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Purpose of Assessment
Assessment Process
Key Milestones
Results and Changes
- 2010-11 results
- Implemented (2010-11) and planned (2011-12) changes
- SACS Fifth-Year Report - Institutional Effectiveness
- Linkages between strategic planning and assessment
Success Stories
Next Steps
Assessment Leadership

- President
- VPs and Deans
- UAC
- DRC Members
- Coordinators
Assessment Cycle

Plan

Change

Continuous Improvement

Measure

Analyze
Assessment Scope and Schedule

- 352 programs and units report
  - Continuous improvement process
  - Ongoing reviews and feedback by DRC
  - Centralized online reporting system

- September – Coordinators submit final results and plans

- October – DRCs review results and plans

- November to December – UAC final review
Integrated Approach

- Institutional Effectiveness Assessment
- Program or Unit Review
- Strategic Planning
Key Milestones

- 1996 UAC Established
- 2001 OEAS Established
- 2002 Web Enabled Reports
- 2006 SACS Reaffirmation
- 2008 Enhanced Web Reports
- 2009 Implemented Assessment Rubrics
- 2010 Integrate Strategic Planning
- 2011 Rubric Reports
- 2012 SACS Fifth Year Report
- 2013 Implement Enhanced Assessment Plan Rubric (proposed)
Going to the Next Level
Necessary Steps

- Advance use of IE assessment results for quality improvement initiatives
- Increase evidence of the impact of implemented changes
- Increase inter-rater reliability across DRCs
- Strengthen linkages between strategic planning and assessment
Improved Performance

- **Exemplary**:
  - 2009-10: 91
  - 2010-11: 116

- **Accomplished**:
  - 2009-10: 104
  - 2010-11: 117

- **Meets Expectations**:
  - 2009-10: 59
  - 2010-11: 63

- **Emerging**:
  - 2009-10: 46
  - 2010-11: 36

- **Beginning**:
  - 2009-10: 20
  - 2010-11: 54
Enhanced Collaborative Model

- DRC Members are “assessment coaches”
- Measureable difference after training and consultations
- Coordinator presentations of assessment results and plans
  - Isolated single reviewers to open peer review discussions
- Feedback - face to face, email and phone
- Collaborative reflections in UAC
Divisional Review Committee Ratings
2010-11 Results for Academic Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Public Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEP Foundations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosen College of Hospitality Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Beginning
- Emerging
- Meets Expectations
- Accomplished
- Exemplary
### Divisional Review Committee Ratings 2010-11 Results for Administrative Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations and University Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Research and Commercialization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, Marketing, Communications and Admissions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development and Enrollment Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Legend:*
- **Red** = Beginning
- **Gray** = Emerging
- **Green** = Meets Expectations
- **Yellow** = Accomplished
- **Blue** = Exemplary
Implemented and Planned Changes
2010-11 Results

➢ Academic Programs
  • Changes to curricula – 31%
  • Changes to academic processes – 32%
  • Changes to assessment plans – 37%

➢ Administrative Units
  • Changes to operations – 55%
  • Changes to assessment plans – 45%
4 (CS 3.3.1)

**Institutional Effectiveness**
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 each of the following areas: *(Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1)*

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

**Judgment**
☑ Compliant    □ Non-Compliant

**Narrative**
**NARRATIVE SUMMARY**

The University of Central Florida (UCF) identifies expected student learning outcomes for its academic programs (general education, undergraduate and graduate degree programs). In addition, operational outcomes are articulated and measured for academic programs. UCF assesses how well it achieves these outcomes and documents its use of results to close the gaps.
Evidence of Compliance with SACS

- Quality mark increased

- Emphasis on use of results to make improvement
  - Compiled longitudinal examples
  - DRC Reviews
  - Evidence of Improvement Table
Strategic Plan Linkage

➢ University strategic plan linkages integrated into plan rubric
  • 49% of plans articulated relationship

➢ Common terminology in assessment and strategic planning efforts

➢ Strengthen linkage
  • Revised rubrics to enhance specificity
Success Stories

➢ Academic program
  • Electrical Engineering - B.S.E.E.
    ➢ Assessment coordinators: Drs. Kalpathy B Sundaram, Annie Wu, Damla Turgut

➢ Dean’s office
  • College of Sciences, Dean’s Office
    ➢ Assessment coordinators: Drs. Michael Johnson, Teresa Dorman

➢ Administrative unit
  • Recreation and Wellness Center
    ➢ Assessment coordinator: James Wilkening, Joanne McCully, Sarah Hunt
CORC Committee

- **Role of the CORC Committee**
  - Coordination of assessment for EE, CpE, CS, IT BS programs

- **Communication with course instructors**
  - Feedback loop
  - Data collection instrument

