis (e.g., tutoring, hospital care, working with the elderly or disabled) as a service to the community or the public in general.

**Wait list:** List of students who meet the admission requirements but will only be offered a place in the class if space becomes available.
**Weekend college:** A program that allows students to take a complete course of study and attend classes only on weekends.

**White, non-Hispanic:** A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East (except those of Hispanic origin).

**Women’s center:** Center with programs, academic activities, and/or services intended to promote an understanding of the evolving roles of women.

**Work experience (as admission factor):** Special consideration given to students who have been employed prior to application, whether for relevance to major, demonstration of employment-related skills, or as explanation of student’s academic and extracurricular record.
Financial Aid Definitions

**External scholarships and grants:** Scholarships and grants received from outside (private) sources that students bring with them (e.g., Kiwanis, National Merit scholarships). The institution may process paperwork to receive the dollars, but it has no role in determining the recipient or the dollar amount awarded.

**Financial aid applicant:** Any applicant who submits any one of the institutionally required financial aid applications/forms, such as the FAFSA.

**Indebtedness:** Aggregate dollar amount borrowed through any loan program (federal, state, subsidized, unsubsidized, private, etc.; excluding parent loans) while the student was enrolled at an institution. Student loans co-signed by a parent are assumed to be the responsibility of the student and should be included.

**Institutional scholarships and grants:** Endowed scholarships, annual gifts and tuition funded grants for which the institution determines the recipient.

**Financial need:** As determined by your institution using the federal methodology and/or your institution's own standards.

**Need-based aid:** College-funded or college-administered award from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must have financial need to qualify. This includes both institutional and non-institutional student aid (grants, jobs, and loans).

**Need-based scholarship or grant aid:** Scholarships and grants from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must have financial need to qualify.

**Need-based self-help aid:** Loans and jobs from institutional, state, federal, or other sources for which a student must demonstrate financial need to qualify.

**Non-need-based scholarship or grant aid:** Scholarships and grants, gifts, or merit-based aid from institutional, state, federal, or other sources (including unrestricted funds or gifts and endowment income) awarded solely on the basis of academic achievement, merit, or any other non-need-based reason. When reporting questions H1 and H2, non-need-based aid that is used to meet need should be counted as need-based aid.

**Note:** Suggested order of precedence for counting non-need money as need-based:
- Non-need institutional grants
- Non-need tuition waivers
- Non-need athletic awards
- Non-need federal grants
- Non-need state grants
- Non-need outside grants
- Non-need student loans
- Non-need parent loans
- Non-need work

**Non-need-based self-help aid:** Loans and jobs from institutional, state, or other sources for which a student need not demonstrate financial need to qualify.

**Work study and employment:** Federal and state work study aid, and any employment packaged by your institution in financial aid awards.
Welcome to the VSA online!

The Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) communicates information on the undergraduate student experience through a common web reporting template, the College Portrait.

The VSA is a voluntary initiative for 4-year public colleges and universities. Developed through a partnership between the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the VSA is designed to help institutions meet the following objectives:

- Demonstrate accountability and stewardship to public
- Measure educational outcomes to identify effective educational practices
- Assemble information that is accessible, understandable, and comparable

In the news...

Visit the New College Portrait Website!
COLLEGEPORTRAITS.ORG allows easy access to VSA participating institutions and links to their College Portraits Click Here to Visit.

VSA Participation Exceeds 300 & College Portraits Website is Launched!
AASCU & NASULGC announce near 60% participation of members and unveil new College Portraits website for students and families (posted 10/01/08) Click Here for Press Release. Click Here for Background on College Portraits

National Student Clearinghouse Unveils Cohort Query
The Cohort Query provides a summary of the retention and completion rates of a cohort group by academic year and institutional category. The new measure provides a more accurate assessment of student progress by including transfer patterns in the enrollment and graduation rates of exiting students (posted 9/2/08) Read more details
The Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA™)

Overview of College Portrait

The College Portrait reporting template is five pages in length. The data elements are organized into three sections: 1) consumer information, 2) student experiences and perceptions, and 3) student learning outcomes. Institutions may include a supplemental page after the last page of the College Portrait if it is clearly labeled as a page added by the institution. Following is an overview of each of the three standard sections. An example of the template can be found at http://www.voluntarysystem.org.

I. Consumer Information

The data elements in the first three pages of the College Portrait template address the question: "What information would be most helpful to prospective students and their families in deciding which college or university best fits their educational wants and needs?" Costs of attendance, degree offerings, living arrangements, student characteristics, graduation rates, transfer rates, and post-graduate plans are included.

There are two innovations of particular note – the student success and progress rate and the college cost calculator. The success and progress rate provides a more complete picture of student progress through the higher education system rather than focusing on the graduation rate from only one institution. Such a measure is increasingly valuable as the majority of students now attend more than one institution before they graduate. The college cost calculator is a tool for students and their families to more accurately estimate the net cost of attending a particular institution. Studies have demonstrated that many students, particularly low income students, do not consider attending college because they mistakenly believe the cost of attending is much higher than it actually is.

II. Student Experiences and Perceptions

The second section of College Portrait provides a snapshot of student experiences and activities and their perceptions of a particular college or university by reporting the results from one of four student engagement surveys. Links to other institutional evaluations of campus life are also provided in the top text box.

Institutions will select one of four student surveys to conduct at its campus and report results within six specified constructs that academic research has shown to be correlated with greater student learning and development: group learning, active learning, experiences with diverse groups of people and ideas, student satisfaction, institution commitment to student learning and success, and student interaction with faculty and staff. Under each of the six constructs, student responses to specific questions will be reported to maintain rough comparability across survey instruments.

III. Student Learning Outcomes

The third section of the College Portrait template reports evidence of student learning in two ways. At the top of the page, institutions provide a description of how they evaluate student learning. This description includes links to institution-specific outcomes data such as program assessments and professional licensure exams.
The second method is a VSA pilot project designed to measure student learning gains in critical thinking (including analytic reasoning) and written communication. An institution will select from one of three instruments to measure these broad cognitive skills. The skills are measured at the institution level across all academic disciplines and are intended to be comparable across institution types. It is a pilot project since many public institutions have not previously measured these broad cognitive skills at the institutional level and then analyzed the results to report learning outcomes in this manner.

Results are described on College Portrait template in two ways: as the learning gains between the freshman and senior years (or the value-added component); and as the actual average test scores for freshmen and seniors.

Learning gains or value-added scores reflect the difference between the actual and expected scores of graduating and entering students, taking into account the academic ability of the students. Each of the three testing organizations will use the same method to compute and characterize their learning gains or value-added scores for VSA purposes: Well Above Expected, Above Expected, At Expected, Below Expected, and Well Below Expected.

The reporting of the actual average scores demonstrates whether the average score of the seniors is higher than the average score of the freshmen. Since the range of scores varies across the three instruments, their results do not allow for direct comparisons between instruments.

Since the measurement of student learning at the institutional level is not widespread, many institutions will need a period of time to find the best methods of administration and to determine how to use the test results to improve their educational programs before making the results of the outcomes tests public. For a period of four years, institutions may choose not to publicly report test results. After the four-year period is concluded, institutions will report and update the results at least once every three years.
Detailed Description of College Portrait Data Elements

Following is a guide to the data elements contained in the College Portrait reporting template. For each page or section of the template, a description of the data elements including sources, reporting timelines, and estimated direct costs is followed by the corresponding page of the prototype template of “State University.” Each of the data elements on the prototype template is labeled with a red letter that matches the element description on the proceeding page.

PAGE ONE DATA ELEMENTS

A. Institution Name, Contact Information, Logo, Text Description

- **Data Source(s):** Institution provides information
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs

B. Student Characteristics

- **Data Source(s):** Common Data Set (CDS) [http://www.commondataset.org/](http://www.commondataset.org/)
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs, the data are already collected and reported for other purposes

C. Undergraduate Success and Progress Rate

- **Data Source(s):** The National Student Clearinghouse [http://www.studentclearinghouse.org/colleges/default.htm](http://www.studentclearinghouse.org/colleges/default.htm)
- **Reporting Timeline:** Institutions report success and progress rates as part of template within one year of becoming VSA participant.

**Estimated Direct Costs:** Annual cost is dependent on the level of participation in Clearinghouse services and the total fall enrollment. The amount per student enrolled at each level is: 10 cents, 5 cents, or 0 cents. For example, at an institution with a fall enrollment of 15,000 students, the annual cost could be $1,500 or $750 or $0.

D. Retention of First-Time, Full-Time Students

- **Data Source(s):** Common Data Set (CDS) [http://www.commondataset.org/](http://www.commondataset.org/)
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs, the data are already collected and reported for other purposes
Student Characteristics (Fall 2006)

TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS 30,750

Student Level and Enrollment Status

UNDERGRADUATE PROFILE

Total 22,690

Gender
Women 11,400 50%
Men 11,200 49%

Race/Ethnicity
African American / Black 2,225 10%
American Indian / Alaskan Native 425 2%
Asian / Pacific Islander 1,330 6%
Hispanic 1,520 7%
International 1,640 7%
White 15,250 68%
Race/Ethnicity Unknown 200 1%

Geographic Distribution (Degree-Seeking)
District of Columbia 39%
Other US States & Territories 53%
Other Countries 8%

Age (Degree-Seeking)
Average Age 22
Percent of Undergraduates Age 25 or Older 10%

Undergraduate Success & Progress Rate

A 85% four-year success and progress rate means that 85% of students starting in Fall 2000 either graduated or are still enrolled at a higher education institution four years later.

Counts for the Fall 2000 entering class shown in the graph above.
- 4200 First-Time, Full-Time Students
- 2500 Full-Time Transfer Students

For Detailed Success & Progress Rate Tables CLICK HERE

Retention of Fall 2005 First-Time, Full-time Students
Returned for Fall 2006 91%

A Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA™)

ONE OF THE STRENGTHS OF U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION IS THE BROAD RANGE OF Diverse INSTITUTIONS, EACH WITH ITS OWN DISTINCTIVE MISSION. COLLEGE STUDENTS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SELECT THE INSTITUTION THAT IS THE BEST MATCH FOR THEIR INTERESTS, ABILITIES, AND GOALS. WE PRESENT THIS INFORMATION TO HELP STUDENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES BETTER UNDERSTAND HOW COLLEGES ARE ALIKE IN SOME WAYS, DIFFERENT IN OTHERS. THE ITEMS IN THE COLLEGE PORTRAIT WERE SELECTED BASED ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MANY FOCUS GROUPS AS WELL AS EXPERTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION. WHILE THESE ITEMS WILL GIVE YOU VALUABLE INSIGHT INTO COLLEGE LIFE, THEY WILL NOT CAPTURE THE FULL RANGE AND RICHNESS OF THE OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO YOU.
E. Cost of Attendance and Financial Aid

- **Data Source(s):** Common Data Set (CDS) [http://www.commondataset.org/](http://www.commondataset.org/) and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) [http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/](http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/)
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs, the data are already collected and reported for other purposes

F. College Cost Calculator (behind green button)

- **Data Source(s):** Link to calculator developed for VSA participants; institutionally developed calculator or set of cost tables
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within six months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs to utilize calculator developed for VSA participants, other costs are dependent upon option selected by institution.

