

Florida State College at Jacksonville



End-of-the-Year Report of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee 2012-2013 Academic Year

Prepared by:

Lynne S. Crosby, Ph.D.

Roxanne Jordan, Ed. D.

Erin L. Richman, Ph.D.

July 2013

Table of Contents

Overview

Annual Goals

1. Review the annual Institutional Effectiveness Assessment plans/reports of all programs and units at the College
2. Assess the Effectiveness of the Institutional Effectiveness Process, Systems, and Resources
3. Improve review and feedback process of the Committee
4. Develop “End-of-Year” Committee Report
5. Recognize exemplary work by Effectiveness Process Facilitators and their Programs and Units
6. Develop Plans/Mechanisms to Enhance Employee Awareness of Institutional Effectiveness via the use of ‘Ambassadors’
7. Develop plans/mechanisms to enhance employee awareness of Institutional Effectiveness via marketing campaign
8. Develop and deliver mid-cycle survey to monitor progress on programs’ and units’ plan implementation
9. Develop and deliver web-based tutorials on assessment-related practices and tasks

Review of Assessment Reports and Plans

1. Timeline
2. Assessment of Non-Academic IE Assessment Reports and Plans
3. Assessment of Academic IE Assessment Reports and Plans

Preparations for Next Year

Appendices

Appendix A: List of Committee Members

Appendix B: Meeting Dates

Appendix C: Revised IE Assessment Report Rubrics for Academic Programs and Disciplines

Appendix D: Revised IE Assessment Report Rubrics for Non-Academic Units/Educational Support Services

Appendix E: Timeline for Submission of Non-Academic IE Assessment Reports & Plans

Appendix F: Timeline for Submission of Academic IE Assessment Reports & Plans

Overview

The purpose of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) is to 1) provide oversight, guidelines and resources for institutional effectiveness activities, 2) support program and unit-level development and implementation of academic and non-academic assessment activities, 3) support and monitor College activities pertaining to SACSCOC standards of institutional effectiveness, and 4) support the College's commitment in establishing institutional effectiveness as an ongoing and integral part of its culture and emphasis on quality programs and services. This marks the third full year (2012-2013) of the collegewide Institutional Effectiveness Committee. In response to feedback received from committee members after the first year (2010-2011) the organizational structure of the Committee was expanded to further reflect the diversity of units and programs and to increase the number of members who may participate in the collegewide review of programs' and units' annual assessment reports and plans. By introducing new members to the Committee, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Accreditation also created a two-year rolling term of service for all Committee members. Thus, Committee members who began their term of service in 2010-2011 concluded their service at the end of the 2011-2012 year. Members who joined the Committee in 2011-2012 will conclude their term of service at the end of the 2012-2013 year. The Committee is designed to reflect the diversity of units and programs and ensure broad-based involvement of employee groups. Committee members include faculty, career employees and administrative and professional employees. Appendix A lists the 2012-2013 Committee members and their role at the College. The full membership of the Committee met nine times throughout the year to carry out its responsibilities. The Committee meeting schedule may be found in Appendix B.

The Co-chairs of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee for the 2012-2013 Academic year were Dr. Lynne Crosby, Associate Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation as District representative, and Dr. Erin Richman, Professor of Psychology at South Campus, as Faculty representative. The Co-chairs were responsible for guiding the Committee through the completion of its annual goals and the review of all assessment plans and reports in a timely manner. The Co-Chairs, along with Dr. Roxanne Jordan, Institutional Effectiveness Officer (District) held weekly meetings to plan Committee activities and related IE efforts. This team also provided support and guidance to all employees of the College in understanding, implementing and carrying out the Institutional Effectiveness Assessment process.

