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Overview

- institutional effectiveness at UCF
- enhancements made this year
- status report on program assessment
- national visibility
- next steps
UCF’s Integrated Approach to Institutional Effectiveness

**Program Assessment**
- Share information
- Inform budget process

**Unit and Program Reviews**
- Different cycles
- Additional data elements
- Different purposes
  - Continuous improvement
  - Evaluation
  - Planning

**Strategic Planning**

**Linkages**
- Share information
- Inform budget process

**Differences**
- Different cycles
- Additional data elements
- Different purposes
Program Assessment

- formative evaluation process designed to support improvement
- continuous

focused on improving
- student-learning
- student development
- services and operations

DO
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Brief History of Assessment at UCF

- Nichol’s model is adopted
- Programs asked to conduct assessment annually and submit for review every three years
- UAC is established and SACS accepts UCF report
- OEAS Office is established and President announces annual review cycle
- Web-based submission and review, Divisional Review Committees, Web access to surveys
- SACS reaffirmation, emphasis on evidence of learning

Timeline:
- 1995: SACS reaffirmation visit, little evidence of assessment
- 1996: Nichol’s model is adopted
- 1997: Programs asked to conduct assessment annually and submit for review every three years
- 1998: UAC is established and SACS accepts UCF report
- 1999: OEAS Office is established and President announces annual review cycle
- 2000: Web-based submission and review, Divisional Review Committees, Web access to surveys
- 2001: SACS reaffirmation, emphasis on evidence of learning
2005-2006 Enhancements

• Academic Learning Compacts posted on Web
• SACS off-site and on-site Web access
• increased use of direct evidence of student-learning
• increased emphasis on closing the loop
• assessment training for coordinators and DRC members
• FCTL and OEAS assessment workshops
• interdisciplinary and inter-divisional collaborative presentations
Status Report

- submissions
- methods of assessment
- changes made on the basis of assessment
  - academic programs
  - administrative units
  - implemented and planned changes
  - use of results for improvement
- efforts to enhance national reputation
Number of Programs and Units Conducting Assessment

No. of Units conducting assessment

- 2000: 202
- 2001: 254
- 2002: 278
- 2003: 296
- 2004: 310
- 2005: 313
- 2006: 322

The number of programs and units conducting assessment has been increasing from 2000 to 2006.
Submission of Assessment Plans

Term

Submission Rate

Spring 2000 81.0%
Spring 2001 92.0%
Spring 2002 97.5%
Spring 2003 99.0%
Spring 2004 98.3%
Spring 2005 98.08%
Spring 2006 100%
Assessment Tools Used by Academic Programs in 2004-2005

- Indirect Methods
  - 2002_03: 44%
  - 2003_04: 43%
  - 2004_05: 41%

- Evidence Based
  - 2002_03: 39%
  - 2003_04: 38%
  - 2004_05: 46%

- Normed Testing
  - 2002_03: 13%
  - 2003_04: 13%
  - 2004_05: 11%
2004-2005 Programs’ Planned or Implemented Curricular Changes

- Other Change(s)
  - 2004-05: 18
  - 2003-04: 14
  - 2002-03: 17

- Delete Course(s)
  - 2004-05: 19
  - 2003-04: 6
  - 2002-03: 7

- Add Course(s)
  - 2004-05: 47
  - 2003-04: 26
  - 2002-03: 19

- Review Course Contents
  - 2004-05: 52
  - 2003-04: 20
  - 2002-03: 18

- Review Course Sequence
  - 2004-05: 31
  - 2003-04: 16
  - 2002-03: 6

- Revise and/or Enforce Pre-reqs
  - 2004-05: 35
  - 2003-04: 18
  - 2002-03: 14
# 2004-2005 Programs’ Planned or Implemented Process Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Type</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modify Frequency or Schedule of Course Offerings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Technology Related Improvements</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Personnel Related Changes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Admission Criteria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Standards or Processes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Additional Training</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Standards or Processes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Standards or Processes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise Admission Criteria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Changes(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Modify Frequency or Schedule of Course Offerings
- Make Technology Related Improvements
- Make Personnel Related Changes
- Revise Admission Criteria
- Revise Standards or Processes
- Implement Additional Training
- Other Changes(s)
2004-2005 Administrative Units’ Planned or Implemented Operational Changes

Administrative Units that planned or implemented Operational Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2003-04</th>
<th>2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delete services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add new services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement additional training</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make personnel related changes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make technology related changes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revamp service(s)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other change(s)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Blue: 2002-03
- Green: 2003-04
- Orange: 2004-05

Note: The chart shows the number of administrative units that planned or implemented operational changes in each category for the years 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05.
Academic and Administrative Programs Assessment Plan
Changes for 2005-2006

Slide 14 and 17 - Changes to Assessment Plan
3-year Frequency Trend for Academic Programs