G. Undergraduate Admissions

- **Data Source(s):** Common Data Set (CDS) [http://www.commondataset.org/](http://www.commondataset.org/)
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs, the data are already collected and reported for other purposes

H. Degrees and Areas of Study

- **Data Source(s):** Common Data Set (CDS) [http://www.commondataset.org/](http://www.commondataset.org/)
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs, the data are already collected and reported for other purposes
Costs of Attendance and Financial Aid

Typical Undergraduate Costs per Year without Financial Aid (Full-Time, In-State Students)

Total: $14,550

CLICK HERE for typical out-of-state costs and any discipline-specific tuition

The cost to attend State U varies based on the individual circumstances of students and may be reduced through grants and scholarships.

Financial Aid Awarded to Undergraduates

Overall Financial Aid
- 70% of Fall 2005 full-time undergraduates received financial aid of some type including need-based loans, work study, and non need-based scholarships.

Annual Need-Based Scholarships & Grants
- 30% of Fall 2005 full-time undergraduates received need-based grants or scholarships; the average award for the year was $3,800.

Annual Need-Based Loans
- 40% of Fall 2005 full-time undergraduates received need-based work-study and/or loans (not including parent loans); the average loan for the year was $4,500.

Percent of Fall 2005 First-Time Students Receiving Each Type of Financial Aid

CLICK HERE for a list of undergraduate and graduate programs

Undergraduate Admissions

Test(s) Required for Admission: ACT or SAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test(s) Required for Admission</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>23-28</td>
<td>580-690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>23-28</td>
<td>540-670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>21-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of admitted students have test scores within the ranges listed, 25% have scores above, and 25% have scores below.

Percent in top 25% of High School Graduating Class
- 77%

Percent in top 50% of High School Graduating Class
- 97%

Average High School GPA (4-point scale)
- 3.54

Degrees and Areas of Study

Degrees Awarded at State U in 2005-06

Bachelor's
- 3,910

Master's
- 1,550

Doctoral
- 330

Professional (e.g., Law, Medicine)
- 505

Total
- 6,295

Areas of Study with the Largest Number of Undergraduate Degrees Awarded in 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/Management/Marketing</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Journalism</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other degree areas</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Students may receive aid from more than one source.
PAGE THREE DATA ELEMENTS

I. The <AU> Community Text Box Description
   - **Data Source(s):** Institution provides information
   - **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
   - **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs

J. Institution Choice Buttons
   - **Data Source(s):** Institution selects topic for each of the nine buttons and links to the appropriate source
   - **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
   - **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs

K. Study at <AU>
   - **Data Source(s):** Common Data Set (CDS) [http://www.commondataset.org/](http://www.commondataset.org/)
   - **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
   - **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs, the data are already collected and reported for other purposes

L. Carnegie Classifications
   - **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
   - **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs

M. Student Housing
   - **Data Source(s):** Common Data Set (CDS) [http://www.commondataset.org/](http://www.commondataset.org/)
   - **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
   - **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs, the data are already collected and reported for other purposes

N. Campus Safety
   - **Data Source(s):** Institution provides information in text box and links to Clery Report
   - **Reporting Timeline:** Within three months of becoming a VSA participant
   - **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs

O. Future Plans of Bachelor's Degree Recipients
   - **Data Source(s):** Common survey question administered to graduating seniors.
   - **Reporting Timeline:** Within 2 years of becoming a VSA participant. Updated annually.
   - **Estimated Direct Costs:** Dependent on how question is administered, e.g., added to existing surveys
Student Success is not just our name, but our mission and our goal. With 25 departments and offices, over 1000 employees and an additional 1800 student employees, Student Success is a comprehensive student services organization at State University. We provide a variety of services and programs to assist students in the classroom, and out of the classroom. Because student success starts in the classroom, our offices and departments provide a variety of services and programs that enable students to excel academically. From new student orientation to registering for classes, academic advising and the writing center, programs are designed to assist you in making the most of your academic career. Student Success extends beyond the classroom, and many of our departments focus on providing you with opportunities to be active as a key member of the Fighting Chicken Community. Become involved in our residence halls, Greek organizations, student organizations and activities, and to take advantage of the many, many opportunities available to you here at State U.

Study at State U

Classroom Environment
- Students per Faculty: 18 to 1
- Undergraduate classes with fewer than 30 students: 75%
- Undergraduate classes with fewer than 50 students: 90%

Full-Time Instructional Faculty
- Total Faculty: 1,400
- % Women: 45%
- % from Minority Groups: 35%
- % with Highest Degree in Field: 95%

Carnegie Classification of Institutional Characteristics

Basic Type
- Research Universities (high research activity)

Size and Setting
- Large four-year, primarily residential

Enrollment Profile
- High undergraduate

Undergraduate Profile
- Full-time four-year, selective, higher transfer-in

Undergraduate Instructional Program
- Balanced arts & sciences/professions, high graduate coexistence

Graduate Instructional Program
- Comprehensive doctoral (no medical/veterinary)

Note:

Student Housing
- 60% of new freshmen live on campus
- 25% of all undergraduates live on campus

Campus Safety
The Security Monitor Program, a branch of the State University Police Department, offers free walking and biking security escorts to and from campus locations and nearby adjacent neighborhoods for all students, staff, faculty and visitors. All Security Monitors are given training in First Aid, CPR, and Body Substance Isolation are equipped with a First Aid Kit and a portable police radio in the event of an emergency.

Future Plans of 2005-06 Bachelor's Degree Recipients

A Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA™)
P. Text Box and Links

- **Data Source(s):** Institution links to evaluations/assessments of student experiences on campus
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within six months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs

Q. Survey Results

- **Data Source(s):** One of the following four surveys:
  1. College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) [http://www.indiana.edu/~cseq/cseq_generalinfo.htm](http://www.indiana.edu/~cseq/cseq_generalinfo.htm)
  2. College Senior Survey (CSS) from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) [http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cssoverview.php](http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/cssoverview.php)
  3. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) [http://nsse.iub.edu/index.cfm](http://nsse.iub.edu/index.cfm)
  4. University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) [http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/studentsurvey/](http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/studentsurvey/)

**Administration Protocol:** Survey administered to a random sample of seniors at least once every three years

**Reporting Timeline:** Within two years of becoming a VSA participant; updated at least every three years

**Estimated Direct Costs:** Costs to administer surveys vary based on institutional enrollment, number of students surveyed, and services provided by the survey organization. For VSA purposes, the costs would be incurred every three years. Cost estimates are given below for illustrative purposes only. Institutions should contact the survey organizations for exact costs and administration options.

**Scenario 1:** Online survey administration, invitations/reminders sent by survey organization. Institution has an undergraduate enrollment of 10,000, invitations to participate sent to senior class of 2,000 with 800 respondents.

- CSEQ: $6,500
- CSS: $2,900
- NSSE: $6,300 (includes administration of survey to a first-year student sample)
- UCUES: Contact the University of California, Office of the President for administration and pricing

**Scenario 2:** Online survey administration, invitations/reminders sent by survey organization. Institution has an undergraduate enrollment of 20,000, invitations to participate sent to senior class of 5,000 with 2,000 respondents.

- CSEQ: $15,500
- CSS: $4,800
- NSSE: $7,800 (includes administration of survey to a first-year student sample)
- UCUES: Contact the University of California, Office of the President for administration and pricing

*Note: The College Portrait example for "State University" includes examples using all four survey instruments. An institution will select and report the results of only one instrument.*
**Student Experiences and Perceptions**

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

**CLICK HERE** for examples of how State U evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from the one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the 2005 College Senior Survey (CSS) from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

**CLICK HERE** for information on survey administration, the survey sample, and the response rate.

**CLICK HERE** for information on the CSS survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% of seniors were satisfied with tutoring or other academic assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% of seniors were satisfied with academic advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23% of seniors were satisfied with career counseling and advising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12% of seniors indicated they socialized with someone of another racial or ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% of seniors indicated they often had meaningful and honest discussions about race or ethnic relations outside of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% of seniors stated that their knowledge of people from different races or cultures is stronger since entering college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% of seniors stated that their ability to get along with people of different races or cultures is stronger since entering college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24% of seniors were satisfied with the amount of contact with faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to discuss coursework outside of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% of seniors were satisfied with their ability to find a faculty of staff mentor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16% of seniors were satisfied with the overall quality of instruction they received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% of seniors stated they would choose to enroll at this college again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% of seniors were satisfied with the overall sense of community among students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% of seniors were satisfied with their overall college experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Learning Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1% of seniors have discussed course content with students outside of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% of seniors have studied with other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week in student clubs/groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Learning Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week studying and doing homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% of seniors reported challenging a professor’s ideas in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to work on a research project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to apply classroom learning to “real life” issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8% of seniors performed community service as a part of a class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% of seniors participated in a study abroad program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of seniors worked on an independent study program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% of seniors participated in an internship program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12% of seniors indicated they socialized with someone of another racial or ethnic group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13% of seniors indicated they often had meaningful and honest discussions about race or ethnic relations outside of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14% of seniors stated that their knowledge of people from different races or cultures is stronger since entering college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% of seniors stated that their ability to get along with people of different races or cultures is stronger since entering college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16% of seniors were satisfied with the overall quality of instruction they received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% of seniors stated they would choose to enroll at this college again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% of seniors were satisfied with the overall sense of community among students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% of seniors were satisfied with their overall college experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Experiences and Perceptions

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

CLICK HERE for examples of how State U evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from the one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the 2005 College Senior Survey (CSS) from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

CLICK HERE for information on survey administration, the survey sample, and the response rate.
CLICK HERE for information on the CSS survey.

