Academic Experience

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Outcome 1 An online survey was administered through Qualtics to all staff in Academic Experience. The pre-survey administered in fall 2015 serves as the baseline. The post survey was administered in 2016, 2017, and in 2018. Survey questions posed respondents with hypothetical situations covered by the three main policy areas relevant to employment at the College: Code of Conduct, Ethics, and Discrimination. The results demonstrate that the majority of AEX employees are familiar with the three policies and can apply the policy correctly when presented with a real-life, albeit hypothetical, situation. Over a three-year time period, performance on applying the policies to hypothetical situations is consistently high in each area. In 2018, knowledge of all three policies exceeds the performance target (see table). Further, 100% of AEX employees perceive that the policies are being followed and 100% of AEX employees believe that the policies are being enforced. A strategy adopted based on these results is to add each of the three policies to department meeting agendas created by Directors. The opportunity for discussion and questions will be provided. Each of the three policies will be added to the AEX Director's meeting agenda. The opportunity for discussion and questions will be provided. Directors will be asked about situations in which a policy was applied and the group will discuss the case.

Outcome 2 All AEX departments have established foundation accounts and have created a giving opportunity on their website. In 2018, 7 of 8 departments with gifts more than zero increased the total donations over 2017 levels. Two departments (AEX and FYE) The target was 50%, thus we exceeded the performance target. The current strategy is very passive (an opportunity is available, but potential donors are not asked to contribute) and the data from last year and this year demonstrate that a passive approach will not yield funds at the level we need. In 2019 the AVP will work IA to create a more proactive outreach strategy designed to increase giving across the 9 departments and encourage Directors to work with IA on individual department strategies as appropriate.

Outcome 3 International Students’ needs: None of the measures for this outcome were accomplished in 2018. The admissions strategy did not allow for this work to move forward. This Outcome will be retired for 2018-19 and replaced with a new outcome on Professional Development.

Outcomes 1 and 2 and the new outcome 3 involving professional development planned for 2019 reflect the support and facilitation role played by the Office of the Academic Experience.

Academic Advising & Planning Center
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7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Student Learning Outcome 1: Students who attend their academic advising appointment each semester will be able to develop a plan for student progression to graduation continues to be the only outcome whose measures directly connect exclusively to the work of academic advising and therefore, this outcome will continue to be assessed. In addition, the learning that has occurred by the department’s Assessment Committee from previous assessment cycles about the methods and processes used for data collection has become more refined resulting in stronger, unbiased data. For example, the 2017-18 assessment cycle is the second full year using a rubric to collect data. It is also the first year using all rubric criteria during fall and spring semesters. Previous assessment cycles had two rubric criteria only used in the spring semester.

The department continues to be riddled with high staff turnover, which impacts the capacity to accurately and efficiently complete assessment rubrics. It also impacts the department's capacity to stay true to its mission by establishing a relationship of mutual trust with students. High advising loads per advisor also present a challenge, especially during the height of the advising season. The frenzied pace of back-to-back advising appointments over a six week period or more creates a margin of human error in completing the assessment rubric as well. Nevertheless, advisor reminders to use the rubric multiple times throughout the semester as discussed as an action item at the end of the 2016-17 assessment cycle closed the gap on incomplete rubrics in the 2017-18 assessment year. Advisors were not permitted to go back and complete the rubric retroactively, which improved the integrity of the data collected. This practice will continue for the 2018-19 assessment cycle.
Students who met learning contract requirements of 24 cr and 2.00 GPA: individual talents and career planning by enrolling in the Impact Scholars program. Students who are performing well academically at the end of the fall semester will be provided an opportunity to focus on development of their programmatic changes as this time. Increased student participation through exposure to majors and minor programs at the college remains a goal of this event as it is critical that students make well-informed decisions about their program of study to insure a timely graduation, which is part of the departmental mission.

The practice of placing a Missing Major Hold (MMH) has been in place since 2011. As such, the AAPC agreed that this practice as it relates to the 60 hours passed policy to declare a major is firmly embedded in the culture of the college and the practice of placing the MMH moves students to take action, which is the desired result. Ultimately, the college needs to identify what students do to seek out and select an academic major since this is a considerable predictor of student retention. Unfortunately, there are not electronic systems in place that can collect and report the activities students participate in or the rate at which students declare or undeclare their academic major. Until that time, it will continue to be difficult for the AAPC to have a direct measure of advising's impact on when students declare a major as it relates to their interaction with programming and administrative practices. Therefore, this measure will be retired. The data collected over the last three years through formal assessment practices as well as data collected prior to 2015-2016 suggest that the MMH achieves the desired outcome.

Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of campus resources and services after receiving academic advising will be retired. The data collected over the last three years satisfies the outcome and the ability to discern how the AAPC specifically impacts student resource utilization and knowledge is virtually impossible given how and when an advisor gives a referral. Upon discussion, the department decided that there are no further programmatic changes that can be made at this time given the limitations of the data collection process.

Center for Academic Performance and Persistence
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7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s).

Retention and Persistence of Provisionally Admitted Students

Retention and graduation of provisionally admitted students has been the focus of our assessment efforts for the past several years. In 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 UAS collaborated with AAPC to evaluate the impact on two advising sessions per semester on provisional student success. While those results were positive in that the number of provisional students placed on Academic Probation after Fall semester fell in the two years since mandatory multiple advising appointments were implemented

Fall 2012: 10.34%
Fall 2013: 9.39%
Fall 2014: 6.76%

PR continuation rates continue to remain relatively unchanged despite the additional required advising meetings

81.2% of Fall 2012 cohort were continued
80.28% of Fall 2013 cohort were continued
80.18% of the Fall 2014 cohort were continued

In addition, PR students are only meeting their individual semester GPA goal at rates of 20-37% for those who attended both advising sessions each semester and 7-26% for those who attending only the mandatory advising.

For these reasons In AY 2014-2015 UAS conducted additional research with the assistance of IR in an effort to determine the various factors that impact PR retention and graduation rates. The data gained from that study combined with this data will be used to implement revised PR requirements for the Fall 2015 cohort. Multiple required academic advising sessions will be retained as well as implementation of additional contact with support and resources provided by FYE class in the first semester, a PR program coordinator and weekly meetings with a Peer Academic Coach who will serve as an accountability partner in the Fall 2015 semester. PR students who are performing well academically at the end of the fall semester will be provided an opportunity to focus on development of their individual talents and career planning by enrolling in the Impact Scholars program.

Student Learning Outcome 2: Student who participate in academic advising and advising related programs will make a timely and informed pursuit of an academic major by the time they have reached 60 hours will remain in the 2018-2019 assessment cycle. While the Choosing a Major workshop continues to have inconsistent and low student attendance, there is little to suggest why student attendance is low. Perhaps this is the impact of technology and student now prefer watching a video instead of interacting with other students and professional staff members. Since the inception of this program, staff have offered this workshop at various times of the day and night as well as location on campus and attendance has never been very large; however, students that attend have noted on their session evaluation that the content was valuable to them. The Majors and Minors Fair continues to grow in volume of both student and departmental participation. Given that the event is now outdoors, it is difficult to accurately record the number of student participants despite the fact that students are asked to check in to the event by picking up a bag of materials for their use. There are no programmatic changes as this time.
Fall 2010-2013 cohort: 80.59%
Fall 2015 cohort: 83.44% (n=126) of 151 provisionally admitted students
Fall 2016 cohort: 71% (n=184) of 260 provisionally admitted students
Fall 2017 cohort: 75% (n=33) of 44 provisionally admitted students

First to second year retention rates:
Fall 2006-Fall 2012 cohorts: PR retention averages 4.31% lower than regularly admitted students.
Fall 2015 cohort: 77.5% compared to 79.4% for regularly admitted students
Fall 2016 cohort: 61.2% compared to 77.9% for regularly admitted students
Fall 2017 cohort: data will not be available until late in 2018.

Graduation rate data will not be available until 2019.

Efficacy of Faculty and Staff Assisting Students in Trouble (FAST) response initiatives

Results of assessment over the past several years have indicated that while FAST referrals continue to increase

AY 2011-2012: 230
AY 2012-2013:243
AY 2013-2014: 223
AY 2014-2015: 302
AY 2015-2016: 262
AY 2016-2017: 295
AY 2017-2018: 312

Response rate (defined as meaningful email exchange, phone call or in person meeting) did not increase as a result of the new implementation measures.

AY 2011-2012: 30.4%
AY 2012-2013: 34.8%
AY 2013-3014: 38.3%
AY 2014-2015: 33.2%
AY 2015-2016: 46%
AY 2016-2017: 34.58%
AY 2017-2018: 29%

In 2014-2015 UAS implemented and assessed a new approach to our methods for reaching out to students referred by FAST. This included an initial contact email through the Maxient system and then an Outlook contact email after two failed Maxient attempts. This approach did not successfully improve response rates so in 2015-2016 UAS altered the approach by using a targeted, more personal email send directly through Outlook as well as an assessment of whether or not students reach out to resources even if they do not come in to UAS. In AY 2015-2016 and AY2016-2017 UAS attempted to track the number of student referrals that connected with their faculty referral source and/or Center for Student Learning (CSL) for support and assistance. This measure has been extremely difficult to track relevant data. As a result, in AY2017-2018 UAS moved to change this measure to assess the type of outreach measures that are most effective in promoting student response as well as the types of responses UAS receives from students. One additional change included utilization of the text feature in Maxient as a means to increase student response.
As this measure has remained relatively stagnant for the past 7 years, UAS will retire this measure and begin to explore other early alert strategies as a means to identify students who are struggling academically. The current FAST system will continue to be used as an adjunct in the interim.