II. Annual Goals

For the academic year of 2012-2013, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Accreditation set nine goals for the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, as follows:

1. Review the annual Institutional Effectiveness Assessment plans/reports of all programs and units at the College
2. Assess the Effectiveness of the Institutional Effectiveness Process, Systems, and Resources
3. Improve review and feedback process of the Committee
4. Develop “End-of-Year” Committee Report
5. Recognize exemplary work by Effectiveness Process Facilitators and their Programs and Units
6. Develop Plans/Mechanisms to enhance employee awareness of Institutional Effectiveness via the use of ‘Ambassadors’
7. Develop plans/mechanisms to enhance employee awareness of Institutional Effectiveness via marketing campaign
8. Develop and deliver mid-cycle survey to monitor progress on programs’ and units’ plan implementation
9. Develop and deliver web-based tutorials on assessment-related practices and tasks

A. Goal #1 – Review the annual Institutional Effectiveness Assessment plans/reports of all programs and units at the College

To ensure accurate reviews of all annual assessment reports and plans, the Committee underwent multiple sessions of rubric training and range finding exercises. A full-day Rubric Training and Range Finding Exercise for the Non-Academic Rubrics was held on October 12, 2012. In this session all Committee members were trained on how to interpret and apply the Non-Academic Rubric for IE Assessment for Plans and Reports. Dr. Charles Smires and Professor of English Susan Slavicz facilitated the session, utilizing a range of sample reports and plans for Committee members to respond to and deliberate over with the objective of norming the groups’ application of the rubric to particular reports and plans. A separate Rubric Training and Range Finding Exercise was held for the Academic Rubrics on May 17th, 2013. In this case, a revised rubric for the IE Assessment Reports for Academic Programs/Disciplines was used (Appendix C). Dr. Smires with Professor of English, Susan Slavicz, also facilitated this session. For each session, any Committee members who could not attend due to significant schedule conflicts were asked to

attend a make-up event based on the range finding the Committee completed during the corresponding training session.

B. Goal #2 – Assess the effectiveness of the institutional effectiveness process, systems, and resources

As the current process is fairly new at the College, it is important to periodically gather input on the status of the process, system and resources. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Accreditation administered a survey to the members of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in late spring 2013. Approximately 50% (17) of the committee members (as of April 2013) responded to the web-based survey. Responses are based on the current perceptions of the IE Committee members, a diverse group of individuals from academic programs, educational support services, and non-academic units. The committee members were asked to rate the current status and the amount of recent improvement to the particular item. This data was analyzed and reported to the IE Committee at its last meeting of the year, on May 17, 2013.

The survey used a three level scale that matched the rubrics used to review the IE Assessment Plans and Reports. The scales were stated as Exemplary, Progressing, and Developing. Based on the survey responses, the following aspects are current strengths:

- “The OIEA and IE Committee reviews effectively communicate that programs and units should assess multiple outcomes per year, with direct assessment measures aligned with the outcomes, and use the assessment findings to make improvements to programs/disciplines, curriculum, student learning, services and functions. (50.0% Exemplary, 43.8% Progressing, and 6.3% Developing)
- “The IE Manuals are comprehensive, and provide the philosophy and guidelines of the IE process.” (62.5% Exemplary, 31.3% Progressing, and 6.3% Developing)
- “Sufficient human resources are devoted to the collegewide IE Process.” (50.0% Exemplary, 43.8% Progressing, and 6.3% Developing)
- “Professional development workshops and refresher sessions, and individual program/unit consultations are provided to faculty, staff and administration.” (50.0% Exemplary, 50.0% Progressing, and 0% Developing)

Based on the survey responses, the following aspects may benefit from improvement:

- “Systems are in place to provide periodic reports of the quality of IE assessment activities and participation level (per program/unit and collegewide) to administration and other

stakeholders.” (25.0% Exemplary, 68.8% Progressing, and 6.3% Developing)

- “Programs and units receive constructive feedback on their IE Assessment Plans and Reports.” (37.5% Exemplary, 56.3% Progressing, and 6.3% Developing)
- “Systems are in place to ensure that all programs and units participate in the annual IE assessment process in a complete and timely manner.” (37.5% Exemplary, 62.5% Progressing, and 0% Developing)

Other item responses include:

- “Systems are in place to house and share IE plans and reports for all programs and units.” (43.8% Exemplary, 50.0% Progressing, and 6.3% Developing)
- “The IE Process is guided by College procedures, published timelines, and clear expectations on the quality of IE Assessment Plans and Reports, and their associated activities.” (43.8% Exemplary, 56.3% Progressing, and 0% Developing)

The information collected from the survey is reviewed and used to make improvements to the Institutional Effectiveness, process, system and resources.