Group Learning Experiences

1% of seniors have discussed course content with students outside of class
2% of seniors have studied with other students
3% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week in student clubs/groups

Active Learning Experiences

4% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week studying and doing homework
5% of seniors reported challenging a professor’s ideas in class
6% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to work on a research project
7% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to apply classroom learning to “real life” issues
8% of seniors performed community service as a part of a class
9% of seniors participated in a study abroad program
10% of seniors worked on an independent study program
11% of seniors participated in an internship program

Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success

20% of seniors were satisfied with tutoring or other academic assistance
22% of seniors were satisfied with academic advising
23% of seniors were satisfied with career counseling and advising

Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas

12% of seniors indicated they socialized with someone of another racial or ethnic group
13% of seniors indicated they often had meaningful and honest discussions about race or ethnic relations outside of class
14% of seniors stated that their knowledge of people from different races or cultures is stronger since entering college
15% of seniors stated that their ability to get along with people of different races or cultures is stronger since entering college

Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff

24% of seniors were satisfied with the amount of contact with faculty
25% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to discuss coursework outside of class
26% of seniors were satisfied with their ability to find a faculty of staff mentor

Student Satisfaction

16% of seniors were satisfied with the overall quality of instruction they received
17% of seniors stated they would choose to enroll at this college again
18% of seniors were satisfied with the overall sense of community among students
19% of seniors were satisfied with their overall college experience
Student Experiences and Perceptions

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

CLICK HERE for examples of how State U evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from the one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

CLICK HERE for information on survey administration, the survey sample, and the response rate.
CLICK HERE for information on the UCUES survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>15% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with the value of their education for the price they paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with their overall academic experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17% of seniors would choose to attend this institution again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18% of seniors reported that their campus had a strong commitment to undergraduate education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Learning Experiences</td>
<td>1% of seniors worked outside of class on class projects or studied with classmates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week participating in student organizations or clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% of seniors reported serving as an officer or leader in a campus organization or club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4% of seniors helped a classmate better understand course material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Learning Experiences</td>
<td>5% of seniors reported making class presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week studying and other academic activities outside of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7% of seniors enrolled in at least one service learning course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8% of seniors participated in a study abroad program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9% of seniors participated in an internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% of seniors assisted faculty with research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas</td>
<td>11% of seniors rated their ability to appreciate, tolerate, or understand racial and ethnic diversity as good or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12% of seniors rated their ability to appreciate cultural and global diversity as good or better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13% of seniors gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% of seniors gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success</td>
<td>19% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with advising by faculty on academic matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with advising by college staff on academic matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with the availability of courses needed for graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22% of seniors reported raising their standards for acceptable effort due to the high standards of a faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>22% of seniors sought academic help from an instructor or tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23% of seniors talked with an instructor outside of class about course material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24% of seniors worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Student Experiences and Perceptions**

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

CLICK HERE for examples of how State U evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from the one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

CLICK HERE for information on survey administration, the survey sample, and the response rate.

CLICK HERE for information on the UCUES survey.

### Group Learning Experiences
- 1% of seniors worked outside of class on class projects or studied with classmates
- 2% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week participating in student organizations or clubs
- 3% of seniors reported serving as an officer or leader in a campus organization or club
- 4% of seniors helped a classmate better understand course material

### Active Learning Experiences
- 5% of seniors reported making class presentations
- 6% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week studying and other academic activities outside of class
- 7% of seniors enrolled in at least one service learning course
- 8% of seniors participated in a study abroad program
- 9% of seniors participated in an internship
- 10% of seniors assisted faculty with research

### Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas
- 11% of seniors rated their ability to appreciate, tolerate, or understand racial and ethnic diversity as good or better
- 12% of seniors rated their ability to appreciate cultural and global diversity as good or better
- 13% of seniors gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different nationality
- 14% of seniors gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity
- 6% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week studying and other academic activities outside of class
- 7% of seniors enrolled in at least one service learning course
- 8% of seniors participated in a study abroad program
- 9% of seniors participated in an internship
- 10% of seniors assisted faculty with research

### Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success
- 19% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with advising by faculty on academic matters
- 20% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with advising by college staff on academic matters
- 21% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with the availability of courses needed for graduation
- 22% of seniors reported raising their standards for acceptable effort due to the high standards of a faculty member

### Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff
- 22% of seniors sought academic help from an instructor or tutor
- 23% of seniors talked with an instructor outside of class about course material
- 24% of seniors worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework

### Student Satisfaction
- 15% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with the value of their education for the price they paid
- 16% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with their overall academic experience
- 17% of seniors would choose to attend this institution again
- 18% of seniors reported that their campus had a strong commitment to undergraduate education
R. Text Box and Links

- **Data Source(s):** Institution description of student learning initiatives on campus and links to student outcomes data such as program assessment reports, employer satisfaction surveys, graduate school admission rates, and licensing test results.
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within six months of becoming a VSA participant
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** No direct costs

S. Results of Pilot Project

- **Data Source(s):** One of the following three instruments:
  2. **Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)** – complete test including performance tasks, analytic writing tasks [http://www.cae.org/content/procolligiate.htm](http://www.cae.org/content/procolligiate.htm)

- **Administration Protocol:** One test administered in manner consistent with testing organization recommendations at least once every three years
- **Reporting Timeline:** Within four years of becoming a VSA participant; updated at least every three years
- **Estimated Direct Costs:** Costs to administer tests vary based on the number of students surveyed and services provided by the testing organization. For VSA purposes, the costs would be incurred every three years. Cost estimates given below follow the sample size recommendations of the testing organizations to report institutional level scores. The costs are for illustrative purposes only and institutions should contact the testing organizations for exact costs and administration options. The costs do not include any participation incentives distributed by an institution or oversampling to obtain scores for specific subgroups.

  1. **CAAP** (200 students each in fall and in spring): $10,200
  2. **CLA** (100 students each in fall and in spring): $6,500
  3. **MAPP** (200 students each in fall and in spring): $6,200

*Note: The College Portrait example for “State University” includes sample pages for all three testing instruments. An institution will select and report the results of only one instrument.*
Student Learning Outcomes

Colleges and universities use multiple approaches to measure student learning. Many of these are specific to particular disciplines, any are coordinated with accrediting agencies, and many are based on outcomes after students have graduated. In addition, those institutions participating in the VSA measure increases in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests.

Student Learning Assessment at State U

State University is a major research university that emphasizes student learning and effective teaching and sustains a culture that views research and teaching as equally critical to the overall learning environment. State U uses a variety of assessment tools to guide the development and enhancement of the undergraduate learning environment. In particular, the general education assessment process has become part of the campus culture. Not only has it provided important campus-wide data on the extent to which undergraduate students meet university-wide general education goals, it has served as the basis for broad conversations about the depth and breadth of general education knowledge that a State U graduate should possess. Other examples of student success measures used as part of campus improvement initiatives include: assessment in the undergraduate major, academic program review, licensure pass rates, graduation and retention rates, and professional accreditation.

CLICK HERE for examples of student learning assessment and outcomes at State U

Pilot Project to Measure Core Learning Outcomes

As a pilot project, VSA participants measure critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests. Following are the 2007 results from the College Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP). The CAAP measures critical thinking and written communication using two test modules -- critical thinking and a writing essay.

CLICK HERE for a description of the CAAP test.

CLICK HERE for information on test administration, the test sample, and the response rate.

Learning Gains Between Freshman Year and Senior Year

Critical Thinking
The increase in learning on the performance task is above what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.

Writing Essay
The increase in learning on the performance task is what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.

Average Institutional Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman Score</th>
<th>Senior Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Essay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Thinking Score Range: 40 to 80
Writing Essay Score Range: 1 to 6
Student Learning Outcomes

All colleges and universities use multiple approaches to measure student learning. Many of these are specific to particular disciplines, many are coordinated with accrediting agencies, and many are based on outcomes after students have graduated. In addition, those institutions participating in the VSA measure increases in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests.

Student Learning Assessment at State U

State University is a major research university that emphasizes student learning and effective teaching and sustains a culture that views research and teaching as equally critical to the overall learning environment. State U uses a variety of assessment tools to guide the development and enhancement of the undergraduate learning environment. In particular, the general education assessment process has become part of the campus culture. Not only has it provided important campus-wide data on the extent to which undergraduate students meet university-wide general education goals, it has served as the basis for broad conversations about the depth and breadth of general education knowledge that a State U graduate should possess. Other examples of student success measures used as part of campus improvement initiatives include: assessment in the undergraduate major, academic program review, licensure pass rates, graduation and retention rates, and professional accreditation.

CLICK HERE for examples of student learning assessment and outcomes at State U

Pilot Project to Measure Core Learning Outcomes

As a pilot project, VSA participants measure critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests. Following are the 2005-06 results from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). Such general skills are applicable and useful for both career and personal success and are important outcomes of college regardless of a student’s major. The CLA measures critical thinking, analytic reasoning and written communication using two different tasks – a performance task and an analytic writing task.

CLICK HERE for a description of the CLA test.
CLICK HERE for information on test administration, the test sample, and the response rate.

Learning Gains Between Freshman Year and Senior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Task</th>
<th>Average Institutional Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The increase in learning on the performance task is above what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.</td>
<td>Freshman Score 1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Writing Task</td>
<td>Senior Score 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase in learning on the performance task is what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.</td>
<td>Analytic Writing Task 1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA Score Range: 400 to 1600</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Learning Outcomes

All colleges and universities use multiple approaches to measure student learning. Many of these are specific to particular disciplines, many are coordinated with accrediting agencies, and many are based on outcomes after students have graduated. In addition, those institutions participating in the VSA measure increases in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests.

Student Learning Assessment at State U

State University is a major research university that emphasizes student learning and effective teaching and sustains a culture that views research and teaching as equally critical to the overall learning environment. State U uses a variety of assessment tools to guide the development and enhancement of the undergraduate learning environment. In particular, the general education assessment process has become part of the campus culture. Not only has it provided important campus-wide data on the extent to which undergraduate students meet university-wide general education goals, it has served as the basis for broad conversations about the depth and breadth of general education knowledge that a State U graduate should possess. Other examples of student success measures used as part of campus improvement initiatives include: assessment in the undergraduate major, academic program review, licensure pass rates, graduation and retention rates, and professional accreditation.

CLICK HERE for examples of student learning assessment and outcomes at State U

Pilot Project to Measure Core Learning Outcomes

As a pilot project, VSA participants measure critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests. Following are the results from the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP). The MAPP measures critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication and reports separate scores on critical thinking and written communication.

CLICK HERE for a description of the MAPP test.
CLICK HERE for information on test administration, the test sample, and the response rate.

Learning Gains Between Freshman Year and Senior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Freshman Score</th>
<th>Senior Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAPP Score Range: 100 to 130

The increase in learning on the performance task is above what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.

The increase in learning on the performance task is what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.
Florida International University was founded in 1965 and opened for classes in 1972 with 5,667 students—the largest opening day enrollment in U.S. collegiate history. Today it has more than 38,000 students, almost 1,000 full-time faculty and more than 140,000 alumni. FIU is one of the 25 largest universities in the nation, based on enrollment. The University offers more than 200 bachelor's, master's and doctoral programs in 20 colleges and schools. Here at FIU, we are committed to building a great public research institution. In the past six years alone, we have opened and fully accredited a law school, been invited to join the Phi Beta Kappa, launched a Division I-A football program and won approval for a medical school. As we continue to focus on the difference our university will make in the lives of our students and in the world beyond our campuses, we hope to do it as we have done for more than 30 years—in dynamic collaboration with our community.