**EDLS 100: Academic Recovery Plan**

During the 2013-2014 assessment cycle the EDLS faculty members completed a systematic review of the material currently being covered in EDLS 100 classes and prioritized the material they felt should be included in all EDLS 100 sections. In addition, EDLS 100 students were surveyed to determine which learning outcomes were most helpful to current and former students. The results of these assessment measures led to the revision of the learning outcomes for EDLS 100: Learning Strategies. This discussion of learning outcomes led the EDLS 100 faculty to recognize the need for a textbook to address the specific student learning outcomes being taught in the class. In 2014-2015 the EDLS 100 faculty collaborated to write and publish *Destination Success* an academic recovery textbook that is now the required text for EDLS 100. In 2015-2016 the assessment efforts for this program centered around evaluating two specific assignments used to address those learning outcomes. Thes efforts was continued in 2016-2017 and 2017-2018. In addition, data was collected to determine the impact of completion of EDLS 100 on a student’s ability to return to Good Standing.

*Writing Your Story Assignment (percentage of students earning a score of 77.78% or better)*

- Spring 2016: 39%
- Fall 2016: 41.27%
- Spring 2017: 57.72%
- Fall 2017: 67.31%
- Spring 2018: 55.65%

Each semester after the assessment is complete, faculty review the information to determine best practices for in-class directions related to the assignment. In addition, the rubric was normed to improve scoring.

In AY2018-2019 this assignment will be evaluated and then compared with a My Path Forward assignment that occurs at the end of the semester in attempt to demonstrate growth and learning over time.

*Goal Setting Assignment: This assignment and rubric were adjusted for 2016-2017*

- Spring 2016: 11.76% earned a score of 76.19% or better and 6.62% earned a score of 80.95% or better
- Fall 2016: 29.05% earned a score of 76.19% or better and 18.18% earned a score of 80.95% or better
- Spring 2017: 49.59% earned a score of 76.19% or better and 39.67% earned a score of 80.95% or better
- Fall 2017: 61.67% earned a score of 76.19% or better and 55% earned a score of 80.95% or better
- Spring 2018: 48.18% earned a score of 76.19% or better and 40% earned a score of 80.95% or better

In addition, the mean score on the assignment has exceeded 76.19% for the past 3 consecutive semesters. This assignment is consistently meeting or exceeding targets and will be phased out to incorporate the new My Path Forward assignment.

*Academic Standing:*

- Spring 2016 EDLS 100 cohort: 45.02% returned to Good Standing within 2 semesters
- Fall 2016 EDLS 100 cohort: 59.5% returned to Good Standing within 2 semesters
- Spring 2017 EDLS 100 cohort: 34.9% returned to Good Standing within 2 semesters
- Fall 2017 EDLS 100 cohort: 41.77% returned to Good Standing within 2 semesters.

While gaining knowledge, skills and techniques related to learning strategies are not the only factors contributing to future academic success, additional information may be gained by disaggregating the data further to explore possible connections between grade in the class and ability to return to Good Standing.

**Strengths in First Year Experience**

During the 2017-2108, the CliftonStrengths assessment was integrated into the First Year Synthesis Seminar class in an effort to help students identify their top five talent themes. CliftonStrengths is designed to be a development tool to assist students in identifying how they approach life in the most productive, efficient, and effective manner, and how they might further develop these strengths to succeed in academic, major and career selection, and relationships. Research indicates that students who are able to develop and utilize their individual strengths have higher levels of hope and engagement which indirectly results in higher GPAs and credits completed and higher levels of well-being.
Students completed a Strengths Efficacy Scale measure and demonstrated a positive change of 0.2 on a 5 point Likert scale.

Students also completed a VoiceThread assignment related to using strengths in goal-setting and applying strengths to academic strategies. Students scored a 4.73 out of 9 on the Strengths VoiceThread Rubric. Scores on each individual area averaged 1.59 out of 3.

Center for Excellence in Peer Education
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7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

StrengthsQuest in the First-Year Experience

During the 2017-2018, the CliftonStrengths assessment was integrated into the First Year Synthesis Seminar class in an effort to help students identify their top five talent themes. CliftonStrengths is designed to be a development tool to assist students in identifying how they approach life in the most productive, efficient, and effective manner, and how they might further develop these strengths to succeed in academic, major and career selection, and relationships. Research indicates that students who are able to develop and utilize their individual strengths have higher levels of hope and engagement which indirectly results in higher GPAs and credits completed and higher levels of well-being.

Students completed a Strengths Efficacy Scale measure and demonstrated a positive change of 0.2 on a 5 point Likert scale.

Students also completed a VoiceThread assignment related to using strengths in goal-setting and applying strengths to academic strategies. Students scored a 4.73 out of 9 on the Strengths VoiceThread Rubric. Scores on each individual area averaged 1.59 out of 3.

TEDU 205 (Lesson Plan Development and Delivery)

Students enrolled in TEDU 205 (Exploring Leadership: Building Peer Facilitation Skills) were expected to develop and deliver lesson plans and use a variety of instructional strategies to engage their students.

Students developed lesson plans using the provided template and instructions. Students delivered the lesson plan to a class of TEDU 205 peers, simulating a group of their mentees. A rubric was used to score the lesson plan and the presentation.

Students enrolled in the face-to-face section received full credit on their rubrics for all but one item: Student Learning Outcomes. Students enrolled in the hybrid sections received full credit on their rubrics for all but two items: Student Learning Outcomes and Specific Learning Activities.

In 2018-2019, TEDU 205 instructors will provide additional instruction with regard to developing student learning outcomes and developing specific learning activities to support those student learning outcomes. This additional instruction will include at least one additional reading and at least one additional group activity.

No significant difference was found when comparing rubric results for the hybrid versus the face-to-face sections.

A pre- and post-survey related to public speaking and lesson plan delivery was also given to all students prior to and following the lesson plan delivery.

The pre- and post-surveys were intended to assess students’ comfort levels with public speaking and lesson plan delivery. There were positive changes in every field, with the greatest changes related to “I feel prepared when giving a speech.”

The areas of potential concern are related to students’ confidence level, eye contact, and articulation/lucidity/tone. In 2018-2019, TEDU 205 instructors will provide additional instruction with regard to improving students’ confidence, eye contact, and articulation/lucidity/tone. This additional instruction will include at least one additional reading and at least one additional group activity.

Peer Educator Experiences

Students serving in peer educator roles were expected to demonstrate growth in communication (one-on-one communication and group facilitation), leadership (ethics, professionalism, and decision-making), and mentoring (knowledge of campus and referral skills).

An end-of-academic-year survey was administered to all peer educators at the conclusion of the academic year.

The survey data suggests that our peer facilitators need additional support and training related to stress management, time management, and written communication skills. The following strategies will be implemented:
Each peer facilitator is assigned to a team, and an experienced PF is assigned as the team leader of that team. In addition to the required weekly team meetings, the team leader will be required to meet at least once per semester with each individual member of his/her team. This will allow the PF the opportunity to work with the team leader on his/her stress management and time management. Each peer facilitator will be required to submit weekly, typed reports to his/her team leader. The report will include a section for written reflection regarding the past week of work as a peer facilitator. This will allow the PF the opportunity to provide and improve written communication.

Providing support for time and stress management will also likely increase the number of students eligible for IMTPC certification.

First-Year-Experience Peer Facilitators were expected to complete all requirements for International Mentor Training Program Certification to receive individual IMTPC Certification (Level 1, 2, or 3).

The goal of 90% certification at each level was not met. In 2018-19, Peer Facilitators will be encouraged to meet the required number of mentoring hours within the academic year. This is a realistic goal for students serving as Peer Facilitators during both academic semesters. However, it will be challenging for students working in only one academic semester.

Center for Student Learning
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7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

The CSL experienced significant changes during the past three assessment cycles, primarily due to exhaustive staff turnover between 2015-2018. As of June 2018, the current staff has been involved in at least one cycle, and thus is better equipped to understand the programs and services offered by the Center, recognize needs that exist, and implement programmatic changes that can positively impact both the student employees and the students served.

Changes that have been or will be implemented, based on observations and data from recent assessment cycles:

- Peer Tutor Experience
  - CSL staff has made significant changes to the content of the tutor training program in order to address additional areas of professional and personal development for the tutors.
  - A new format for training has been implemented to allow tutors more autonomy and flexibility in creating a robust and meaningful training experience.
  - The CSL Associate Director is currently designing a more navigable and incentivized path to CRLA certification.

- Addressing High DFW Courses of Concern
  - CSL staff recognized that comparing grades of users vs. non-users in historically high-risk courses is less significant than comparing DFW rates of users vs. non-users. Thus, the measure was changed.
  - To address a growing need for increased support, the tutoring format was changed from ‘by appointment’ to a walk-in lab, and the number of hours/week was increased.
  - CSL staff sought collaboration with and funding through the School of Business.

- Exposure to Diverse Study Strategies through Supplemental Instruction
  - In order to address lower than expected responses to questions regarding both implementation and acquisition of varied study strategies by SI leaders and attendees, changes were made to 1) the target population of students surveyed, and 2) descriptions of study strategies for SI leaders
  - Training for SI leaders will be modified to help leaders better understand when they are using different study strategies.