- Collect and Analyze Additional Data and Information: 40.6% (Administrative units), 54.0% (Academic programs)
- No Changes Made to Plan: 16.0% (Administrative units), 13.5% (Academic programs)
- Other Planned Changes: 11.3% (Administrative units), 16.7% (Academic programs)
- Change other Method(s) of Data Collection: 33.3% (Administrative units), 48.4% (Academic programs)
- Revise Measurement Approach(es): 48.4% (Administrative units), 53.1% (Academic programs)
- Revise Objective/Student Outcome Statement(s): 56.3% (Administrative units), 63.8% (Academic programs)

Legend: Administrative units, Academic programs
Examples of Quality Improvements in Assessment Development

College of Engineering and Computer Sciences
increased assessment activity among specific faculty, including presenting at conferences

General Education Program
increased number of student-learning outcomes for each course in the program

Ombuds Office
developed new measurement strategies and data collection techniques to more effectively examine the program
Examples of Quality Improvements
College of Education


Outcome: graduates will meet all 12 Florida Educators Accomplished Practices standards

Assessment Method: observations, rubrics, surveys

Results: students performed well on FEAP 2 – 12, but only 27 percent achieved the target for FEAP 1
Examples of Quality Improvements
College of Education...Continued

Changes: faculty and curriculum focus shift to prepare students better for FEAP 1

Improvements:
• new course developed focusing on assessment in education
• program revisions underway to incorporate this new course and additional improvements
• curriculum and assessment maps designed for each program to document where core curriculum is addressed and assessed
Examples of Quality Improvements
College of Engineering and Computer Sciences

Computer Science, B.S.

**Assessment Method:** curriculum mapping of key learning outcomes across the curriculum

**Results:** some areas were not adequately addressed; other areas were overemphasized

**Changes:** curriculum changes, including elimination of courses, addition of courses, and combining courses

**Improvements:**
- curriculum delivered more efficiently
- assessment across the program better coordinated
Examples of Quality Improvements
College of Health and Public Affairs

Communication Sciences and Disorders

**Assessment method:** department competency exam

**Results:** AY 04-05, 56 percent of students scored 70 percent or better on “acoustic and perceptual analysis of speech and voice” section of 12-section competency exam

**Action taken:** Improved coordination of speech lab content and course instruction, revised presentation style based on FCTL peer evaluation feedback and provided students with learning “Tips for Success”

**Improvement:** AY 05-06, 75 percent of students scored at least 70 percent on this section of competency exam
Office of Diversity Initiatives

**Assessment Method:** Two survey instruments in pilot study:
- Point of Service - immediately following workshops
- Reflective Web-based - one week and one month following training

**Results:** Pilot study of 36 people attending 14 different sessions collected point-of-service responses and follow-up responses. Follow-up survey focused on awareness of behavior and potential changes in behavior. Frequency data indicate the usefulness of the training in changing behavior.
Office of Diversity Initiatives…Continued

**Actions Taken:**
- developed a rich source of data not typically captured (will launch fully in 2005-2006)
- expanded ODI Web based resources
- streamlined internal processing of training data
- enhanced collaboration between ODI and OEAS

**Improvements:**
- workshops impact increased with a follow-up *tickle*
- presented at National Association of Institutional Research Forum
- invited to present at SAIR Regional Conference
Examples of Quality Improvements
President’s Division...Continued

Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Programs

Assessment method: internal records assessing improvements in processing time for faculty and A&P hiring packets

Results: decreased review time, continuation of a 10-year trend

Action taken: established goal of two-day processing time as office priority; trained a second reviewer for this year

Improvement: decreased processing time this year to .95 days (from 1.0 last year)

- # of Hiring Reviews Performed in Academic Year ending as shown
- # of Processing Days

- 1996: 242 days
- 1997: 334 folders, 1.6 days
- 1998: 292 folders, 2.1 days
- 1999: 335 folders, 1.7 days
- 2000: 321 folders, 1.3 days
- 2001: 219 folders, 1.0 days
- 2002: 315 folders, 1.1 days
- 2003: 496 folders, 1.4 days
- 2004: 707 folders, 1.1 days
- 2005: 609 folders, 1.3 days
- 2006: 707 folders, 1.0 days

Note: The number of processing days decreases sharply from 1996 to 2002, then increases sharply from 2002 to 2006.
Examples of Quality Improvements
Office of Research and Commercialization

Arboretum

**Outcome:** provide employment search services that adequately prepare students for a successful job search

**Assessment Method:** review specific goals and targeted objectives

**Results:** lack of resources to pursue desired and necessary partnerships

**Changes:** establish an identity for the arboretum to promote diverse instructional and research use of faculty members, and involve faculty members in arboretum activities

**Improvements:**
- increase direct course involvement by 50 percent
- expand volunteer base by 25 percent
- complete revision of arboretum Web site
Examples of Quality Improvements
Student Development and Enrollment Services