C. Goal #3 - Improve review and feedback process of the Committee

In an effort to improve the review and feedback between the Committee and Effectiveness Process Facilitators, some modifications of the process were implemented in the 2012-2013 year. First, instead of administering only a Fall term feedback survey to Effectiveness Process Facilitators as has been in previous years, this year the Committee designed and instituted a mid-cycle survey to ascertain their needs. In addition, the rubric for IE Assessment Reports were slightly modified to include a category called, “Improvements Achieved” (Appendices C and D). While entering assessment data in WEAVEonline, Effectiveness Process Facilitators can input improvements achieved for program and unit outcomes.

Finally, in an effort to assess the effectiveness of the working relationship between the Committee and the OIEA, an anonymous, voluntary online survey was administered to the Committee members following the October, 2012, range finding training. This online survey asked members to evaluate their perceptions of the usefulness and timeliness of the range finding training. Out of 38 members, 23 responded to the survey (60% response rate). Among respondents, 89% agreed or strongly agreed that the rubric range finding training sessions were effective and 99% agreed or strongly agreed that the training session well-timed in relation to

when members were expected to review plans/reports. Overall, this suggests that rubric range finding training sessions were both effective and timely in delivering training to the Committee's members.

D. Goal #4 – Develop “End-of-Year” Committee Report

The “End-of-Year” Report summarizes the major activities of the Committee and was created through several drafts with the opportunity for comment by all Committee members. Committee Co-Chair Erin Richman drafted the “End-of-Year” Report. After revisions by Committee Co-Chair and Associate Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Lynne Crosby and Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Officer Roxanne Jordan, the report was submitted to the Committee for recommendations for improvement during the April 19th, 2013 IE Committee meeting. After integrating Committee members' feedback, the completed report was delivered via email to all Committee members and made available to Cabinet.

E. Goal #5 – Recognize exemplary work by Effectiveness Process Facilitators and their programs and units

Committee members [Donna Martin, Sondra Evans, Samantha Ertenberg, Karen Arlington, Sheri Litt, Wendy Perniciaro, and Terry Sawma], proposed creating an Institutional Effectiveness Honor Roll as part of an annual IE recognition process for Effectiveness Process Facilitators and their programs and units. The recommendations included creating an Honor Roll for exemplary plans and reports produced by disciplines, programs, and units. Other recommendations include a creating a public, viewable Honor Roll that would be housed at the Administrative Offices, but be portable so that it could be displayed at IE Days when honorees are recognized. The Committee supported the overall concept of these recommendations, yet also recognize that collaboration and support from Campus Presidents and other College leadership will be vital to larger institutional support.

F. Goal #6 – Develop plans to enhance employee awareness of Institutional Effectiveness via the ‘Ambassadors’

Committee members [John Marr, Janice Amos, Don Hughes, John Grissett, Jeff Knapp, Reta Roberts, and Audrey Jackson], proposed the development of a secondary, college wide group at the College beyond the Committee trained and available as support and mentorship in matters related to institutional effectiveness; such a group will be known as “IE Ambassadors.” Ambassadors will be

former Committee members and located on the campuses for convenient access. Additionally, they will be recognized for their service to the Committee and the larger effort of Institutional Effectiveness at the College. The Committee supported these recommendations. The “IE Ambassadors” project will be maintained through the Committee and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Accreditation next year, however, activities and materials used by Ambassadors may require continued collaboration and consent from other divisions at the College.