As the CSL moves ahead into the 2018-19 cycle, we will continue to address changes and developments in these areas as they apply to both the twofold mission of the CSL--supporting the academic success of all students and the professional and personal development of our student employees--and realted components of the College's Strategic Plan, namely the enhancement of the undergraduate academic core and the enhancement of co-curricular programs and initiatives that enhance the holistic education of undergraduate students.

First Year Experience
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7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Strengths Quest Implementation in FYSS 101 Courses

This was the first year that we implemented Strengths in the FYSS 101 Courses. We administered a pre- and post-Strengths Quest Self-Efficacy survey to all students in FYSS 101. Overall students showed an average positive change in their understanding and application of Strengths with a .20 point increase on a 5-point Likert Scale. These results show that students did increase their basic knowledge of Strengths at the end of the semester. There were 7 questions where students showed an average a positive change below a .20. We hope that our changes for next year (discussed below) will help increase this score.
We assessed the VoiceThreads with a Rubric. We randomly selected Synthesis Seminars from the fall and spring semesters. 25% of the fall sections is 18, and 25% of the spring is 9 for a total of 27 sections. Overall students scored a 4.73 of 9 on the Strengths Voice Thread Rubric. Students scored lowest (1.37 of 3) on the Academic Strategies questions (slide 13). Students scored highest (1.75 of 3) on the Critical Applications question (slide 15). The average score across all three question was 1.59 of 3. Our target for 2018-2019 would be to achieve a score of 1.59 of 3 on each side of the rubric.

We also conducted a focus group with PFs to find out how they perceived Strengths in their Synthesis Seminars. Their reaction was mixed, some thought students embraced it, while others did not. PFs suggested that Strengths were introduced into the OAKS modules too early. The CEPE took this feedback seriously and are re-organizing the OAKS modules to introduce Strengths later in the semester. We are going to redesign the Voice Threads and combine two of them into one VoiceThread. The goal is to make this information easier to understand for PFs and students. Since we are making small changes we will have to decide next assessment cycle if our baseline is correct or if we will have to re-set it.

New FYE Course Grading Policy Effectiveness

This past year, 2017-18, we implemented a new FYE Grading Policy in the academic FYSE courses in order to link them to the Synthesis Seminar (FYSS 101). The intended outcome is to increase student engagement. Since FYSS 101 counts for zero credit hours a grade cannot be assigned to that course. With the implementation of new OAKS modules the PFs can submit a completion grade to professors at the end of the semester. In 2015-16 and 2016-17 we collected syllabi to assess the attendance and grading policy to see if there was an increase in student engagement through the implementation of a grading policy. Yet, since we changed the policy for syllabi collected in 2017-18 we have decided to use that data to set a new baseline.

In fall 2017, 77.4% of FYSE included the new policy. In spring 2018, that number dropped to 66.7%. New target baseline of inclusion in syllabi of FYE Grading Policy for both semesters will be 72.88% or better.

We also are establishing a new baseline for attendance of 3+ absences using data from 2017-18 because we switched from gathering data from a system of emails to Google Forms. Reporting for FYSS absences changed from emails from Director of the CEPE to Google reporting filled out by Peer Facilitators. With this change there were more reported total absences in Fall 2017 -11.74% (as compared to Fall 2016 – 5.54%) and slightly less in Spring 2018 – 15.2% (as compared to Spring 2017 – 15.88%). We need more data to find out if the new attendance policy is working to keep students more engaged.

FYE New Faculty Workshop

During the second day of the New Faculty Workshop we invite veteran FYE Faculty to attend workshop with New FYE Faculty. This past May 2018 we had 20 New FYE Faculty attend and 31 Veteran faculty (out of 102 teaching in FYE in 2018-19). These are good numbers since sometimes it is difficult to get attendance at such events. In the afternoon we offer breakout sessions that are meant to provide information on pedagogical approaches to help design or re-vamp FYE courses. Our goal is that faculty will find these workshops useful for their courses. In order to gather this data we sent out a survey to FYE Faculty who participated in the workshop. Overall a total of 51(N) new and returning faculty members participated in the FYE Faculty Workshop in May 2018. Of those faculty, 35 (n) responded to the faculty survey and provided data. We used a survey on a 10-point Likert Scale to assess four sessions dealing with pedagogical approaches. It should be noted that faculty can attend two sessions and that is why the counts appear higher than actual attendees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to Make your FYE class even better. What works in your classes</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Sarah Owens)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakout - Supporting College Level Reading and Comprehension in</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your Discipline (Lindy Coleman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakout - Creating your own FYE Abroad Trip (Devon Hanahan,</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liza Wood, Bill Olejniczak, and Stephanie Leahy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakout - Learning to Transfer (Chris Warnick)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakout - Preparing Students for Class Discussions (Gabby Principe,</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy Kolak, Lisa Ross)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Mean for all workshops dealing with course design and assignment development: 8.1 These results will set the performance target for the 2018-19 assessment cycle data collection. On the survey there was an opportunity for professors to give positive and negative feedback regarding sessions. We will use that feedback to choose sessions for next year. We will also share the feedback with presenters.

This coming fall 2018 and spring 2019 we will collect assignments from faculty who applied knowledge from the workshops into their FYE classes. We will assess that data in 2018-19.

New Student Programs
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7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Orientation
New Student and Family Orientation are two of the largest programs provided by the Office of New Student Programs. This report was submitted by the OIEP of June 29, 2018. Since new student and family orientation occurs during the summer (June 2018-August 2018), data from those attending these programs and focus group comments will be analyzed in fall 2018. These results will be reported in June 2019.

Charleston Bridge
In 2017, the College of Charleston Office of Admissions extended offers to 209 first year college students to participate in a new program referred to as Charleston Bridge. The program was a collaboration between the College of Charleston and Trident Technical College, a public two-year community college in Charleston SC.

Charleston Bridge provides a one-semester opportunity for South Carolina residents to live and study on the College of Charleston campus during the fall 2017 semester while taking coursework with Trident Technical College faculty. Establishing a new program in a short time frame was challenging and required careful coordination between the two campuses. Campus leadership and administrators met frequently during the spring 2017 to plan various aspects of the program. The Charleston Bridge program is housed in the Office of New Student Programs and directed by the Assistant Vice President of First Year & Bridge Student Services.

Several changes have been implemented for fall 2018 as a result of the assessment process such as the mentor hiring and meeting requirement, the online student success seminar, the book distribution process, the handbook, and Charleston Bridge orientation.

A campus wide effort was made to implement the program in the fall that included:

- Creating an admission and billing process
- Developing promotional materials
- Establishing a system for student tracking and course enrollment using the institution’s BANNER system
- Registering students for Trident Technical College coursework
- Designing a program website and student handbook
- Offering a faculty training workshop for Trident Technical College faculty
- Assigning students to residence halls and roommates who were also in the Charleston Bridge program
- Creating a Charleston Bridge participation agreement in consultation with the Office of Legal Affairs, Residence Life, and the Registrar
- Determining program completion requirements and communicating this to students participating in the program
- Providing students with one-day orientation
- Implementing a reporting system (FAST) to monitor students of concern
- Hiring mentors to assist in supporting Charleston Bridge students
- Developing an online Student Success Seminar
- Designing workshops for Charleston Bridge students to attend during the fall semester
- Assembling a Charleston Bridge Leadership council to provide feedback regarding the program
- Tracking student progress
- Assessing student satisfaction and the use of support services
- Initiating a midterm grade and final grade reporting and an appeal process
- Providing a spring advising and registration process for admitted students
- Transitioning admitted students to the College of Charleston to the First Year Impact program

At the end of the fall semester, 143 of 209 students met the Charleston Bridge program requirements were offered admission to the College of Charleston for the spring 2018 semester (retention fall to spring 70%). At the time of this report (July 1, 2018), 130 of 143 students are registered for fall 2018 classes at the College of Charleston.

In addition to focus groups, a survey was administered to students in fall 2017 and a follow up survey was administered in spring 2018. 146 of 209 Charleston Bridge students completed the end of semester survey administered in November 2017. Students found several resources helpful including the Center for Student Learning, Addlestone library, an academic advisor, the Charleston Bridge mentor, the handbook, and TTC faculty.

Findings from the survey indicated reasons why students would not attend College of Charleston in the spring even if admitted. Reasons stated were:

- Top reason - Planning to transfer to another institution (20%)
- College of Charleston was not the right fit (15%)
- The residence hall experience (15%)
- Unable to afford the spring tuition (15%)

46 of 143 students completed the follow up survey in spring 2018. Significant findings from this survey included:

- 93% strongly agreed or agreed that they are familiar with the resources at the College of Charleston to help them be successful.
- 87% understand the academic expectations as a student at the College of Charleston.
- 83% plan to graduate from the College of Charleston
- 70% felt adequately prepared to register for classes after working with an advisor.
- 58.69 % developed a supportive peer network on campus (29.26% neither agree or disagree, 13% disagree)
Much was learned from the first year of program implementation. Communication between Trident Technical College (TTC) and CofC as well as with students from both institutions needs to be improved. Therefore, a point person at TTC has been hired and will work closely with CofC staff. An assistant director for the bridge program has also been hired at CofC to facilitate communication efforts and support bridge program directors.

