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Purpose of Assessment

- Are current practices effective?
- Are student learning outcomes being achieved?
- Are we meeting national, regional, and state standards?
- How can we continue to improve performance?
Assessment Scope and Schedule

➢ 355 programs and units report
  • Year round process
  • Centralized online reporting system
  • Ongoing reviews and feedback by DRC

➢ 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
## Similarities and Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Effectiveness Assessment</th>
<th>Unit or Program Reviews</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Summative</td>
<td>Integrated; Highly Formative and Summative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based decisions</td>
<td>Evidence-based decisions</td>
<td>Evidence-based decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports continuous quality improvement</td>
<td>Evaluates current status</td>
<td>Integrates current status, ongoing improvements, and future requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible budgetary impact</td>
<td>Possible budgetary impact</td>
<td>Major contributor to budgetary decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working towards alignment of reporting cycles
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
- 2012 Complete SACS Five-Year Report
Assessing our Assessment Process

*Planned Outcomes for 2009-10*

- Achieve clear and consistent rating system
- Establish collaborative model for reviewers and coordinators
- Tie IE assessment with strategic planning
Clear and Consistent Rating System

The Rubric

- Communication tool
  - Sets clear expectations
  - Uses common terminology
  - Offers concise, focused and timely feedback

- Guides self-evaluation

- Improves accuracy and consistency throughout the assessment process

- Generates meaningful discussion – more involved faculty and staff members
Collaborative Model

- Increases channels of communication
- Results in more “off-line” consultations
- Higher attendance of assessment workshops

Note: Mostly positive responses from Coordinators and Divisional Review Committee members
Initial Attempt To Tie IE Assessment to Strategic Planning

- Common leadership and support
- University strategic plan linkages integrated into plan rubric
- Common terminology in assessment and strategic planning efforts
### Divisional Review Committee Ratings
#### 2008-09 Results for Academic Units (Pre-rubric)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Un</th>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Ex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Business Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Public Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Colleges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEP Foundations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Medicine</td>
<td>4</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosen College of Hospitality Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Unacceptable**
- **Acceptable**
- **Good**
- **Excellent**
## Divisional Review Committee Ratings
### 2008-09 Results for Administrative Units (Pre-rubric)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations and University Relations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy, Marketing, Communications and...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Research and Commercialization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Division</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Development and Enrollment Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Unacceptable
- Acceptable
- Good
- Excellent
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Implemented and Planned Changes
2008-09 Results

- Academic Programs
  - Changes to curriculum - 27%
  - Changes to academic process - 29%
  - Changes to assessment plans - 44%

- Administrative Units
  - Changes to operations - 50%
  - Changes to assessment plans - 50%
Note: A copy of the *Rubric* will be distributed to all attendees.
### Divisional Review Committee Ratings
#### 2009-10 Plans (using the Rubric)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Unit Status</th>
<th>University of Central Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans not approved by the DRC Chair(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan not created</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan in progress</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans submitted to DRC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan review process has begun, but the review has not been approved</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of program and unit plans approved by the DRC Chair</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of programs and units doing assessment</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Unit Rubric Level</th>
<th>Number of Programs or Units meeting the level</th>
<th>Percentage of Programs or Units meeting the level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>45.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Leaders

- Assessment coordinators, faculty and staff members
- Divisional Review Committee members
- University Assessment Committee
- Operational Excellence and Assessment Support staff members
- University leadership team
Next Steps

- Meet earlier reporting deadlines
- Fully implement the “results” rubric
- Strengthen linkages between strategic planning and assessment
- Improve alignment of reporting cycles
Thank you!

Strategic Planning

IE Assessment

Program or Unit Reviews