**Student Characteristics (Fall 2007)**

**Total Number of Students**: 38,290

**Student Level and Enrollment Status**

- Undergraduate: 31,390
  - Gender:
    - Women: 17,574 (56%)
    - Men: 13,816 (44%)
  - Race/Ethnicity:
    - African American / Black: 3,684 (12%)
    - American Indian / Alaskan Native: 59 (0%)
    - Asian / Pacific Islander: 1,177 (4%)
    - Hispanic: 19,869 (63%)
    - International: 1,141 (4%)
    - White: 4,948 (16%)
    - Race/Ethnicity Unknown: 312 (1%)

- Graduate/Professional: 6,900

**Total Undergraduate Profile**: 31,390

- Gender:
  - Women: 17,574 (56%)
  - Men: 13,816 (44%)

- Race/Ethnicity:
  - African American / Black: 3,684 (12%)
  - American Indian / Alaskan Native: 59 (0%)
  - Asian / Pacific Islander: 1,177 (4%)
  - Hispanic: 19,869 (63%)
  - International: 1,141 (4%)
  - White: 4,948 (16%)
  - Race/Ethnicity Unknown: 312 (1%)

**Geographic Distribution (Degree-Seeking)**

- Florida: 28,884 (93%)
- Other US States & Territories: 997 (3%)
- Other Countries: 147 (4%)

**Age (Degree-Seeking)**

- Average Age: 23
- Percent of Undergraduates Age 25 or Older: 23%

An 88% four-year success and progress rate means that 88% of students starting in Fall 2001 either graduated or are still enrolled at a higher education institution four years later. Counts for the Fall 2001 entering class shown in the graph above.

- 2,482 First-Time, Full-Time Students
- 504 Full-Time Transfer Students

**Retention of Fall 2006 First-Time, Full-time Students**

- Returned for Fall 2007: 20%
- Continued for Fall 2008: 80%
- Continued for Fall 2009: 69%
- Continued for Fall 2010: 63%
- Continued for Fall 2011: 59%

**CLICK HERE** for Detailed Success & Progress Rate Tables

One of the strengths of U.S. higher education is the broad range of diverse institutions, each with its own distinctive mission. We encourage you to check out college web sites and visit campuses to get a more complete picture of the opportunities available to you!
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Typical Undergraduate Costs per Year Without Financial Aid for Full-Time, In-State Students (2008-09)

- Tuition (in-state) $3,880
- Room & Board (on campus) $11,120
- Required Fees $318
- Other expenses (books, transportation, etc.) $5,060

Total: $20,184

CLICK HERE for typical out-of-state costs and any discipline-specific tuition.

The cost to attend varies based on the individual circumstances of students and may be reduced through grants and scholarships.

Financial Aid Awarded to Undergraduates (Fall 2006)

Overall Financial Aid
- 75% of Fall 2006 full-time undergraduates received financial aid of some type including need-based loans, work study, and non need-based scholarships.

Annual Need-Based Scholarships & Grants
- 32% of Fall 2006 full-time undergraduates received need-based grants or scholarships; the average award for the year was $1,594.

Annual Need-Based Loans
- 21% of Fall 2006 full-time undergraduates received need-based work-study and/or loans (not including parent loans); the average loan for the year was $3,315.

Percent of Fall 2006 First-Time Students Receiving Each Type of Financial Aid

- State Grants 79%
- Federal Grants 33%
- Student Loans 23%
- Institutional Aid/ Scholarships 23%
- Any Type of Financial Aid 81%

NOTE: Student may receive aid from more than one source.

CLICK HERE for a list of undergraduate and graduate programs.

Academic Preparation of New Freshman

Test(s) Required for Admission: SAT or ACT

- Middle 50% of Test Score Range
  - Composite 23-26
  - English 20-25
  - Critical Reading 530-610

50% of admitted students have test scores within the ranges listed, 25% have scores above, and 25% have scores below.

Percent in top 25% of High School Graduating Class
Percent in top 50% of High School Graduating Class
Average High School GPA (4-point scale) 3.66

Degrees and Areas of Study

Degrees Awarded at FIU in 2006-07

- Associate's 62
- Bachelor's 5,753
- Master's 1,933
- Doctoral 100
- Professional (e.g., Law, Medicine) Total 86

Areas of Study with the Largest Number of Undergraduate Degrees Awarded in 2006-07

- Business/ Management/ Marketing 36%
- Social Sciences 7%
- Psychology 7%
- Health Professions and Related Sciences 7%
- Engineering 6%
- All other degree areas 37%

100%

CLICK HERE for a list of undergraduate and graduate programs.
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At FIU, we believe that students’ learning is enhanced through their engagement in out-of-class activities and their meaningful interactions with faculty, staff, and peers. Through the numerous programs and services offered at FIU, any student can find opportunities to develop leadership skills and acquire experience that will be beneficial to their future career. Our many services also help support students’ academic success and ensure that their experience at FIU is both enjoyable and meaningful.

More than 125 student clubs infuse the FIU campuses with spirit, daring our students to discover the person they were meant to be. Whether it’s learning firsthand about social and environmental issues or biking across the country to raise awareness and funds for the most vulnerable among us, FIU students enrich our communities in countless ways. That is why thousands of students from around the world come together to live in our residence halls, work out in our athletic facilities, study in our libraries and labs, and add their own unique voice to the campus experience.

**Classroom Environment**

Students per Faculty: 26 to 1
Undergraduate classes with fewer than 30 students: 51%
Undergraduate classes with fewer than 50 students: 80%

**Full-Time Instructional Faculty**

Total Faculty: 852
% Women: 36%
% from Minority Groups: 34%
% with Highest Degree in Field: 84%

**Carnegie Classification of Institutional Characteristics**

**Basic Type:** Research Universities (high research activity)

**Size and Setting:** Large four-year, primarily nonresidential

**Enrollment Profile:** High undergraduate

**Undergraduate Profile:** Medium full-time four-year, selective, lower transfer-in

**Undergraduate Instructional Program:** Professions plus arts & sciences, high graduate coexistence

**Graduate Instructional Program:** Comprehensive doctoral (no medical/veterinary)

**NOTE:** Institutional classifications based on the Carnegie 2005 edition.

**Click here** for more information on Carnegie Classifications.

**Student Housing**

Fall 2007
18% of new freshmen live on campus
8% of all undergraduates live on campus

**Campus Safety**

The FIU Police Department is dedicated to improving the quality of life for our community while at the same time reducing fear of crime on campus. To accomplish this, we have adopted a Community-Oriented Policing (COP) philosophy specifically designed to identify and resolve problems within our community. COP consists of two basic complementary fundamentals: community partnerships and problem solving. FIU police officers are enhancing the quality of life for the FIU community through a variety of approaches such as Bicycle Patrol, Operation Bookstamp, self-defense workshops, and crime prevention seminars.

**Click here** for Campus Crime Statistics report.

**Future Plans of Bachelor's Degree Recipients**

Data used to build graph are not yet available

**Click here** for information on survey administration, sample, and response rate.
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Student Experiences and Perceptions

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

Click here for examples of how FIU evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

Click here for information on the NSSE survey.

---

Group Learning Experiences

- 82% percent of seniors worked with classmates on assignments outside of class.
- 51% of seniors tutored or taught other students.
- 16% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week participating in co-curricular activities such as student organizations and intramural sports.

Active Learning Experiences

- 73% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week preparing for class.
- 14% of seniors worked on a research project with a faculty member.
- 40% of seniors participated in an internship, practicum, or field experience.
- 45% of seniors participated in community service or volunteer work.
- 8% of seniors participated in study abroad.
- 95% of seniors made at least one class presentation last year.

Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success

- 51% of seniors rated the quality of academic advising at this institution as good or excellent.
- 42% of seniors reported that this institution provided help in coping with work, family and other non-academic responsibilities.
- 94% of seniors reported working harder than they thought they could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations.

Student Satisfaction

- 77% of seniors would attend this institution if they started over again.
- 75% of seniors rated their entire educational experience as good or excellent.
- 80% of seniors reported that other students were friendly or supportive.

Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff

- 44% of seniors believed that the campus staff were helpful, considerate, or flexible.
- 79% of seniors believed that faculty are available, helpful, or sympathetic.
- 88% of seniors reported that faculty members provided prompt feedback on their academic performance.
- 60% of seniors discussed readings or ideas with faculty members outside of class.

Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas

- 87% of seniors reported their experience at this institution contributed to their understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds.
- 90% of seniors often had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity.
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Student Learning Outcomes

All colleges and universities use multiple approaches to measure student learning. Many of these are specific to particular disciplines, many are coordinated with accrediting agencies, and many are based on outcomes after students have graduated. In addition, those institutions participating in the VSA measure increases in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests.

Student Learning Assessment at FIU

Florida International University has developed an Academic Learning Compact for each baccalaureate degree program offered. The compacts identify the expected core student learning outcomes for degree program graduates in the areas of communication skills, content/discipline knowledge and skills, and critical thinking skills. Students should acquire these skills if they follow the prescribed course of study in their declared major. Students may be expected to participate in a number of activities associated with the compacts such as answering embedded questions in scheduled exams, creating a portfolio, enrolling in a capstone course, or sitting for a specialized exam. The program or department will notify students of what procedures have been developed to measure the learning specified in the Academic Learning Compact in their baccalaureate program beyond course grades.

CLICK HERE for examples of student learning assessment and outcomes at FIU

Pilot Project to Measure Core Learning Outcomes

Results from the pilot project using one of the three learning outcomes tests are not yet available.
Community Engagement Elective Classification

The new classification for Community Engagement is an elective classification, meaning it is based on voluntary participation by institutions. Whereas the Foundation’s all-inclusive classifications involve secondary analysis of existing national data sources available for all institutions, elective classifications involve additional data collection and documentation, with substantial effort invested by participating institutions. Elective classifications enable the Foundation’s classification system to recognize important aspects of institutional mission and action that are not represented in the national data.

Because of their voluntary nature, elective classifications do not represent a comprehensive national assessment: an institution’s absence from the Community Engagement classification should not be interpreted as reflecting a judgment about the institution’s commitment to its community.

Community Engagement describes the collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

The classification includes three categories:

Curricular Engagement includes institutions where teaching, learning and scholarship engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community-identified needs, deepen students’ civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.

Outreach & Partnerships includes institutions that provided compelling evidence of one or both of two approaches to community engagement. Outreach focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. Partnerships focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.).

Curricular Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships includes institutions with substantial commitments in both areas described above.

Future Plans

The Foundation will open the community engagement classification to new participants in 2008 (see below). Announcements will be sent to all subscribers to the Classifications Mailing List.