Program modifications for fall 2018 based on fall 2017 assessment:

- To enhance communication with students, a communication plan for Charleston Bridge has been established. More communication with students via email will occur during the summer. This will also include parents. A parent newsletter will also be distributed 2-3 times during the fall 2018 semester.

- Given the short time frame to implement components of the program, a Charleston Bridge website was not available until the students began the fall semester. A website is now in place and has resulted in fewer calls about the program requirements, fees, and administrative processes. The website will be updated as needed to ensure the information is accurate and timely.

- Orientation will now begin at Trident Technical College (TTC) and schedule building and finalization will be handled by TTC rather than College of Charleston. This will help TTC establish a connection with students in the Charleston Bridge program. This time will also be spent working with students who need assistance from TTC staff in the financial aid and billing areas. The bill due date has also been moved to earlier in the summer to prevent students from moving on CoC campus before the fall bill has been paid to TTC.

- For summer 2018, afternoon orientation activities at CoC will focus more on student support services, student engagement, residence life, the First Year Impact program and the student success seminar.

- Based on feedback from focus groups and surveys, changes will be made in requirements related to the online modules and workshop attendance for fall 2018. Online assignments have been reduced and face-to-face meetings will be required with seminar instructors. This may allow stronger relationships between students and staff.

- Workshop attendance has also been adjusted to the use of the Center for Student Learning services at least 3 times during the fall. Previous workshop content will now be covered with students during registration in December or their FYE course in the spring. This will eliminate the required workshops requirement, however, students will still be required to attend the Major/Minor Fair (Academic Advising & Planning Center), meet with their seminar instructor to review midterm grades, and submit a final exam study plan.

- Hiring temporary employees as mentors will be adjusted for fall 2018. Rather than face to face meetings being required, the mentors will attend the face to face meetings with seminar instructors and be available to students as needed. The mentors will also reach out to Charleston Bridge students via email and social media outlets. Based on feedback from the 2017-2018 mentors, the mentors stated it difficult to get students to meet with them for a second time, especially if they were doing well. For those struggling, these students neglected their meetings as well as their coursework. The mentor relationship and hiring process will be adjusted for fall 2018. Mentors will be selected from the undergraduate population who completed the TEDU-250 course provided by the Center for Excellence in Peer Education. These students have been trained to work with first year students as peer facilitators or peer academic coaches. Not only will hiring students in this role reduce temporary employment cost, the students serving as mentors would have the opportunity to easily transition to becoming Peer Academic Coaches and work with this population of students in the spring.

iCharleston

A major part of the iCharleston Program assessment focused on the Spring 2018 focus groups completed with iCharleston participants. Students were selected to be part of the focus group based on involvement in the program and the perception of varying experiences abroad. All three site directors were present for each focus group. The purpose of this focus group was to learn about the student perception of several facets of the iCharleston program immediately after their experience and several months later.

Findings

Students were more positive about their experience in April in comparison to January responses

The most overt finding was that students developed an affinity for their time abroad the further removed from the experience they came. During the first focus group, students were excited to be on campus and felt that their time abroad was difficult and not always enjoyable. In the second group students mentioned that they missed their location and are hoping to travel abroad again during their college career. This expanded into other facets of the program including “Passport to CoC”, and students’ self-disclosed successes.

Greatest successes has been personal growth

Overall, students self-disclosed that their biggest success throughout the year was their personal growth and academic development. Many students noted that they felt as though they are able to conquer any challenge after having completed the abroad portion of the iCharleston program. Almost every student said that their biggest challenge in the fall was being away from their family and friends while during the spring semester most students noted that their biggest challenge was getting connected to other students and keeping up with the fast-paced workload.

The results of the “Passport to CoC” questions in the first focus group were mixed. Many students saw value in the initial sessions designed to help with locating resources, and the final sessions that dealt with the CoC transition. However, students remarked that many sessions in the middle weren’t useful, and they felt as though fewer sessions could have sufficed. Taking this into consideration, Site directors did change the formatting from weekly meetings to eight in-class portions and three out-of-class portions. The April focus group reflected that students appreciated this approach and were more receptive to the idea of “Passport to CoC” with this format. This was mainly because students discovered that the seminar played a major role in staying on top of assignments and due dates for the program throughout the fall semester. Still, students saw the main purpose of Passport to CoC as a way to touch base with everyone in the program and served as a motivator and reminder about returning to CoC. From this iCharleston staff completed a total revision of the “Passport to CoC” weekly seminar to be used during the fall 2018 program at the various program locations. Students remarked that some sessions weren’t useful, and they felt as though fewer sessions could have sufficed. Taking this into consideration, the iCharleston staff changed the formatting of these required weekly meetings to eight in-class portions and three out-of-class portions. The three out-of-class portions will be group programming events, which is a required component of the iCharleston Site Director role.

REACH

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

A summary can only be provided after October 31, 2018 when all student data has been collected, processed, and evaluated.
**Veteran & Military Student Services**

**Assessment Report Summary**

7. **Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement**: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

**Outcome 1**

**Measure 1**

Though a majority of veteran and military students receive some form of education benefits (VA, Federal or State), there remains a considerable financial deficit that their funding doesn’t cover (i.e. books, parking, etc.). In an effort to ease this financial burden, a non-credit online OAKS course is now offered to veteran and military students addressing topics such as financial aid options and applying for scholarships.

Access was given to (N=226) were given access to the course. Of those students:

- 74% (n=168) of students accessed the course overview but not the course materials
- 30% (n=68) of students accessed course materials

Although 74% of students accessed at least the overview of the course, only 30% accessed course materials. The goal for the following academic year is to increase student participation to 33%.

In order to improve student participation, detailed instructions will be sent to each student on how to access the course. In addition to instructional emails, periodic OAKS messages will be sent out to class list highlighting different course materials.

**Measure 2**

In order to assess the effectiveness of the instructional materials, students were given two end of module “knowledge checks”. The first module assessed their knowledge of the “FAFSA” and the second on “Additional Federal Student Aid Options”.

Each knowledge check consisted of five questions, with each question worth 20%. The average score for each module was:

- 80% for Module 1 FAFSA
- 56% for Module 2 Additional Federal Financial Aid Options

There was a considerable discrepancy between the scores for the FAFSA knowledge check (80%) and the Additional Federal Financial Aid Option knowledge check (56%). After reviewing the individual scores for each question in the Additional Financial Aid Option knowledge check, there were two questions that 80% of students answered incorrectly. The two questions identified were:

*What is the current interest rate for Federal Student Loans?*

a. 4%  
b. 5%  
c. 4.45%  
d. 3.5%

*What is the difference between a Federal Pell Grant and a Federal Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant?*

b. Pell Grants require financial need and Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants require exceptional financial need.  
c. Pell Grants are for undergraduate students while Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants are for graduate students.  
d. Pell Grants are required to be paid back, but Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants must be repaid.

After reviewing the identified questions, it was determined that the multiple choice answers were too similar, making it unnecessarily difficult for participants to determine the correct answer. To correct this issue, the answers will be rewritten for the next academic year.

**Measure 3**

To gauge the effectiveness of the course a focus group was conducted via online discussion with (N=5) students who accessed course materials. Students were asked a series of questions to identify which areas (if any) could use improvement. Unfortunately, no feedback was received, but students gave positive feedback regarding several other areas the course.

When asked:

*What parts of this course did you find most useful and interesting?*

- Essay and Letters of Recommendation
- Sample of scholarship writing and how to organize. Some great tips on filling out scholarship applications and how to ask for recommendation letters.
- That so many scholarships are offered to veterans only.

Though the feedback from the focus group was positive. It was limited and insufficient to gauge course effectiveness. To correct this shortfall, the focus group will be converted to an end of course survey open to all course participants.
Measure 4
After consulting with both the financial aid and the treasurer’s office, it has been determined that the only method to collect such data is for students to self-report when they receive a scholarship. Using this method, one student reported being the recipient of a $10,000 Student Veterans of America Scholarship.

After determining that the sole method for collecting financial aid data was to rely on students reporting when they receive a scholarship, it has been determined that the data gathered (if any) using this method would be unreliable and/or incomplete. As a result, this measure will be discontinued for the 2018-2019 academic year.

Outcome 2
Measure 1
The veteran and military resume workshop remained in development during the 2017-2018 academic year. However, student veterans were offered a resume workshop through a veteran career event held by a local nonprofit. During the workshop human resource professionals assisted veterans with writing, formatting and reviewing their resumes.

Program coordinator attended planning meetings during which it was established that nonprofit staff would track attendance and survey data, as the event was open to the public. In order to distinguish veteran student data from general data, a checkbox was used to identify students during check.

Attendance and survey data was collected by nonprofit staff with student data differentiated by use of a checkbox identifying them at check-in. Although it was agreed that veteran student data would be provided to program coordinator after event, it was never received. Despite several attempts to make contact with nonprofit staff, program coordinator was unable to get a response or data.

Measure 2
Attendance and survey data was collected by nonprofit staff with student data differentiated by use of a checkbox identifying them at check-in. Although it was agreed that veteran student data would be provided to program coordinator after event, it was never received. Despite several attempts to make contact with nonprofit staff, program coordinator was unable to get a response or data.

Due to the lack of attendance and survey data, there are no results to reflect on. However, in the future all data will be tracked by program coordinator rather than an outside organization to ensure information is both reliable and accessible. The veteran student resume workshop will launch fall 2018 at which data will begin to be collected.