G. Goal #7 – Develop plans to enhance employee awareness of Institutional Effectiveness via a marketing/communications campaign

Committee members [Beth Tuckwiller, Rose Zurawski, Melanie Clark, Derrick Johnson, Margo Martin, Patricia Butler, and Wendy Norfleet], developed a layered concept for promoting the awareness of institutional effectiveness activities across the College with attention to positive messages, engaging visuals, and media-enriched delivery methods. Their plan included utilizing QR Codes, designing an internal slogan and logo specific to institutional effectiveness at the College, and creating a visually engaging webpage to post and distribute user-friendly information related to IE. Additionally, they designed coasters with the IE logo on them in an effort to promote the integration of IE into faculty and staff’s workspaces throughout the College.

H. Goal #8 – Develop and Deliver mid-cycle survey to monitor progress on programs’ and units’ plan implementation

Committee members [John Carter, John A. Woodward, Wayne Singletary, Maggy Dartiguenave, Beth Harvey, Ebru Bilgili, and Melissa Armstrong] designed a voluntary, anonymous web-based survey to monitor Effectiveness Process Facilitators’ timely progress and to implement appropriate modifications within the institutional effectiveness cycle. Their first action was to implement a mid-cycle web-based survey (via Survey Monkey) to all Effectiveness Process Facilitators in Non-Academic Units. The responses to the survey will help steer follow-up conversations initiated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Accreditation staff and help the IE Committee to understand and gain a clearer picture of the implementation status of the IE Assessment process. The survey will also be administered to Effectiveness Process Facilitators of Academic Programs and Disciplines in the fall term 2013.

I. Goal #9 – Develop and Deliver web-based tutorials on assessment-related practices and tasks

Committee members [Nancy Sutton, Jeff Smith, Monica Franklin, Bill Ganza, Stan Jurewicz, Jerry Fliger, and Toni Southerland] developed web-based tutorials to enhance communications across the College as a whole and to increase awareness of IE-related concepts, tools, and tasks. For example, this working group created one web-based tutorial that showed how to enter data into WeaveOnline with a narrated, step-by-step visual of the process. It is expected that these media-rich, time-relevant tutorials will be useful for multiple years, however it is likely that the Committee will need to review and update the tutorials' content every 3-5 years to ensure validity and accuracy.

I. Submission and Review of Assessment Plans

A. Timeline

The College has organized the Institutional Effectiveness Process into five phases that occur during an annual cycle. These five phases reflect development, review and implementation of plans and reports for each program and unit. The disciplines and academic programs submitted their 2012-2013 IE Assessment Reports and 2013-2014 IE Assessment Plans on May 15, 2013. The non-academic units submitted their 2011-2012 IE Assessment Reports and 2012-2013 IE Assessment Plans on September 30, 2012.

B. Assessment of Academic IE Assessment Reports and Plans

In May 2013, 2012-2013 IE Assessment Reports and 2013-2014 IE Assessment Plans for academic disciplines and programs were submitted in WEAVEOnline. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee reviewed the assessment reports and plans, and in the case of the reports, applied the new IE Assessment Report rubric for Academic Programs and Disciplines (Appendix C). Each report and plan was reviewed by two committee members and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation compiled the feedback and disseminated it to the appropriate Effectiveness Process Facilitators of the academic programs and disciplines. Table 1 and Table 2 indicate the results of the reviews, respectively.