About the 2008 Community Engagement Classification

Additional Information

National Advisory Panel

2006 Documentation Examples (hosted on the Campus Compact web site)
RESOURCES FOR CARNEGIE’S COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT APPLICANTS


http://www.pdx.edu/cae/ A Guide to Reciprocal Community-Campus Partnerships, a introductory guide to describing, developing and sustaining reciprocal partnerships. The guide provides understandings and practices that emerged from Portland State University’s Partnership Forum that brought together higher education and community partners to study partnerships.


www.communityengagedscholarship.info The Community Engaged Scholarship Toolkit from Community/Campus Partnerships for Health is to provide health professional faculty with a set of tools to carefully plan and document their community-engaged scholarship and produce strong portfolios for promotion and tenure.
The Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement

2008 Documentation Reporting Form

Introduction

This documentation framework is intended to gather information on your institution's commitments and activities regarding community engagement.

Use of data: The information you provide will be used to determine your institution's community engagement classification. Only those institutions approved for classification will be identified. At the end of the survey, you will have an opportunity to authorize or prohibit the use of this information for other research purposes.

Please provide your contact information (for Carnegie Foundation use only):

Name: 

Title: 

Telephone: 

Email: 

City: 

State: 

Institution: 

Institution President/Chancellor: 

President/Chancellor's Mailing Address:
I. Foundational Indicators

A. Institutional Identity and Culture

Required Documentation (Complete all 5 of the following)

1. Does the institution indicate that community engagement is a priority in its mission statement (or vision)?
   □ Yes □ No

Quote the mission (vision):

Limit to 100 words
2. Does the institution formally recognize community engagement through campus-wide awards and celebrations?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe with examples:

Limit to 300 words
3. a. Does the institution have mechanisms for systematic assessment of community perceptions of the institution’s engagement with community?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe the mechanisms:

Limit to 400 words
b. Does the institution aggregate and use the assessment data?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe how the data is used:

Limit to 300 words
4. Is community engagement emphasized in the marketing materials (website, brochures, etc.) of the institution?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe the materials:

Limit to 300 words
5. Does the executive leadership of the institution (President, Provost, Chancellor, Trustees, etc.) explicitly promote community engagement as a priority?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe examples such as annual address, published editorial, campus publications, etc.

Limit to 300 words
B. Institutional Commitment

*Required Documentation* (Complete all 6 of the following)

1. Does the institution have a campus-wide coordinating infrastructure (center, office, etc.) to support and advance community engagement?

   □ Yes  □ No

   Describe with purposes, staffing:

   Limit to 400 words
2 a. Are there internal budgetary allocations dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe (percentage or dollar amount), source, whether it is permanent, and how it is used, etc.

Limit to 50 words

b. Is there external funding dedicated to supporting institutional engagement with community?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe specific funding:

Limit to 200 words
c. Is there fundraising directed to community engagement?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe fundraising activities:

Limit to 200 words
3 a. Does the institution maintain systematic campus-wide tracking or documentation mechanisms to record and/or track engagement with the community?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 400 words
b. If yes, does the institution use the data from those mechanisms?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

[Space for 300 words limit]

c. Are there systematic campus-wide assessment mechanisms to measure the impact of institutional engagement?

☐ Yes  ☐ No
d. If yes, indicate the focus of those mechanisms:

☐ Impact on students

Describe one key finding:

Limit to 200 words

☐ Impact on faculty

Describe one key finding:

Limit to 200 words
☐ Impact on community

Describe one key finding:

Limit to 200 words

☐ Impact on institution

Describe one key finding:

Limit to 200 words
e. Does the institution use the data from the assessment mechanisms?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 300 words
Is community engagement defined and planned for in the strategic plans of the institution?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe and quote:

Limit to 200 words
5. Does the institution provide professional development support for faculty and/or staff who engage with community?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 300 words
6. Does the community have a “voice” or role for input into institutional or departmental planning for community engagement?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 300 words

At this point, applicants are urged to review the responses to Foundation Indicators I A, 1 through 5 and I B, 1 through 6 on pages 1-17 and determine whether Community Engagement is “institutionalized.” That is, whether all or most of the Foundational Indicators have been documented with specificity. If so, applicants are encouraged to continue with the application. If not, applicants are encouraged to withdraw from the process and apply in the next round in 2010.
Supplemental Documentation (Complete all of the following)

1. Does the institution have search/recruitment policies that encourage the hiring of faculty with expertise in and commitment to community engagement?
   
   [ ] Yes  [ ] No

   Describe:

   Limit to 300 words
2  a. Do the institutional policies for promotion and tenure reward the scholarship of community engagement?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 300 words
b. If yes, how does the institution classify community-engaged scholarship? (Service, Scholarship of Application, other)

Explain:

Limit to 100 words

b (cont'd). If no, is there work in progress to revise promotion and tenure guidelines to reward the scholarship of community engagement?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 200 words
3. Do students have a leadership role in community engagement? What kind of decisions do they influence (planning, implementation, assessment, or other)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Examples:

Limit to 300 words
4. Is community engagement noted on student transcripts?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 100 words


5. Is there a faculty governance committee with responsibilities for community engagement?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 200 words
II. Categories of Community Engagement

A. Curricular Engagement
Curricular Engagement describes the teaching, learning and scholarship that engages faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.

NOTE: The terms community-based learning, academic service learning, and other expressions are often used to denote service learning courses.

1  a. Does the institution have a definition and a process for identifying Service Learning courses?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe requirements:

Limit to 200 words

b. How many formal for-credit Service Learning courses were offered in the most recent academic year? _____
What percentage of total courses?

c. How many departments are represented by those courses?
What percentage of total departments? _____
d. How many faculty taught Service Learning courses in the most recent academic year? ____
   What percentage of faculty? ____

e. How many students participated in Service Learning courses in the most recent academic year? ____
   What percentage of students? ____

2. a. Are there institutional (campus-wide) learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community?
   □ Yes □ No

   Provide specific learning outcome examples:

   Limit to 200 words
b. Are there departmental or disciplinary learning outcomes for students' curricular engagement with community?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Provide specific learning outcome examples:

Limit to 200 words
c. Are those outcomes systematically assessed?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe:

Limit to 200 words
d. If yes, how is the assessment data used?

Describe:

Limit to 200 words
3. a. Is community engagement integrated into the following curricular activities?

☐ Student Research
☐ Student Leadership
☐ Internships/Co-ops
☐ Study Abroad

Describe with examples:

Limit to 300 words
b. Has community engagement been integrated with curriculum on an institution-wide level?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, indicate where the integration exists:

☐ Core Courses  ☐ Graduate Studies
☐ First Year Sequence  ☐ Capstone (Senior level project)
☐ In the Majors  ☐ General Education

Describe with examples:

Limit to 300 words
4. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their curricular engagement achievements (action research studies, conference presentations, pedagogy workshops, publications, etc.)?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Provide a minimum of five examples from different disciplines:

Limit to 300 words
B. Outreach and Partnerships

Outreach and Partnerships describe two different but related approaches to community engagement. The first focuses on the application and provision of institutional resources for community use with benefits to both campus and community. The latter focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.)

1. Indicate which outreach programs are developed for community:

  - □ learning centers
  - □ tutoring
  - □ extension programs
  - □ non-credit courses
  - □ evaluation support
  - □ training programs
  - □ professional development centers
  - □ other (specify)

Describe with examples:

Limit to 300 words
2. Which institutional resources are provided as outreach to the community?

- [ ] co-curricular student service
- [ ] work/study student placements
- [ ] cultural offerings
- [ ] athletic offerings
- [ ] library services
- [ ] technology
- [ ] faculty consultation

Describe with examples:

Limit to 300 words

3. Describe representative partnerships (both institutional and departmental) that were in place during the most recent academic year (maximum 15 partnerships). Use the attached Excel file to provide descriptions of each partnership.
4. a. Does the institution or do the departments work to promote the mutuality and reciprocity of the partnerships?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Describe the strategies:

Limit to 300 words
b. Are there mechanisms to systematically provide feedback and assessment to community partners and to the institution?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe the mechanisms:

Limit to 300 words
5. Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their outreach and partnerships activities (technical reports, curriculum, research reports, policy reports, publications, etc.)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Provide a minimum of five examples from varied disciplines:

Limit to 300 words
III. Wrap-Up

1. (Optional) Use this space to elaborate on any short-answer item(s) for which you need more space. Please specify the corresponding section and item number(s).

Limit to 400 words
2. (Optional) Is there any information that was not requested that you consider significant evidence of your institution's community engagement? If so, please provide the information in this space.

Limit to 400 words
3. (Optional) Please provide any suggestions or comments you may have on the documentation process and online data collection.

Limit to 400 words

4. May we use the information you have provided for research purposes beyond the determination of classification (for example, conference papers, journal articles, and research reports), with the understanding that your institution's identity will not be disclosed without permission? (Your answer will have no bearing on the classification decision.)

□ Yes  □ No

Thank you! Please remember to save the document for your record.
AAHE Principles

Source: http://www.aahe.org/assessment/principles.htm
American Association for Higher Education

ASSESSMENT FORUM.9 Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning

1. The assessment of student learning begins with educational values. Assessment is not an end in itself but a vehicle for educational improvement. Its effective practice, then, begins with and enacts a vision of the kinds of learning we most value for students and strive to help them achieve. Educational values should drive not only what we choose to assess but also how we do so. Where questions about educational mission and values are skipped over, assessment threatens to be an exercise in measuring what's easy, rather than a process of improving what we really care about.

2. Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding of learning as multidimensional, integrated, and revealed in performance over time. Learning is a complex process. It entails not only what students know but what they can do with what they know; it involves not only knowledge and abilities but values, attitudes, and habits of mind that affect both academic success and performance beyond the classroom. Assessment should reflect these understandings by employing a diverse array of methods, including those that call for actual performance, using them over time so as to reveal change, growth, and increasing degrees of integration. Such an approach aims for a more complete and accurate picture of learning, and therefore firmer bases for improving our students' educational experience.

3. Assessment works best when the programs it seeks to improve have clear, explicitly stated purposes. Assessment is a goal-oriented process. It entails comparing educational performance with educational purposes and expectations — those derived from the institution's mission, from faculty intentions in program and course design, and from knowledge of students' own goals. Where program purposes lack specificity or agreement, assessment as a process pushes a campus toward clarity about where to aim and what standards to apply; assessment also prompts attention to where and how program goals will be taught and learned. Clear, shared, implementable goals are the cornerstone for assessment that is focused and useful.

4. Assessment requires attention to outcomes but also and equally to the experiences that lead to those outcomes. Information about outcomes is of high importance; where students "end up" matters greatly. But to improve outcomes, we need to know about student experience along the way — about the curricula, teaching, and kind of student effort that lead to particular outcomes. Assessment can help us understand which students learn best under what conditions; with such knowledge comes the capacity to improve the whole of their learning.