Outcome 3
Measure 1
In order to assist new veteran and military students in their transition to campus, orientation breakout sessions and a student meet and greet are offered at the beginning of each semester. New students are encouraged to attend in order to receive key information on campus resources and services.

Of all the new veteran/military students (N=84) that attended fall 2017 orientation.
• 70% (n=59) of new students attended the veteran/military breakout session
• 18% (n=15) of new students attended the new student meet and greet
• 74% (n=62) of new students attended at least one new student event

Although fall 2017 orientation breakout sessions met the attendance goal set from the previous year, it was also identified that 31% (n=26) of new students were unable to attend. In order to ensure those students received the same information on services, an information session was added to the new student meet and greet. A total of 18% (n=15) of new students attended the meet and greet. This additional information session resulted in a total of 74% (n=62) of new students receiving the same information on services as those who attended a breakout session prior to starting classes.

A total of 28 new veteran/military students registered for spring 2017 orientation, however due to inclement weather and campus closure all scheduled new student events were cancelled. As a result, there is no data to report and the goal for spring orientation was not met. Although the scheduled events were cancelled and an information sheet with campus services was emailed to students.

After reviewing attendance data for the fall semester breakout session there remained a sizable group of new students who were unable to attend a session. To remedy this shortfall the new student meet and greet will expand the information session in order to accommodate students who are unable to attend a breakout session.

Measure 2
A focus group was conducted via online discussion with (N=5) students that attended at least one new veteran/military student event (orientation breakout session or new student meet and greet). Only one suggestion for improvement was provided. The new student focus group was asked:

What additional suggestions or information would you like to see added to our future new student events and presentations?
"Better review of staff and what their able to help with. Could even be a short simple breakdown in a handout highlighting these things."
A focus group was conducted via online discussion, however, rather than using a Likert scale as stated in the assessment methods section an online discussion group was used instead. The focus group consisted of (n=5) students that attended at least one veteran/military student new student event in fall 2017. Taking student suggestions into consideration from the previous year’s survey data, a social hour was added as an icebreaker to the meet and greet event. In addition, a more accessible location was selected that was easy to locate and convenient to parking. As an additional precaution, signs were posted throughout building directing students to location. There was no negative feedback recorded regarding the new student meet and greet location, signage, or convenience to parking, therefore this location change was considered a success.

The responses regarding the newly added social hour to the new student meet and greet was entirely positive and students had the following feedback when asked:

What did you find most valuable from attending the meet and greet?

• The interaction with other veterans. It offered a good support system while I make the transition from military to student life.
• I was able to get to know other Veterans...and this was key for me because of my age, I am more comfortable around the Veterans also because of the shared sacrifices in service.
• Meeting fellow veterans.

A focus group of five students who received a new student information packet will be asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the content. Students will evaluate packets using a Likert scale (1-Strong Agree through 5-Strongly Disagree) in addition to a brief knowledge check on the key campuses services covered in packet.

An information sheet has been distributed to new students in previous years however, using feedback from the student focus group, the program coordinator will create and distribute a comprehensive information packet to all new students covering campus services at new student events and via email for those unable to attend an event.

Measure 3
To assess the relevance and effectiveness of the materials presented during the veteran and military student orientation breakout session, a survey was sent via Qualtrics to the new students (N=82) that attended at least one new student event, either the breakout session or new student meet and greet.

32% (n=27) of the students responded to the survey. Of the students that completed the survey:

• 78% (n=18) strongly agreed that the topics and information presented during the breakout session were accurate and relevant to them.
• 83% (n=19) strongly agreed that they felt more aware of the services and programs available to them after attending the breakout session.
• 78% (n=18) strongly agreed that they knew where to get help with their academics.

Taking into account the increase in responses for the 2017-2018 survey, the Microsoft Word mail merge tool, will continue to be employed to send personalized emails to each new student with survey invitation. An additional reminder will be sent to the new student distribution list to increase responses to Qualtrics survey.

Center for International Education

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

Enhancement of faculty workshops with an increased focus on program development and budgeting. Increase customized programming (more customized programming = more programs offered).

Analysis of the 2017-2018 years’ data shows a 3.5% decrease of study abroad enrollment numbers. After peaking at 1,022 students in 2015-2016, the CIE has seen a decrease in participation for two consecutive years. While this is not surprising considering the unprecedented world events during the year, CIE implemented additional efforts to encourage more students to study abroad during their undergraduate career, increasing the number of globally-minded graduates from the College of Charleston. The decline does seem to be a nationwide trend.

The CIE strives to provide new resources to assist students with financial obstacles to study abroad so as to increase not only the overall number of students who benefit from this impactful experience but also to increase underrepresented populations such as Pell-eligible students. Scholarships are available to assist with the financial burdens of this experience, enabling more students to participate in study abroad. Maintaining and developing new outreach efforts to underrepresented students must continue to achieve the goal of increasing the diversity of the study abroad population.

CIE presents workshops for both faculty directors and students to enhance the holistic experience for participants. These workshops focus on improving all aspects from research, application, pre-departure preparation, onsite experience, and reflection. The program director seminars prepare faculty to lead quality study abroad programs with a particular emphasis on best practices for development and administration. Workshops for students highlight the extensive study abroad opportunities offered by CIE and inform on the resources available to them.
To further expand the study abroad opportunities for students, CIE should continue partnering with third party providers to offer customized programs for existing and new faculty-led programs. Over the last three years, the CIE has consistently added new program options with 49 offered in 2014-2015, 54 in 2015-2016, and 72 in 2017-2018.

Library

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

This is the third year the library has evaluated journal and database subscriptions using the process outlined in the Collections of Information Outcome, and so far we have received nothing but positive feedback from the faculty on this process. The results of this assessment demonstrate that we have clearly identified the large majority of the low to no use resources to which the library subscribes and have implemented an efficient and cohesive process to evaluate those resources for potential cancellation. We anticipated last year that future assessments will continue to show higher use of our resources as these low-no use resources are removed from the collection. This has proven to be true as the number of low to no use resources identified has dwindled from the previous year. In addition, the expected $38,139.54 savings from this outcome will allow the library to add a small number of new subscription-based resources in FY19 at a time when our budget has not received any new funding, aside from the cost of inflation for our existing subscription-based resources. Though the FY19 budget is effectively flat, with this small savings, we can continue to support some of the growing needs of the pedagogy of the College community and address faculty requests for additional subscriptions.

The Instruction Outcome focused on creating a new qualitative survey tool aimed at collecting experiential data from Special Collections reading room users (students, faculty, community members, scholars, genealogists, etc.) was predicated on the formal adoption of the Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services Metrics in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter referred to as the “Standard”) by the premier professional associations for academic/research libraries and archives, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and the Society of American Archivists (SAA). This Standard defines the collection of quantifiable statistics in archival and special collections reading rooms (how many, during what times, which collections, etc.) while the qualitative survey tool for assessing other more experiential aspects of public services interactions (the objective of this outcome) complements the aforementioned Standard. These two mechanisms for collecting assessment data from users can comprehensively inform daily workflows and performance targets. Unfortunately, adoption of the Standard (which was anticipated in the fall of 2017 but did not occur until late January of 2018) delayed the launch of the qualitative survey tool. As a result, data collection and analysis will continue into FY 2019.

While satisfaction with the library’s services measured in the Environment Outcome is high with 94% of students and 93% of faculty responding positively on the annual library user surveys, communication was cited as an area in need of improvement. To facilitate communication, the library has requested a license to smore, a linkable web-based newsletter software. This tool will be used by the librarians in each liaison area (discipline) to provide more timely email communication to faculty. In addition, the Associate Dean of Access, Instruction, & Assessment will be emailing newsletters directly to enrolled students. Dean White has also reconstituted the Library Social Media Working Group to unify our social media presence to provide more consistent, timely communication.

Office of Research & Grants Administration

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):

ORGA has introduced Twitter and Facebook as a new way of disseminating grant funding opportunities to faculty and departments. The old system was no longer functional for the purposes of ORGA. ORGA will monitor the effectiveness of social media in disseminating grant funding opportunities and other grant-related information to faculty.

The number of proposals submitted and grants awarded demonstrates a constantly high activity level with regard to research and grants at the college. However, in FY 2018, less grants proposals were submitted and less grants were funded (see outcome 2). This is not unusual as the number of proposals and awards shows cyclic variations. For example, in FY 2014, only 84 proposals were submitted. ORGA plans to increase outreach activities, such as collaboration with other offices at the college to find synergies, and increasing awareness among faculty about services provided by ORGA.

Special note on future strategic planning and assessment:

ORGA staff have discussed the current state of the strategic and assessment plans of previous years. After several meetings, ORGA staff came to the conclusion that the goals in the strategic plan as well as the outcomes in the assessment plans no longer reflect the tasks that ORGA staff are fulfilling. As a consequence, ORGA staff have made changes to the strategic plan and added new outcomes to the assessment plan for FY 2018-2019. This was necessary, because the post-award non-accounting services that ORGA provides...
were not included in the strategic and assessment plan. However, the post-award service area has taken up a large amount of resources in the course of the last two years. In addition, the goals in the previous strategic plan were not actually goals, but rather functions fulfilled by ORGA. To reflect ORGA’s tasks better, we have broadened our goals and added new outcomes. This will also result in changes in ORGA’s mission statement. Due to the diversification of tasks, ORGA plans to acquire a new IRB management system in fiscal year 2018-2019 in order to streamline coordination of processes.