Student Academic Resource Center

**Outcome:** 80 percent of students attending the 2004 Learning Fair or Learning Fair workshops will identify at least one learning strategy to improve their study skills

**Assessment Method:** two survey instruments

**Results:**

- 47 (81 percent) of the 58 students surveyed at the Learning Fair indicated they learned at least one strategy to improve their study skills
- 51 (96 percent) of the 53 students surveyed at the workshops indicated they learned at least one strategy to improve their study skills
Examples of Quality Improvements
Student Development and Enrollment Services

Student Academic Resource Center...Continued

Improvement:
• level of student satisfaction with academic workshops increased from 94 percent in 2003-2004 to 99 percent in 2004-2005
• student participation in Learning Fair almost doubled in 2005 (94 percent) and in 2006 (89 percent)
• student participation in Learning Fair academic workshops tripled in 2006 (175 students) compared to 2004 (53)
• maintain and monitor Learning Fair strategy development
Examples of Quality Improvements

Student Development and Enrollment Services...Continued

Housing

**Outcome:** 85 percent of residents living in university-owned and -affiliated housing will indicate that they are satisfied with the computer connection in their room

**Assessment Method:** EBI survey, telephone survey

**Results:** residents were not as satisfied with in-room computer connections in on-campus housing or affiliated housing as desirable (target was 85 percent satisfaction)

**Changes:** infrastructure and equipment improvements were made to network connections (primarily on-campus); additional personnel were added

**Improvement:** 10 percent increase in Orlando campus satisfaction after improvements
Examples of Quality Improvements
Student Development and Enrollment Services

Career Services and Experiential Learning
Improving UCF Student Employment Readiness

**Outcome:** provide employment search services to adequately prepare students for employment

**Changes:** new, integrated, certificate program called *PRO* to enhance student employability skills
Examples of Quality Improvements
Student Development and Enrollment Services

Career Services and Experiential Learning…Continued

Impact of Changes
• 1,650 PRO student contacts in 2004-2005
• 637 (+39%) students attended the semi-annual Employment Prep Conference
• 451 (+4.1%) students attended PRO Outreach presentations
• 310 (+52%) practice Interviews completed
• anecdotal employer feedback has noted improvements in student preparation for interviews.
Examples of Quality Improvements
Marketing, Communication & Admissions

University Marketing

**Assessment method:** During brand identity research phase, obtained feedback from external consultant and 12 constituent groups.

**Results:** Consultant completed 9 months of pre-campaign research; Brand initiative was introduced to more than 25 groups, including each college.

**Action taken:** Developed strategy, creative direction, and media campaign. Rolled out campaign December 2005.

**Improvements:** Successful in developing UCF’s brand identity, which did not exist previously. As of June 30, 2006, the brand identity campaign included 8 print ads, 7 radio spots, and 6 TV commercials.
Increasing Our National Prominence in Assessment

- conference presentations
  - 40 presentations (27 last year)
  - 18 different conferences (16 last year)
  - presented by 2 colleges (5 departments)
    SDES, FCTL, and IAA personnel

- workshop presentations
  - 9 workshops (5 last year)

- collaborative presentations
  - OEAS and FCTL
  - OEAS and SDES
Conference Presentations

- AACTE (1)
- ABET TEI (2)
- AIR (4)
- FAIR: 2 Meetings (4)
- FATE (1)
- FPAW (1)
- ICFE: CS and CE (1)
- IEMS (2)

- LiveText Regional (3)
- LiveText National (2)
- Livetext State (1)
- NASPA (1)
- NASPA Assessment: IARC (2)
- NC State UAS (1)
- SACS (7)
- SAIR (6)
- TAMU (1)
Workshops Conducted

2005-2006 = 9
- AIR (2)
- FAIR (1)
- NASPA-IARC (2)
- SAIR (1)
- SACS (3)

2006-2007
Accepted or Proposed
- AIR (2)
- NASPA (1)
- SAIR (4)
- SACS (3)

Invited Presentations
- SACS Quality Enhancement Institute
External Consultations and Site Visits

- Consultations and Assistance in 2005-2006
  - UNF
  - FIU
  - FAMU
  - FSU
  - FCCJ
  - SACS Class 2006 Level VI Schools

- Florida DOE
  - state ad hoc committee to revise approval standards

- Increased SACS Activities
  - off-site team
  - international off-site team
  - on-site team chair
Planned Enhancements for Next Year

- increase emphasis on evidence-based measures of learning outcomes in assessment plans
- refine Academic Learning Compacts
- monitor university reorganization to include new offices in IE process
- maintain partnership with FCTL for work with academic departments
- increase collaboration with SDES assessment activities
- improve recognition for best assessment practices
- expand national reputation
  - increase leadership in student affairs assessment
  - peer reviewed assessment-related publications