5. Assessment works best when it is ongoing not episodic. Assessment is a process whose power is cumulative. Though isolated, "one-shot" assessment can be better than none, improvement is best fostered when assessment entails a linked series of activities undertaken over time. This may mean tracking the process of individual students, or of cohorts of students; it may mean collecting the same examples of student performance or using the same instrument semester after semester. The point is to monitor progress toward intended goals in a spirit of continuous improvement. Along the way, the assessment process itself should be evaluated and refined in light of emerging insights.

6. Assessment fosters wider improvement when representatives from across the educational community are involved. Student learning is a campus-wide responsibility, and assessment is a way of enacting that responsibility. Thus, while assessment efforts may start small, the aim over time is to involve people from across the educational community. Faculty play an especially important role, but assessment questions can't be fully addressed without participation by student-affairs educators, librarians, administrators, and students. Assessment may also involve individuals from beyond the campus (alumni/ae, trustees, employers) whose experience can enrich the sense of appropriate aims and standards for learning. Thus understood, assessment is not a task for small groups of experts but a collaborative activity; its aim is wider, better-informed attention to student learning by all parties with a stake in its improvement.
7. **Assessment makes a difference when it begins with issues of use and illuminates questions that people really care about.** Assessment recognizes the value of information in the process of improvement. But to be useful, information must be connected to issues or questions that people really care about. This implies assessment approaches that produce evidence that relevant parties will find credible, suggestive, and applicable to decisions that need to be made. It means thinking in advance about how the information will be used, and by whom. The point of assessment is not to gather data and return "results"; it is a process that starts with the questions of decision-makers, that involves them in the gathering and interpreting of data, and that informs and helps guide continuous improvement.

8. **Assessment is most likely to lead to improvement when it is part of a larger set of conditions that promote change.** Assessment alone changes little. Its greatest contribution comes on campuses where the quality of teaching and learning is visibly valued and worked at. On such campuses, the push to improve educational performance is a visible and primary goal of leadership; improving the quality of undergraduate education is central to the institution's planning, budgeting, and personnel decisions. On such campuses, information about learning outcomes is seen as an integral part of decision making, and avidly sought.

9. **Through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and to the public.** There is a compelling public stake in education. As educators, we have a responsibility to the publics that support or depend on us to provide information about the ways in which our students meet goals and expectations. But that responsibility goes beyond the reporting of such information; our deeper obligation -- to ourselves, our students, and society -- is to improve. Those to whom educators are accountable have a corresponding obligation to support such attempts at improvement.
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INTRODUCTION

Assessment in higher education is currently a "hot topic." Some state legislatures and governors are mandating that colleges and universities develop assessment plans. Regional and professional accrediting associations are sharpening their focus on the assessment of student achievement. And conferences on assessment abound. Why is there so much interest—and what do presidents and chief academic officers need to know about the topic?

Although assessment, as a buzzword, may fade away, the pressure for better information regarding student achievement is likely to continue. Based on a survey of state higher education officials in January 1987 (Boyer, et. al.), at least two-thirds of the states have formal initiatives that are labeled assessment. Significantly, however, the survey also reported a "strong trend among state authorities . . . to consider the design and conduct of assessment a matter of institutional prerogative."

With the assessment focus apparently shifting from the state house to the campus, the American Council on Education authorized this essay as a way to help campus administrators review some of the issues surrounding assessment so that they might make the best decisions for their institutions. This essay, cosponsored by the AAHE Assessment Forum, has three purposes:

- to offer perspective on what the assessment debate is all about;
- to suggest some considerations for deciding whether a campus should commit itself to the development of new assessment procedures; and
- to highlight some issues relevant to deciding how to approach assessment of student learning.

This is not a "how-to" manual. It does not review specific assessment techniques or offer guidance for how a campus committee might proceed to develop an assessment program. The American Association for Higher Education, through its Assessment Forum, is sponsoring a number of publications designed to offer such guidance. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, are among the agencies that are developing detailed guides to available assessment measures. This essay, in contrast, seeks to offer general perspective for senior administrators who have little or no previous experience with systematic approaches to assessment.
Section I:
Assessment: What is it all about?

In higher education today, assessment typically has ambiguous meaning. The term, which arises from the lexicon of psychological measurement and testing, has taken on a much broader meaning not unlike a closely related word, evaluation. In higher education, its meaning is sometimes associated with a few, well-publicized approaches to assessment at the college level. To date, assessment has focused almost entirely on undergraduate education.

DEFINING ASSESSMENT

While there is no single, commonly accepted definition of assessment, the current debate over its value for higher education reflects at least two critical aspects of its meaning:

- assessment tries to determine what students actually achieve in their college study; and
- assessment links educational objectives (of a course, a program, a field of study, or an institution) to some measures of student achievement.

The key purposes of assessment are to ask important questions about student learning, to get some meaningful information on these questions, and to use the information for academic improvement. An assessment program need not be expensive to achieve these goals. Nor is it necessary that elaborate research instruments and procedures be developed.

A typical pattern of assessment is the use of several measures of what students are learning, administered periodically. Often, this involves putting existing campus information to new and more systematic use. Examples of such information include registrar’s information on course-taking patterns, on student completions and failures in specific courses, and on student progress toward a degree.

In other instances, campuses have begun collecting new data, often including proficiency
Figure 1. Different Approaches to Assessment: Some Examples

LIMITED APPROACHES
(These involve a specific program or assess an aspect of student performance.)
- Assessment linked to efforts to increase student retention
- Senior-year projects, to demonstrate what seniors have learned and their ability to apply their knowledge
- Comprehensive exams based on the general education curriculum
- Evaluation of services to support and monitor remedial/developmental education
- Student development outcomes assessed during the college years
- For selected academic majors, statements of program objectives developed along with ways to evaluate them
- Results on job placement and employer satisfaction
- Surveys of graduating seniors or of alumni/ae to learn their opinions about the college's programs

COMPREHENSIVE APPROACHES
(These include several different components, assess students at several points or cover the entire curriculum.)
- Student surveys plus standardized tests administered as students enter and again as they complete college
- Competency-based curriculum in all occupational and professional programs
- New general education curriculum, with each course having defined objectives and criteria for assessing their achievement
- Use of assessment center techniques, which measure the performance of each student on specific learning objectives, usually at several times and by several different methods

WHY THE CONCERN ABOUT ASSESSMENT?
A logical question to ask is “Why is all this going on?” A related question follows, “Can we ignore it?” Answers range widely and are quite speculative. Some common explanations for the current move toward assessment include:
- Perceived weaknesses of higher education. Some observers contend that current college instructional practices, rooted in the early 1970s, are shoddy, lenient and out-of-date. This explanation, which provided the underlying rationale for most of the national reports on higher education that have been issued in the last few years, focuses on weaknesses in the academic curriculum and, sometimes, blames shortcomings on excessive responses to student pressure for curricular flexibility. Such arguments contend that the curriculum at many colleges and universities is uneven, lacks overall coherence, and reflects very little attention to what students are actually learning. Others see a “backlash” against open-access policies, a call for returning to the “basics” and restoring stringent expectations. A related argument is that, because a few postsecondary institutions may provide low-quality programs, new requirements must be imposed on all institutions.
- Trends in the workplace. Another explanation looks to forces of change in the American economy. Dramatic changes are taking place in the occupational needs of the American workplace, with a sharply increased demand for workers with stronger academic skills. The needs of an information society—with an expanding service sector and with increasing skill levels needed for automated, high-technology industries—have created an urgent need for workers with good reading and mathematics skills and the ability to handle more complex tasks than previously required. Both the public school system and the collegiate sector are, therefore, under pressure to respond. Political leaders, in a context of a rising exams for writing skills and testing of achievement levels of entering students. New attention has also been given to assessments by graduating students of their college experience and to questionnaires sent to alumni/ae, employers, or graduate schools. As Figure 1 indicates, campuses have developed quite different approaches to assessment, based on each institution’s own priorities and mission.
imbalance in foreign trade, have responded to concerns of business and industry, in part by championing their need for a better educated workforce. Under this scenario, the greatest pressure is to improve the "minimum" levels of skills that workers possess; this pressure focuses on the high schools and, secondarily, on community and technical colleges.

- Political pressures. The increasingly important role of state government is another factor. Recent events—troubled state economies, economic development initiatives, revenue sharing, and cuts in federal spending programs—have shifted important responsibilities to the state level. State governments have gained increasing professionalism and are asking tougher questions about how state funds are being spent. Colleges are being asked to provide evidence of quality, in this view, as part of a generally tougher stance by the states.

There are also those who would offer a more political explanation. They argue that many state political leaders found perceived weaknesses in elementary and secondary education to be an effective political issue, and are now repeating that political scenario with a focus on higher education.

Despite the lack of clarity on "why" assessment has become a new rallying cry for reform, certain facts are quite evident: Two-thirds of the states have taken action to expect new information on student progress and performance, and most accrediting agencies now expect better information regarding student achievement and institutional effectiveness. The call for improved assessment is not something that colleges can ignore.

Indeed, findings from ACE's most recent Campus Trends survey (Campus Trends, 1987) indicate that a large number of colleges and universities are considering ways to develop new approaches to student assessment. Currently, one in four institutions reports that their states are requiring the development of assessment procedures. Among the institutions without state mandates, seven in ten nevertheless expect to introduce some form of assessment on their campuses in the next few years.

"Two-thirds of the states have taken action to expect new information on student progress and performance."
Section II:
Should we develop an assessment program?

Given the current climate, most college administrators may be asking this question. Yet, many find it difficult to think objectively about how assessment might affect their own institutions when, at the same time, they must pay attention to external requirements for assessment. If the state legislature or higher education coordinating board requires some form of assessment, a college has no option but to do something, whether or not its leaders see the potential value in it. Similarly, in regions where the accrediting association emphasizes the assessment of student achievement or institutional effectiveness, colleges must take some action on student assessment, particularly if accreditation visits are scheduled in the near future.

BENEFITS OF ASSESSMENT

Apart from external constraints, there are potential benefits that may make it worthwhile for a campus to consider assessment. Among them:

- Academic introspection. Perhaps the greatest long-term benefit is that assessment, once established, makes an institution more self-conscious about what its academic programs are accomplishing. A well-designed assessment program with strong faculty support should foster a strong collective—and continuing—focus on how effectively the institution is meeting its goals.

- Information for recruitment. Some institutions have realized that prospective students and their parents are keenly interested in information on the actual experiences and accomplishments of students. Colleges with large numbers of pre-professional students have found that applicants want to know the college’s “success rate” in professional school admissions. College viewbooks increasingly provide such information.