All in all, ORGA has gone through major changes in fiscal year 2017-2018, with a staff reduction from 4 full-time employees to 3 full-time employees and one part-time employee. In fiscal year 2018-2019, the number of employees will be further reduced to 3 full-time employees due to retirement. This development resulted in employee cross-training and transfer of major service areas to different employees. Cross-training and knowledge transfer will continue in fiscal year 2018-2019.

**Provost Office**

**Assessment Report Summary**

7. **Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement:** Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

**Registrar's Office**

**Assessment Report Summary**

7. **Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement:** Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

**Our Mission**

The mission of the College of Charleston Office of the Registrar is to develop and maintain effective processes, procedures, and services necessary for the accurate and timely creation, maintenance, storage, auditing, transmission, and retrieval of student academic records from matriculation to graduation.

**Our Vision**

- The College of Charleston Office of the Registrar will preserve the integrity of the institution's academic record by upholding the academic policies of the institution and insuring compliance with state and federal regulations.
- The Office of the Registrar will strive to provide exemplary service by continually improving and technologically innovating our business processes for registration, scheduling, academic records, graduation, transfer credit evaluation, degree audit, and related functions.
- The Office of the Registrar will create and maintain a service-oriented office environment that encourages collaboration and cooperation with the constituencies it serves.
- The Office of the Registrar will treat every person with courtesy and respect while providing quality, professional service in every transaction.

**2017-2018 Assessment Cycle**

In 2017-2018, The Office of the Registrar continued to evaluate and fine-tune its mechanisms for improving the student experience and student satisfaction. We are driven by our goal of service excellence in all that we do.

Eileen Soisson, Director of Service Excellence at Coastal Carolina University, said it best in a January 2017 Academic Impressions article, “The customer is not always right, but it is our job to make the situation right.” She goes on to note, “...create an empowering culture that allows and encourages people to go out of their way for the good of the customer.”

**CUSTOMER SERVICE**

The Office of the Registrar continuously strives to exceed customer expectations and deliver positive outcomes. This assessment cycle presented us with an opportunity to utilize a customer service satisfaction survey to solicit and evaluate how we are performing with our customers.

**Measure 1.3:** The Office of the Registrar will electronically send an Appointment Manager customer satisfaction survey to all College of Charleston students/alumni who visit our office and sign in on our Appointment manager iPad with active credentials or telephoned the front office (843.953.5668) and provide active credentials from July 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018.

**Performance Target:** 100% of College of Charleston students/alumni who visited our office and signed in on our Appointment manager iPad with active credentials or telephoned the front office (843.953.5668) and provided active credentials from July 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018 electronically received a survey request.
Results: 100% of College of Charleston students/alumni who visited our office and signed in on our Appointment manager iPad with active credentials or telephoned the front office (843.953.5668) and provided active credentials from July 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018 electronically received a survey request.

Measure 1.4: The Office of the Registrar will evaluate customer service satisfaction survey results each quarter with the Office Manager, Senior Associate Registrar, the Associate Director of Student Systems Security, Access, and Training, and the Registrar to identify areas of success and opportunities for improvement.

Performance Target: Three customer service satisfaction areas will be identified. Three customer service opportunities for improvement will be identified.

Results: Our response rate was 5.19%. 7,587 students/alum received a survey during the specified time period. 394 students/alum responded to the survey which contained the following questions:

1. In thinking about your interaction with the Office of the Registrar, how would you rate the professionalism of the staff?
2. In thinking about your interaction with the Office of the Registrar, how would you rate the knowledge of the staff?
3. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with today’s interaction?
4. Was the purpose of your visit (call) resolved?

Responses available: Very satisfied; Somewhat satisfied; Neutral, Somewhat dissatisfied; Very dissatisfied/unprofessional/unknowledgeable

Areas of Success and Opportunities for Improvement:

Areas of Success: 1. Approximately 90% of all survey respondents indicated their issue was resolved. 2. 73% of the survey respondents indicated they were Very Satisfied with their overall experience with the RO. 3. 74% of survey respondents indicated they were Very Satisfied with their interaction with the RO.

Opportunities for Improvement: 1. The RO Office Manager will re-review front desk professional appearance and behavior protocol (i.e. gum chewing; cell phone viewing) with all team members. 2. The RO Office Manager in consultation with the Registrar will seek a computer monitor solution that does not block the customer service employee’s face from the visitor. 3. The RO Office Manager will provide a training with the customer service staff regarding non-verbal behaviors and body language. This training will include methods for providing top-notch customer service.

Customer service will continued to be assessed in 2018-2019 in Measure 1.5 and 1.6.

ACALOG CATALOG SYSTEM

Measure 2.3: The Office of the Registrar will evaluate Google Analytics report results from July 1, 2017-May 31, 2018 to identify areas of low and high traffic in the online catalog system.

Performance Target: Five high and five low traffic areas/trends will be identified.

Results: Target Met. The Office of the Registrar collected Google Analytics data on catalog.cofc.edu from July 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018. The top five navigation menu traffic areas (excluding Search and Home landing page) were as follows***:

1. Course Descriptions: 203,764 page views*; 87,907 unique page views**
2. Programs of Study Filter: 79,827 page views*; 20,633 unique page views**
3. General Education Requirements: 21,857 page views*; 8,852 unique page views**
4. Academic Regulations: 18,163 page views*; 7,579 unique page views**
5. Personal Catalog Feature: 13,572 page views*; 5,199 unique page views** 

During this assessment period, 2,106 students created a personal catalog. Overall, 6,805 have been created since February 1, 2016.

The five low traffic navigation menu areas were as follows (this only includes pages that received a hit; unvisited pages are excluded)***:

The bottom results were single page view items. They contained courses and program planners. This type of information is not helpful in evaluating major sections of the catalog. Going forward, we will restrict our data to section headers of the navigation menu.

*page view is the total number of pages viewed...repeated views of a single page are counted
**unique page views is the number of sessions during which the specified page was viewed at least once
***See evidence-report-google-analytics-17-18.PDF for details of this data.
Measure 2.4: The Office of the Registrar will evaluate Google Analytics report results from July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018 to identify areas of low and high program of study traffic in the online catalog system.

Performance Target: The top ten undergraduate major and minor programs of study traffic areas/trends will be identified.

Results: Target Met. Program of study data for this year is as follows (see ***evidence report for specific page views):

Majors
1. Biology, BS
2. Business Administration, BS
3. Computer Science, BS
4. Exercise Science, BS
5. Public Health, BS
6. Psychology, BS
7. Communication, BA
8. Psychology, BA
9. Marine Biology, BS
10. Marketing, BS

Minors
1. Psychology
2. Spanish
3. Business Administration
4. Marketing
5. Environmental and Sustainability Studies
6. Neuroscience
7. Entrepreneurship
8. Real Estate
9. Crime, Law, and Society
10. Studio Art

*page view is the total number of pages viewed...repeated views of a single page are counted
**unique page views is the number of sessions during which the specified page was viewed at least once

***See evidence-report-google-analytics-17-18.PDF for details of this data.

SPECIAL TOPICS SHOPPING

Process improvement is often the result of multiple small incremental changes over time. The Office of the Registrar utilizes the assessment process to make sure we are continually aware of improvement opportunities on our campus. Special Topics Shopping provided us with an great opportunity to make sure the defined expectations for this practice were still accurate, relevant and supportive.

As context, the Special Topics Shopping (STS) process was developed and implemented in partnership with Academic Affairs as an exception management tool designed to reduce the number of individual student exceptions involved when a special topics (ST) course is applied to an interdisciplinary minor or major. Chairs and program directors were involved in the creation of the process. Departments were asked to provide detailed descriptions for all ST courses offered in a given semester. Prior to the start of that semester, directors were able to “shop” for ST courses appropriate for credit in their interdisciplinary program and the course was added to the degree audit block for that semester only so that the course counted in the same way for all students enrolled in the course and in the program. This had the added benefit of ending retrospective shopping for courses as a student’s desired graduation date neared. The STS process allowed program directors to be proactive in creating appropriate curriculum.
Measure 3.1: The Office of the Registrar will collect data from Degree Works special topics scribing blocks; student degree audits; commentary from faculty and staff emails and conversations/meetings as related to the Special Topics Shopping process.

Performance Target: Fall 2016 course data for all Degree Works scribing blocks and audits for currently declared students will be reviewed to identify whether or not it supports a recommendation for continuation or cessation of the Special Topics Shopping process.

Results: Target Met. The Office of the Registrar’s assessment of the STS process has identified a number of unintended outcomes leading us to conclude that STS is no longer a viable exception management tool. First, chairs and program directors embraced the process as a way to advertise their courses to students rather than as a tool to limit curriculum exceptions. The Office of the Registrar scribed a few thousand major and minor blocks for shopped ST courses, but fewer than 50 would have required an exception to apply the course to their program of study. The workload to pre-scribe the courses in the blocks is excessive by comparison to the few individual exceptions that would have resulted without STS. Despite having deadlines in place to support transparency for students registered for courses, we continually received “shopping” requests well beyond the deadline. Secondly, because faculty did not fully understand or embrace the purpose of STS (limit individual exceptions and reduce retroactive credit shopping coincident to graduation), they repeatedly asked to “shop” other repeatable course (variable topics, selected topics, readings). The structure of these types of courses do not permit them to be pre-scribed by term in the same way as ST courses. Falsely believing that STS was about promoting enrollments in their “shop” other repeatable course (variable topics, selected topics, readings). The structure of these types of courses do not permit them to be pre-scribed by term in the same way as ST courses. Falsely believing that STS was about promoting enrollments in their interdisciplinary program and the course was also added to the degree audit block for that semester only so that the course counted in the same way for all students enrolled in the course and in the program. This had the added benefit of ending retrospective shopping for courses as a student’s desired graduation date neared. The STS process allowed program directors to be proactive in creating appropriate curriculum.