- **Communication with program faculty and chair**
Electrical Engineering Courses Assessed

1. EEL 3004 Electrical Networks
2. EEL 3123 Networks and Systems
3. Electronics I
4. EEL 4914 Senior Design I
5. EEL 4915 Senior Design II

Assessments of the above courses will meet the ABET Program Outcomes (13)
Assessment Results
Implementation of Strategies and Improvements for
EEL 3123 - Networks and Systems for 5 years

Methods: Using appropriate portions of exams, homework questions, and lab assignments, students should demonstrate knowledge of mathematics, science, and engineering by being able to perform linear circuit analysis using Laplace transforms, and transfer functions and convolution.
Results and Improvements

% of students passing the criteria for EEL 3123 Networks & Systems

- 2007-08: 52%, 40%
- 2008-09: 64%, 79%
- 2009-10: 73%, 81%
- 2010-11: 70%

Categories:
- LaPlace Transforms (Orange)
- Transfer Functions & Convolutions (Brown)
Strategies Implemented

2007-08: Based on the 2007-08 results, the professor teaching the course noted that students had a weaker background in differential equations. More examples were worked out in future classes.

2008-09: Students still showed deficiencies in differential equations needed for the Laplace transforms. In addition to more examples, a proposal to implement remedial math work was made so that the students are better prepared to apply differential equations to the course concepts. This remedial math strategy was implemented in 2009-10.

2009-10: Change in instructional strategy made to include quizzes and discussion during laboratory experiments.

2010-11: Refreshed materials learned in EEL 3004 and encouraged students to work many problems in Laplace Transforms.
College of Sciences Dean’s Office
Services & Satisfaction Survey

One survey, two designs, 354 COS Personnel

Response Rate
- 27% overall (N=95, +1%)
- 24% faculty (n=43, +2%)
- 50% admin/staff (n=52, +13%)

Areas Surveyed
- Human Resources
- Budget
- Research
- Academic Services
- Information Technology
- Facilities Operations, Facilities Planning and Safety Support
- Instruction Facilities
College of Sciences Dean’s Office
Services & Satisfaction Survey

Quality Measures
- 67% were highly satisfied (“Satisfied” or “Completely Satisfied”)
- 89% were neutral or better

What did we do with the results?
- Identified themes based on the last several years’ responses
- All responses (including quality assessments and open-ended comments) are shared with the service area’s lead personnel and the dean
- Survey results shared with personnel via e-mail and web:
  - Summary Response
  - Action Items
  - Changes Implemented
Learning outcomes for at-risk students after interventions

At-Risk Students
- Academic Probation (GPA < 2.0) (Excluding FTIC)
- Transfer Students
- Early Warning (GPA < 2.5)
- Second-year students
College of Sciences Dean’s Office
Academic Services

Interventions

**Academic Probation Students** (SP11: 512)
- Mandatory web-session
- Pre- and post-test to ensure knowledge of resources
  - Moved from 70% to 90% to pass post-test to remove hold
- Changed from web-session to face-to-face workshop and incorporated the “Pegasus Plan”

**Transfer Students** (higher rate of probation: 64%)
- Updated/Coordinated transfer orientations
- Interactive, transition-focused advising with pre/post test to ensure content knowledge
- Progress tracked, still assessing impact
Interventions

**Early Warning (Low GPA) Students (SP11: 825)**
- Not yet on probation, but at risk
- Personal e-mail outreach and voluntary advising
- At first intrusive/negative outreach, but adjusted to informative/resource oriented approach based on feedback

**Second Year Students (SP11: 1318)**
- Shift from first- to second-year and advising challenges
- E-mail outreach with information and resources
- Improved coordination with other advising units
- Probation and continued progress tracked
  - May determine additional intervention is no longer needed
Recreation and Wellness Center

- **Outcome**: Proactive, planned response to managing risk in recreation facilities and programs

- **Strategic Initiative**: Enhance student opportunities for experienced based learning

- **Supports Creed Value “Creativity”**
Recreation and Wellness Center

- 09/10 Emergency Response Model (F.A.S.T.)
  - How will students learn and retain E.A.P. information

- 10/11 Active Shooter Plan
  - How will students apply Emergency Response Model to a specific emergency?

- 87% post test
- 86% mock scenario

- 82% post test
- 89% application
Recreation and Wellness Center

Improvements and Future Implications

- Training and development strategies adjusted
- Reinforced emergency simulations
- Integrating new processes in operations
Next Steps

- Increase evidence of the impact of implemented changes
- Deploy revised IE rubrics in 2013-14
- Increase inter-rater reliability across DRCs
- Strengthen linkages between strategic planning and assessment
Thank you!