- A context for planning. Information on student progress and performance also offers a factual context for academic planning. Some institutions have begun small-scale assessments as

“A well-designed assessment program with strong faculty support should foster a strong collective—and continuing—focus on how effectively the institution is meeting its goals.”
part of a curriculum improvement project. Others conduct assessments of the post-college employment success of graduates as a way to keep their vocational programs up-to-date.

- Readiness for accreditation studies. Another potential benefit of an assessment program relates to regional accreditation. Within the past five to ten years, all of the regional accreditation associations have called for evidence about institutional effectiveness and the quality of student achievement. Most accrediting associations consider that assessing student achievement should be an ongoing and integral part of the college's planning process. Development of an assessment approach may mean that, at the time of the college's next accreditation self-study, it already will have collected a good amount of information on student achievement and incorporated this into institutional decision-making.

- Improvements in teaching and learning. Institutions having some experience with assessment report such benefits as greater clarity on how course sequences fit together, vigorous and helpful faculty dialogue on educational purposes, and the assurance that all students meet certain standards.

Other reported benefits include better student retention, improved public relations, and fund-raising gains. One university, for example, reports that the assessment process has helped its image with both students and legislators. Another college reports that its applicant pool has increased since it began a comprehensive assessment program about a decade ago.

BALANCING ASSESSMENT WITH OTHER GOALS

With all the activity surrounding assessment in recent years, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that, at best, assessment is a vehicle for academic improvement; it is not an end in itself but a means to an educational purpose. An institution should not implement assessment at the expense of other important academic and institutional goals. As part of the planning process, colleges must examine an assessment plan's potential effect on other important goals. Among the issues colleges should consider:

- Current circumstances. The timing may be wrong. There are special circumstances that may make it difficult to begin a new assessment
Some institutions with well-developed assessment programs have taken the stance that assessment is used for academic program improvement, not for penalizing students.
College's other purposes. Many institutions, for example, pride themselves on the degree of choice they make available to students. Will an assessment program introduce pressure on students to take certain courses that "help" in passing an institution-wide test? A college's programs may be distinctive in certain fields. Is it inconsistent to require that all students participate in the same forms of assessment? Standardized examinations may be convenient to use but the test results are only appropriate for undergraduate majors where the curricular emphasis matches the subject emphasis of the exams.

- Adaptation to change. An assessment plan should be flexible so that it remains meaningful when curricular changes are made. Many colleges have recently introduced a new "core" curriculum and may plan to review and change certain elements after a few years of experience. They should anticipate parallel changes in the assessment plan. An institution may be planning to introduce new programs in the near future. Another institution may be concerned about institutional change and renewal. In both situations, it is important that an assessment plan not "lock in" any particular approach or work against change.

DEALING WITH EXTERNAL CONSTITUENCIES

For many campuses, requests from governors, legislators, and state agencies have been the starting point for looking into assessment. For many other campuses, the impetus for considering assessment strategies has come from regional accrediting agencies.

Are these pressures dangerous for higher education? Are they unduly coercive, reflecting intrusion into issues that should be internal to the academy? Representatives of these agencies argue that their actions are a responsible call for greater accountability. They stress, too, that they generally give colleges considerable leeway in determining how to respond to these new mandates.

The institutional perspective is often at odds with this view. Even though many states have invited colleges and universities to develop assessment plans that fit their own circumstances, coercive elements often remain, especially in the form of short deadlines or specific requirements. Needless to say, some tension between the state's purposes and institutional purposes is inevitable: As one observer noted, state actions typically focus on "proving" something while the institution's interest is in "improving" education. Even

"It is important that an assessment plan not 'lock in' any particular approach or work against change."
so, college presidents know well that there are some real dangers in state-mandated approaches to assessment. Institutional purposes and programs can become distorted; large numbers of students could have their educational progress tossed into confusion or delayed.

When states require colleges and universities to provide specific assessment information, a particular sore point is over the prospect that inter-institutional comparisons will be publicized. In the *Campus Trends* survey conducted by the American Council on Education (*Campus Trends*, 1987), a majority of college administrators argued against a requirement that institutional data should be published, even though almost all survey respondents supported the use of assessment as a means of internal improvement. A key fear is that wide distribution of such comparisons invites a "rankings" game: The information that gets the most attention, often in the state's leading newspapers, is the information that is easy to use—perhaps a single statistic compared across all institutions. Yet, such information frequently offers a distorted picture because it describes only limited aspects of what each college does and ignores many relevant factors.

"... decisions made to accommodate a testing mandate can conflict with decisions that make academic sense internally."
Colleges having some experience with assessment often prefer to present assessment information as part of a larger document that puts results in context. Points to the college’s primary concerns, and states what the college intends to do about these areas of concern. In other instances, where inter-institutional comparisons are mandated, college administrators have found that they can sometimes avoid undue emphasis on “rankings” by the use of multiple indicators, i.e., information describing institutions in a number of different ways.

Broadly focused state-mandated tests are also a subject of major concern to college administrators. Their concern is not so much with the notion of testing as with the negative effects that statewide testing can have on academic programs. They contend that, despite good intentions, mandated tests of general competencies are likely to affect what courses are taught, the timing and sequence of courses, or the course choices of students. Furthermore, decisions made to accommodate a testing mandate can conflict with decisions that make academic sense internally. Distinctive programs can be seriously affected if students in those programs do not do well on some aspect of the mandated test.

What’s to be done? Options may seem limited. To date, however, most colleges faced with new state mandates have found that, although they were coerced to do something, there was flexibility in choosing exactly what to do and what the timing would be. And colleges sometimes have considerable opportunity to shape specific aspects of what the state agency or legislature will decide regarding assessment. The advice shown in Figure 2, offered by college administrators who have some experience with assessment, speaks to such situations.

Many administrators with experience in assessment also suggest that each college take the initiative by planning for assessment. In advance of a state mandate, colleges could develop procedures for assessment that are responsive to external concerns yet are meaningful for the college. A technical institute may choose to focus on reactions of local employers to the quality of the institute’s recent graduates. A liberal arts college may wish to demonstrate the value of its general education curriculum. A university may wish to emphasize undergraduate professional programs that already are subject to external review. Such campus experience with assessment would generally prove useful, whatever the eventual direction of state activity on assessment.
Section III: How should we start?

Because assessment is a tool for academic improvement, there is no "best" place for all campuses to start when they decide to develop an assessment procedure. Figure 3 illustrates the wide variety of options to consider. The starting point and focus can vary widely from college to college, depending on circumstances.

One of the most important tasks is to develop an initial position on what assessment means for the institution and what a process for implementation should include. Both the definition and process are likely to evolve, becoming more specific and more precisely tied to the college's own programs as efforts get underway. Thus, it is important to give careful thought to a "starting point" while also recognizing that new directions will emerge.

Implementation activities have generally started with a limited focus. The few institutions that have comprehensive approaches to assessment today either faced unusual circumstances or moved quite gradually toward a comprehensive approach, often over a decade's time.

Generally, it makes sense to try to link assessment efforts to the college's current priorities. If a new general education curriculum will be introduced soon, an assessment plan might be designed to test its effects. If improving student retention is a top concern, assessment might be linked to these efforts. Sometimes, an upcoming accreditation visit, whether for a particular program or for the entire institution, is a useful focus for planning new assessment activities.

THE LEADERSHIP ROLE

It is up to the president and chief academic officer to set the assessment process in motion. Once they have given the green light and indicated their support for the idea, faculty involvement should begin. Because discussions over assessment procedures inevitably raise quite fundamental issues about the institution's educational purposes and priorities, it is also important that the president or chief academic officer take the lead in helping the institution arrive at

Figure 3. Possible Components of an Assessment Plan

Early in a student's college career
1. Do placement testing in key academic skill areas.
2. Test before and after remedial/developmental courses.
3. Design competency-based skills courses.
4. Collect data for assessing changes in student knowledge, values, etc.

During middle years
1. Identify desired outcomes for the "core" curriculum and develop ways to show how they are achieved.
2. Identify desired outcomes in major fields of study and develop ways to show how they are achieved.
3. Develop methods for evaluating proficiency levels that students achieve in writing, critical thinking, and other general competencies.
4. Conduct continuing or periodic surveys of student values and attitudes.
5. Review student transcripts, papers, examinations, etc.

At college completion
1. Develop comprehensive examinations, oral interviews, or other ways to demonstrate accomplishments of graduating students.
2. Gather information on post-college plans of graduates, including employment and further study.
3. Conduct final surveys of student values and attitudes.

After college
1. Conduct periodic surveys of alumni, employers, and graduate and professional schools.
2. Obtain information on placement rates (into jobs or for further schooling).
Figure 4. Possible Roles for Presidents and Chief Academic Officers in Student Assessment

Setting the direction for Institutional activity
1. Set possible scope (and limits)
2. Indicate expectations
3. Propose an initial timetable
4. Demonstrate moral and financial support

Putting the idea into institutional context
1. Offer an appropriate rationale for developing an assessment program
2. Provide an initial definition of assessment for the campus
3. Distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate reasons for developing assessment
4. Emphasize that the goal is academic improvement
5. Respond to concerns

Just as important, the president or chief academic officer needs to explain what important goals and uses of assessment are envisioned. Is it important that all students be assessed? Why? Will information be shared with students? Should assessment data be tied to the courses offered by individual departments? Should assessment information be published and, if so, for whom?

The president or chief academic officer also needs to clarify limits. The concept of assessment can be controversial and can engender numerous misunderstandings. Unless the president makes it clear that assessment results will not be linked to faculty evaluations, for example, it is likely that many faculty will have fears in this regard. Unless the president clearly explains what impact the assessment procedures will have on students, confusion and distrust among current students are also likely.

ORGANIZING FOR ASSESSMENT

As soon as the president has committed the institution to assessment as a concept, the organization of an approach to assessment can begin. Substantial faculty involvement at the outset is essential. First steps will usually involve the formation of an assessment committee, generally including opinion leaders among the faculty and the chief academic officer. The involvement of others beyond this core group will vary by institution, personal experience, and special expertise. This core committee must develop a process that will allow the college to clarify the learning objectives to be assessed and to consider alternative approaches to assessment.

An important task for the assessment committee is to review all approaches to assessment in light of other important institutional priorities. As plans begin to take shape, the committee should consider what the effects of a plan might be in a few years. Unintended (and potentially damaging) outcomes are difficult to pinpoint, but a considerable degree of insight about them can be gained from a full discussion of the issues.
If, for example, departmental comprehensive examinations are to be required as students are completing their studies, there must be assurances that there is sufficient faculty time available to develop and conduct the examinations and that there are clear next steps available for students who fail. If assessment will rely on a standardized test, the institution must decide whether results will be used solely for diagnostic information for programs or, instead, whether a specific passing score is to be expected of all students. If the latter, the institution must be prepared to justify this decision, including the choice of passing score and the fit between the test and the college's academic program.