A recent assessment of the STS process has identified a number of unintended outcomes leading me to conclude that STS is no longer a viable exception management tool. First, chairs and program directors embraced the process as a way to advertise their courses to students rather than as a tool to limit curriculum exceptions. The Office of the Registrar scribed a few thousand major and minor blocks for shopped ST courses, but fewer than 50 would have required an exception to apply the course to their program of study. The workload to pre-scribe the courses in the blocks is excessive by comparison to the few individual exceptions that would have resulted without STS. Despite having deadlines in place to support transparency for students registered for courses, we continually received “shopping” requests well beyond the deadline. Secondly, because faculty did not fully understand or embrace the purpose of STS (limit individual exceptions and reduce retroactive credit shopping coincident to graduation), they repeatedly asked to “shop” other repeatable course (variable topics, selected topics, readings). The structure of these types of courses do not permit them to be pre-scribed by term in the same way as ST courses. Falsely believing that STS was about promoting enrollments in their courses, faculty claimed it was “unfair” to limit STS to Special Topics (see minutes from several FCC meetings). Finally, the change to GPA calculation policy approved by the Faculty Senate combined with pre-scribing and STS has resulted in problems for students who enrolled in a course without knowing that it would be scribed into a major/minor block and subsequently counted within a GPA calculation.

Measure 3.2: Utilizing the data noted in Measure 3.1, the Office of the Registrar will make a recommendation as to whether or not Special Topics Shopping is a viable process to continue for the 2018-19 catalog year.

Performance Target: The University Registrar will create and submit a memo to the Associate Provost for Curriculum & Institutional Resources on or before June 30, 2018 with a recommendation for whether or not Special Topics Shopping should continue for the 2018-19 catalog year.

Results: Target Met. The University Registrar created and submitted on March 26, 2018 recommending that the College of Charleston discontinue the special topics shopping process. The recommendation was reviewed and approved by the Provost and Deans. Special Topics Shopping ends on July 1, 2018. See memorandum below:

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lynn Cherry, Associate Provost for Curriculum & Institutional Resources
FROM: Mary C. Bergstrom, Registrar
DATE: March 26, 2018
SUBJECT: Special Topics Shopping

This memo is to notify you that effective June 30, 2018, the Office of the Registrar will discontinue the Special Topics Shopping process.

As context, the Special Topics Shopping (STS) process was developed and implemented in partnership with Academic Affairs as an exception management tool designed to reduce the number of individual student exceptions involved when a special topics (ST) course is applied to an interdisciplinary minor or major. Chairs and program directors were involved in the creation of the process. Departments were asked to provide detailed descriptions for all ST courses offered in a given semester. Prior to the start of that semester, directors were able to “shop” for ST courses appropriate for credit in their interdisciplinary program and the course was added to the degree audit block for that semester only so that the course counted in the same way for all students enrolled in the course and in the program. This had the added benefit of ending retrospective shopping for courses as a student’s desired graduation date neared. The STS process allowed program directors to be proactive in creating appropriate curriculum.

A recent assessment of the STS process has identified a number of unintended outcomes leading me to conclude that STS is no longer a viable exception management tool. First, chairs and program directors embraced the process as a way to advertise their courses to students rather than as a tool to limit curriculum exceptions. The Office of the Registrar scribed a few thousand major and minor blocks for shopped ST courses, but fewer than 50 would have required an exception to apply the course to their program of study. The workload to pre-scribe the courses in the blocks is excessive by comparison to the few individual exceptions that would have resulted without STS. Despite having deadlines in place to support transparency for students registered for courses, we continually received “shopping” requests well beyond the deadline. Secondly, because faculty did not fully understand or embrace the purpose of STS (limit individual exceptions and reduce retroactive credit shopping coincident to graduation), they repeatedly asked to “shop” other repeatable course (variable topics, selected topics, readings). The structure of these types of courses do not permit them to be pre-scribed by term in the same way as ST courses. Falsely believing that STS was about promoting enrollments in their courses, faculty claimed it was “unfair” to limit STS to Special Topics (see minutes from several FCC meetings). Finally, the change to GPA calculation policy approved by the Faculty Senate combined with pre-scribing and STS has resulted in problems for students who enrolled in a course without knowing that it would be scribed into a major/minor block and subsequently counted within a GPA calculation.

Results: Target Met. The Office of the Registrar’s assessment of the STS process has identified a number of unintended outcomes leading us to conclude that STS is no longer a viable exception management tool. First, chairs and program directors embraced the process as a way to advertise their courses to students rather than as a tool to limit curriculum exceptions. The Office of the Registrar scribed a few thousand major and minor blocks for shopped ST courses, but fewer than 50 would have required an exception to apply the course to their program of study. The workload to pre-scribe the courses in the blocks is excessive by comparison to the few individual exceptions that would have resulted without STS. Despite having deadlines in place to support transparency for students registered for courses, we continually received “shopping” requests well beyond the deadline. Secondly, because faculty did not fully understand or embrace the purpose of STS (limit individual exceptions and reduce retroactive credit shopping coincident to graduation), they repeatedly asked to “shop” other repeatable course (variable topics, selected topics, readings). The structure of these types of courses do not permit them to be pre-scribed by term in the same way as ST courses. Falsely believing that STS was about promoting enrollments in their courses, faculty claimed it was “unfair” to limit STS to Special Topics (see minutes from several FCC meetings). Finally, the change to GPA calculation policy approved by the Faculty Senate combined with pre-scribing and STS has resulted in problems for students who enrolled in a course without knowing that it would be scribed into a major/minor block and subsequently counted within a GPA calculation.

Measure 3.2: Utilizing the data noted in Measure 3.1, the Office of the Registrar will make a recommendation as to whether or not Special Topics Shopping is a viable process to continue for the 2018-19 catalog year.

Performance Target: The University Registrar will create and submit a memo to the Associate Provost for Curriculum & Institutional Resources on or before June 30, 2018 with a recommendation for whether or not Special Topics Shopping should continue for the 2018-19 catalog year.

Results: Target Met. The University Registrar created and submitted on March 26, 2018 recommending that the College of Charleston discontinue the special topics shopping process. The recommendation was reviewed and approved by the Provost and Deans. Special Topics Shopping ends on July 1, 2018. See memorandum below:

MEMORANDUM

TO: Lynn Cherry, Associate Provost for Curriculum & Institutional Resources
FROM: Mary C. Bergstrom, Registrar
DATE: March 26, 2018
SUBJECT: Special Topics Shopping

This memo is to notify you that effective June 30, 2018, the Office of the Registrar will discontinue the Special Topics Shopping process.

As context, the Special Topics Shopping (STS) process was developed and implemented in partnership with Academic Affairs as an exception management tool designed to reduce the number of individual student exceptions involved when a special topics (ST) course is applied to an interdisciplinary minor or major. Chairs and program directors were involved in the creation of the process. Departments were asked to provide detailed descriptions for all ST courses offered in a given semester. Prior to the start of that semester, directors were able to “shop” for ST courses appropriate for credit in their interdisciplinary program and the course was added to the degree audit block for that semester only so that the course counted in the same way for all students enrolled in the course and in the program. This had the added benefit of ending retrospective shopping for courses as a student’s desired graduation date neared. The STS process allowed program directors to be proactive in creating appropriate curriculum.

A recent assessment of the STS process has identified a number of unintended outcomes leading me to conclude that STS is no longer a viable exception management tool. First, chairs and program directors embraced the process as a way to advertise their courses to students rather than as a tool to limit curriculum exceptions. The Office of the Registrar scribed a few thousand major and minor blocks for shopped ST courses, but fewer than 50 would have required an exception to apply the course to their program of study. The workload to pre-scribe the courses in the blocks is excessive by comparison to the few individual exceptions that would have resulted without STS. Despite having deadlines in place to support transparency for students registered for courses, we continually received “shopping” requests well beyond the deadline. Secondly, because faculty did not fully understand or embrace the purpose of STS (limit individual exceptions and reduce retroactive credit shopping coincident to graduation), they repeatedly asked to “shop” other repeatable course (variable topics, selected topics, readings). The structure of these types of courses do not permit them to be pre-scribed by term in the same way as ST courses. Falsely believing that STS was about promoting enrollments in their courses, faculty claimed it was “unfair” to limit STS to Special Topics (see minutes from several FCC meetings). Finally, the change to GPA calculation policy approved by the Faculty Senate combined with pre-scribing and STS has resulted in problems for students who enrolled in a course without knowing that it would be scribed into a major/minor block and subsequently counted within a GPA calculation.
GPA calculation approved by the Faculty Senate combined with pre-scribing and STS has resulted in problems for students who enrolled in a course without knowing that it would be scribed into a major/minor block and subsequently counted within a GPA calculation.

Special Topics courses remain popular with faculty and programs. The Office of the Registrar will continue to support departments and programs that wish to schedule Special Topics courses (see below). For the reasons described above, the Office of the Registrar will no longer scribe term based special topics courses for specific majors and minors. Exceptions will be submitted and entered on a student-by-student basis.

Registration and Scheduling

-Our Registration and Scheduling Team will continue to solicit course titles and descriptions from Departments for data entry in Banner.

-The Registration and Scheduling Team will continue to place the “ST” attribute on special topics courses.

-The Special Topics Course Descriptions Archive located on our website will be removed September 1, 2018. (http://registrar.cofc.edu/course-offerings/index.php)

-Students and faculty will continue to have the ability to view and research the individual special topic titles and course descriptions for a given term in Self Service Banner (SSB).

-Faculty will continue to have access to the Descriptions for Special Topics Course Sections report in COGNOS (Public Folders > Student > Academic Administrative Reporting).

This topic will not continue in our 2018-2019 assessment plans.

Summer Sessions

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

As a result of thorough and consistent review of student information in Target X before those records are uploaded into Banner, the number of error records reported by IRPIM this summer was down 62% compared to the previous year. As IRPIM only ran one error report this summer, measure one was negated and measure two was automatically attained.

As a result of supplying concise step by step application instructions at the Summer Sessions website and enhancing the lawful presence verification process, the turnaround time between submissions of visiting student applications and visiting student registration has decreased greatly. Last year both measures indicated that the turnaround time was 14-15 days. This summer both measures indicated that the turnaround time decreased to 12-14 days.

Due to the College's membership in NC-SARA and the fact that we are a public institution that offers no online programs at present, no visiting summer students were removed from online courses this summer and no measures were required. However, state authorizations are a changing landscape from year to year and the summer school office will continue to monitor state authorizations annually, especially noting the permanent addresses of visiting summer students who are only enrolled in online courses and removing those students from those courses if their permanent addresses are in states the College is not authorized to offer online courses at that time.

Baseline measurements indicate that most academic departments and programs are not following the summer session guidelines concerning the initiation of contracts 60 days before each part of term in summer begins. In fact, Summer II was the only part of term with more than 50% of the contracts initiated before the 60 day deadline. With additional communication to chairs, program directors and admin assists, we hope to attain that 50% measure or more in all parts of term next summer. Notifying contract initiators of errors quickly is an area that needs improvement as well. This past summer only 40% of the initiators were notified of errors within 5 days. With quicker communication to chairs, program directors and admin assists, we hope to attain a 50% or more measurement next summer.

This year the changes we have made to visiting application instructions and the process for verifying lawful presence have resulted in shorter turnaround times for completion of visiting student applications, which shortens the visiting student registration process as well. We will continue to tweak those instructions and add videos that will aid visiting students in use of the College's email and electronic payment systems. Although the total number of errors in Banner student records dropped significantly this year, next year we will request that IRPIM send us error records more than once during the summer terms. This will enhance our ability to keep student records as error free as possible at any one given time in the summer. We will continue to monitor NC-SARA before summer registration begins to make sure any changes in state authorization are reflected in our registration instructions. Finally, our baseline figures for contract initiation indicate that we must begin monitoring that process as soon as the RO makes the summer schedule of
courses available. The first three outcomes and corresponding sets of measures and our planned measures for improving contract initiation and contract error notification all align well with the Summer Sessions dedication to efficient/effective service to students and faculty and accurate maintenance of their records.

Sustainability Literacy Institute

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

2017-2018 was the first year of operations for the SLI. All baseline targets were met, but in terms of daily functions more resources would be helpful for the SLI. Specifically the SLI would benefit from a 40-hour a week full-time administrative assistant to help with logistical planning of SLI events, web presence, and campus outreach to faculty, staff, and especially students. In year 1 this position was at 20 hours a week but more hours were found to work 28 hours via the employee starting the position in October so hours from July, August, and September were redistributed throughout the year. In terms of specific outcomes related to research the SLI director should focus more research efforts on publishing and presenting on sustainability, and the SLI Fellows should be encouraged to do the same. The Faculty Development fellow should reach out to SLI affiliated faculty to track the publications and presentations related to sustainability these affiliated faculty have completed each year. In terms of student education and the outcome related to internships the SLI director should also work with the ENVSS minor to work on a description for an internship position and recruit interns via the ENSS program. The SLI should also consider partnering with SURF on faculty/student research, both to fund research and then have that research presented at the August showing of student summer research. For outreach the SLI should approach student clubs and Civic Engagement and look into forming community partnerships based on service opportunities on sustainability issues. The Innovation Fellow needs to be more proactive in making partnerships in the community, as well. In terms of education the SLI should consider increasing compensation for teaching SR courses up to $500. Lastly in terms of both faculty development and community outreach the SLI should consider bringing more sustainability experts to campus for faculty trainings, and while those experts are here meet with off-campus constituents to help broaden the reach of the SLI into the community. It is suggested that the faculty trainings with sustainability experts be incentivized in some capacity by the Provost and/or Deans to help encourage faculty participation.

QEP

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

The most immediate learning gains for the QEP in year 1 related to recruiting faculty to teach SF/SR courses by incentivizing their participation in new ways; providing an event introduction script that speaks more directly to the triple bottom line and literacy about sustainability, to help the audience make clearer connections between the event and the goals of the QEP; having OIEP host a discussion/focus group training with SLI faculty, staff, GAs, and Assessment Team and the creation of a discussion/focus group guide; faculty feedback on the first May training informed the May 2018 faculty training on how to teach sustainability literacy; and continued strategizing for outreach/marketing occurred, including the development of a more robust social media presence for the SLI on social media platforms.

Undergraduate Research & Creative Activities

Assessment Report Summary

7. Summary of Assessment Results with Focus on Program Improvement: Describe evidence-based changes that have taken place within the last few assessment cycles because of assessment. Statements must be supported by evidence from the assessment report(s):.

Participation in undergraduate research and creative activities has been shown to be a critical factor in student development. Moreover, the disciplinary skills, and the application of those skills, likely increases student long-term success. As we strive to increase the number of students involved in this high impact learning experience, we will contribute to the increase in successful students the college will graduate. The individual faculty mentors are the conveyors of the disciplinary learning, however, the URCA office provides a critical resource by funding mentored research and creative works. Overall, the URCA office is helping to serve the needs of the students and faculty engaged in undergraduate research.

The URCA office has focused on three primary outcomes to assess:

Communication: The URCA office continues to improve the communication of research opportunities for students. In addition to posters and information sessions, we have created a Facebook account and a Yammer account in order to communicate opportunities to the campus. Both of these media venues continue to be active. We continue to be challenged by the migration to Yammer in on-campus communication, but were able to post nearly twice as many postings this year as in the past. We were able to collect useful data this year that indicates the URCA website is the primary source of information for the students/faculty who are applying for grants. Thus, we will work this year to strengthen that aspect of our communication. Unfortunately, we don't know the best means by which to
engage new applicants, so we will continue our efforts in our other communication methods as well. We enhanced communication directly to the department chairs this past year in the hopes that information will be passed down to the faculty. We did see an increase in grant submissions this past year, so we will continue those efforts. In addition to providing on campus opportunities, the URCA office has recently made a concerted effort to communicate undergraduate research opportunities more broadly to the students. The data indicate this information is reaching the public, and we will continue to increase this communication in the upcoming year, as resources allow. Unfortunately, the office lacks the manpower to increase communication much beyond what is currently being done.

Disciplinary excellence: We have little information on the impact of URCA grants on the disciplinary excellence of the students. We continue to struggle with the most effective and comprehensive way to collect student impact and outcomes. Last year, we began to collect data on student outcomes regarding presentations and post-graduate plans. Many of the students who are receiving URCA funding are presenting their work in a public forum. This is extremely encouraging and we were thrilled to hit the 100% target for the first time this year. Many of the presentations are local, and while valuable, we will continue to encourage students to present at regional and national conferences the upcoming year. Unfortunately, resources are limited and conference travel can be expensive. Some of the outcome data are difficult to obtain, thus, we are not sure we have established a clear baseline from which to project improvements. We will continue to work with faculty and students to develop a more accurate database of student success. Unfortunately, this takes resources we do not currently have. An additional measure we implemented this past upcoming year was a direct measurement of disciplinary excellence by scoring poster presentations for those students who received summer grants. These data have provided us with a baseline for this particular learning outcome, but is extremely labor intensive. Overall, we are very pleased with the quality of the experience students are getting as a result of URCA funding.

Financial resources: Over the past 11 years, the URCA office has maintained a healthy, unwavering budget. However, two years ago, due to the college's budget deficit, the URCA office took a 2.7% mid-year reduction in its operating budget. This budget cut continues to have a negative effect on student support. It is unlikely that the operating budget will be restored in the near future, thus, efforts to increase support of the foundation account will be a priority. We have been posting links to the foundation account more prominently on the website and on Facebook and we did receive one new donation this year. It is important to note that over the past several years, non-URCA resources were increased (NIH, HHMI funds, SSM Dean's Excellence) on campus, especially in the research intensive disciplines of biology and chemistry. This allows for those student-faculty teams to be supported through the School of Science and Math, and for URCA to provide a more equitable distribution of funds across campus.