COLLECTING DATA

In planning for assessment, the committee should consider from what sources information will be collected and how it will be analyzed. Often, a fair amount of relevant information already exists in campus data files and just requires further analysis. Other potential measures will require collecting new data.

Among the potential sources of existing data:

- **Student transcripts.** If an institution asserts that students receive a high-quality general education, is that assertion supported by an analysis of the transcripts? If it is assumed that student "good sense" combined with effective faculty advising will assure that students take courses in such core areas as a second language, mathematics, exposure to other cultures, historical and ethical perspectives, etc., to what extent is this assumption supported by the transcript evidence? Some institutions are also exploring ways in which standard sources of student evaluation like course examinations or papers can be "re-evaluated" as part of the college's broader assessment effort.

- **Student retention studies.** A focus on student retention can be an important part of the assessment activity. Of the students who enroll as first-time, full-time freshmen, what proportion receive their degrees within a reasonable time? How does this percentage relate to the retention rate at comparison institutions? Most institutions also could compare students who graduate with students who withdraw from the institution on such factors as cumulative grade-point...
average and characteristics upon entrance (e.g., high school rank, aptitude test scores, career goals, financial needs). These comparisons help the college understand better why students are leaving the institution. For example, if high achieving students are more likely to leave, is it because these students are not challenged academically?

Among the new approaches to consider:

- **Standardized tests.** One of the most basic measures of student learning are tests of their academic skills. Examples include the administration of pre- and post-tests for remedial courses; the use of what are sometimes called "rising junior" tests in basic skill areas or in general education; and the assessment of higher order skills in the areas of critical thinking, quantitative problem-solving, oral communication, and writing.

Use of standardized tests for internal academic planning is another option. Major testing agencies are in the midst of developing new instruments for flexible use in undergraduate assessment. An advantage of using standardized instruments is that the results can be compared across departments and colleges within a single institution and, if appropriate, across institutions. Care must be taken that such comparisons are appropriate and that available instruments measure what the college wants to have measured.

Academic achievement need not be the only factor measured by standardized test instruments. A number of institutions recently have found it helpful to collect data related to the quality of student effort in a variety of areas (e.g., contacts with faculty, use of the library).

A critical factor in the interpretation of test results lies with the motivation of students taking them: a dilemma is that, if the tests don't count on the students' records, students may not make their best effort (or even show up for the tests) but, on the other hand, if the tests do count, it becomes critical that the content of a test closely parallel the objectives of the program that is being assessed.

- **Assessment centers.** One unique and comprehensive approach to assessing student achievement is the assessment center model. This approach focuses on individual student
learning, with assessment based on student performance in simulated activities that draw on the student's knowledge as well as skill in applying that knowledge. Persons external to the institution are asked to determine whether each student has achieved certain specific learning objectives. Successful adoption of this powerful approach to assessment requires a total institutional commitment and a long period of implementation.

- **Departmental senior exams.** In assessing achievement in a student's major field, some four-year colleges have developed a senior comprehensive examination, in some cases using external examiners. Some fields already have a professional licensing examination. Both of these approaches can be effective components of the assessment of student outcomes.

- **Student evaluations.** Periodic assessment of their educational experience by students and former students can provide helpful information for planning. Some institutions have developed a pattern of collecting questionnaire data from graduating students every year and from a sample of alumni/alumnae every three to five years. These questionnaires can include items that ask the respondent to assess the extent to which she/he has developed competence in a variety of areas (e.g., written and oral communication, quantitative skills, solving complex problems). While the usual caveats that accompany self-assessment information are required, this approach can provide helpful insights regarding institutional strengths and weaknesses.

- **Employment information.** Other approaches to the collection of information involve data from the institution's career development center and from employers of graduates. Four-year institutions often seek information from the graduate and professional schools in which their graduates enroll.

As yet, it is difficult to find methods and instruments that are ideal for each institution and program. A good approach, used by most institutions that have developed assessment procedures, is to use several related measures and look for a consistent pattern of results before decisions are reached about weaknesses in an academic program.
DETERMINING COSTS OF ASSESSMENT

Potential costs of assessment are a major source of uncertainty. How much does it cost to test or survey students, to administer and analyze questionnaires, to develop an assessment center? Will assessment become a new budget item requiring large amounts of institutional resources? Where will the money come from?

In fact, as Figure 5 suggests, several different types of costs must be anticipated. During planning, for example, funds may be needed to cover consultant visits, trips to conferences or to other colleges, or special campus workshops. To put an assessment plan in place, there may be costs for extensive faculty participation in the development of new tests or examinations; purchase and scoring of standardized examinations; adaptation of existing computer information systems; or conduct of surveys among students or alumni/ae.

Once an assessment plan is in place, ongoing costs may include costs for periodic surveys or testing of student learning as well as necessary staff support for the assessment activity. Other costs, to be expected at all stages, include: released time for a small number of faculty; staff assistance from the office of institutional research or the office of the chief academic officer; additional computer time to assemble and analyze existing information on student performance; and costs to purchase relevant books and other resource materials.

How will all this be financed? Colleges that have already developed assessment plans have taken different approaches. There may be financial assistance with planning and start-up costs, whether from a special grant from the state, a foundation or other source. Some institutions in Virginia and New Jersey received special funding from state agencies, for example. Even a small grant from a foundation or private donor provides an important catalyst for getting started.

On the other hand, some of the "pioneer" institutions have developed low-cost assessment programs largely through reallocation strategies. They may give released time to committee members and assign new responsibilities to several administrators. The reallocation approach works best with aspects of an assessment plan that build on existing activities. An alumni/ae affairs office may have conducted an occasional survey.

---

"... some of the "pioneer" institutions have developed low-cost assessment programs largely through reallocation strategies."
of alumni/ae and now might plan for a survey on a regular basis. Existing information on placement test results may be given more detailed analysis and wider circulation than before. A curriculum committee's mandate might be broadened to include review of assessment results.

Student fees are another funding source, especially appropriate to cover costs for tests or assessments that offer specific benefits to students. One college, which has an extensive and individualized assessment program, charges each student a one-time fee of $50 to cover assessment.

Most colleges have found that, in addition to these special sources of funding, costs for assessment also must be budgeted on a regular basis. Among colleges that currently have programs in place, costs typically have been $10 to $15 per student enrolled. There is no easy formula for estimating these costs, although key factors include the extent to which existing personnel can coordinate the effort, and the nature and scope of the assessment plan. If the college already has an extensive institutional research or testing program in place, a new assessment program simply may require a redirection of effort. If assessment activities will be focused within academic departments as part of ongoing planning or departmental review efforts, additional costs may be modest. If an entirely new, multi-staged assessment is planned, or if all students are to be assessed at several stages of their academic progress, costs could be substantial.

A valuable part of any planning committee's work is to discuss the costs of various assessment alternatives. The committee's charge might specify that any proposal must be cost-effective and realistic for the college's financial circumstances over the next decade.

A budgetary framework might be established at the outset. Indeed, some approaches have very different cost implications that are not immediately obvious: A "home-grown" test developed by the college's faculty may appear to be a low-cost option, but might prove to be very expensive because of the personnel costs involved. Different choices might be made that keep costs down without losing good information. A small-scale survey of a sample of students may be as useful as a canvas of the entire student body.
Some colleges have introduced aspects of assessment as part of their planned activity for accreditation self-studies. Phasing of assessment activities—and their budgetary requirements—may be feasible: Individual schools and departments may be involved in assessment on different time schedules; surveys of alumni, or of employers in the local community, may be conducted every few years rather than annually.

Budgetary needs for assessment should also be viewed in broader perspective. Assessment information can be of great benefit to the college, offering internal committees and administrators valuable planning information as well as providing external constituents—public officials, legislators, the media, students, and parents—with special assurances about the worth of programs offered. Administrators at several colleges have stated that an unexpected benefit has been additional funding, whether from state sources or other sources, that is tied to the fact that the college was able to demonstrate the academic performance of its students and the strength of its programs.

**ESTABLISHING A SCHEDULE**

The development of effective assessment programs takes time. Colleges and universities that today are recognized as leading institutions in the field of assessment have been developing their assessment programs for decades or more. And their programs continue to evolve.

Recognizing this, that high-quality assessment program is not likely to emerge within six months or a year, the president, in consultation with an assessment committee, should establish a timeline for implementation—probably involving activity over three to five years.

Two quite different examples of a three-year time schedule are shown in Figure 6.

No single model would be appropriate for all colleges. Some institutions may require an additional year or two for planning and exploratory activities. Other institutions may need to implement a plan in less than three years; in such situations, it is important to allow sufficient flexibility in an assessment plan so that later modifications can be made.
Conclusion:

Using assessment to greatest effect

In the months ahead, most colleges and universities are likely to be influenced by the debate over assessment. As the focus of activity moves to the development of assessment plans on individual campuses, colleges and universities have the opportunity to engage in assessment activities that make sense for their institution. The danger is that hasty reactions to mandates issued by state boards or other external agencies will not be useful, either for the institution or for its students.

As Figure 7 suggests, the process of developing an approach to assessment is much like other efforts directed to academic improvement. Faculty involvement is critical. Choices have to be made from among many alternatives. An exploratory or experimental stage is often necessary. The commitment of campus leaders is necessary, and fledgling efforts need both financial and moral support. Communication with all affected parties is also important, particularly when an effort will require several years of planning.

Thoughtful leadership from presidents and chief academic officers along with meaningful faculty involvement are crucial if an assessment plan is to benefit students and improve the institution. A key value of any assessment approach lies in the way it raises fundamental questions about the effectiveness of undergraduate education. When campus leaders—president, chief academic officer, administrators and faculty leaders alike—consistently raise such questions and consider ways to improve the academic program based on reliable and appropriate information, the assessment effort will be functioning effectively.

Figure 7. Advice from Assessment "Pioneers"

- Involve faculty at the outset. Tap their knowledge and opinions. Rely on faculty to pose the key questions and to propose ways to answer those questions.
- Provide sufficient resources—especially at the department level.
- Communicate with students about assessment plans. Be sure they understand how assessment activities will (or won't) affect them.
- Use plain English. Don't get hung up on psychometric or other jargon.
- Get started, try something, expecting some change in direction as you learn more.

BUT ............

- Don't scramble to do just anything. Don't run for the first test you hear about.
- Start modestly if necessary, but be clear that the effort is not intended to be short-term.
- Recognize that most successful comprehensive assessment efforts have taken years to develop.
- Don't rely on any one test or measure for academic decisions that affect students or programs. Multiple measures provide a stronger basis for decisions.
- Don't let assessment become just another assignment for some administrative office.
- Stress that the process should lead to improvements in the educational experience for students. Don't mix assessment procedures with procedures to evaluate faculty.
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