Table 1**2012-2013 Academic IE Assessment Reports**

Total number of programs	108
Total number of reports submitted	108
Total number of reports submitted in which improvements are recommended	90
Total number of reports submitted with no improvements or revisions recommended by IE Committee	18
Total number of active programs with no report submitted (++)	0
Total number of programs with no plan submitted due to being a new program (##), delayed funding (\$\$), , inactivated (~~), or pending SACSCOC approval (^^)	0

Table 2**2013-2014 Academic IE Assessment Plans**

Total number of programs	111
Total number of plans submitted	111
Total Number of plans submitted with no improvements or revisions recommended by IE Committee	43
Total number of plans submitted in which improvements are recommended	68
Total number of active programs with no plan submitted (++)	0
Total number of programs with no plan submitted due to being a new program (##), delayed funding (\$\$), , inactivated (~~), or pending SACSCOC approval (^^)	0

C. Assessment of Non-Academic Reports and Plans

In September 2012, 2011-2012 IE Assessment Reports and 2012-2013 IE Assessment Plans for non-academic units were submitted in WEAVEOnline. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee reviewed the assessment reports and plans, according to the non-academic rubrics. Each plan was reviewed by two committee members and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness

and Accreditation compiled the feedback and disseminated to the appropriate Effectiveness Process Facilitators of the academic programs and disciplines. Table 3 and Table 4 indicate the results of the 2012 IE Committee reviews. The 2012-2013 IE Non-Academic Assessment Reports (using the revised rubric – Appendix D) and 2013-2014 IE Assessment Plans will be reviewed in September 2013.

Table 3

2011-2012 Non-Academic IE assessment Reports

Total Number of Units	84
Total Number of reports submitted	80
Total Number of reports submitted in which Improvements are Recommended	61
Total Number of reports submitted with No "Needs Improvement" recommended by IE Committee	19
Total Number of Units not reviewed due to being new unit or unit not reporting	4

Table 4

2012-2013 Non-Academic IE Assessment Plans

Total Number of Units	85
Total Number of plans submitted	80
Total Number of plans submitted in which Improvements are Recommended	49
Total Number of plans submitted with No "Needs Improvement" recommended by IE Committee	31
Number of Units without plan/not continuing implementation of previous year's plan	0
Number of Plans continued from previous year (Denoted by a "Y" in the first column)	5

IV. Preparations for Next Year

Selecting new members and providing orientation to these new members is a key task for late Spring term. Dr. Crosby consulted with Cabinet members and division leaders across the College to identify appropriate replacements.

In its April 2013 meeting, Committee members were asked to engage in a conversation about the goals of the Committee for 2013-2014. The committee discussed several new goals, along with strengthening the goal of embedding institutional effectiveness into the culture of the institution. The drafted goals will be discussed at the first committee meeting of the new academic year in September 2013.

Appendix “A”

Institutional Effectiveness Committee 2012- 2013

Co-chairs: Lynne Crosby (District) and Erin Richman (Faculty Member, South Campus)

Members

Representatives from the Academic Programs Effectiveness Collaborative

Baccalaureate Programs

Terry Sawma (Dean, Kent Campus) (2012-2014)

Beth Tuckwiller (Faculty Member, South Campus) (2011-2013)*

Associate Degrees (A.S./A.A.S.) and Technical Certificates

Wendy Norfleet (Dean, South) (2011-2013)

Nancy Sutton (Instructional Program Manager, Kent Campus) (2012-2014)

Wayne Singletary (Faculty Member, Kent Campus) (2012-2014)

Monica Franklin (Faculty Member, North Campus) (2012-2014)

Arts/Sciences (A.A.)

Jerry Fliger (Associate Dean, Downtown Campus) (2012-2014)

Reta Roberts (Faculty Member, North Campus) (2011-2013)

Margo Martin (Dean, South Campus) (2011-2013)

Jeff Knapp (Faculty Member, Kent Campus) (2011-2013)

Florida Coast Career Tech (PSAV/ATD)

Jeff Smith (Instructional Program Manager, North Campus) (2012-2014)

John Carter (Faculty Member, Downtown Campus) (2012-2014)*

Patricia Butler (Faculty Member, North Campus) (2011-2013)

General Education

Wendy Perniciaro (Faculty Member, Deerwood Center) (2011-2013)

Sondra Evans (Associate Dean, Kent Campus) (2011-2013)

SLS (Student Life Skills)

Maggy Dartiguenave (Program Coordinator, South Campus) (2012-2014)

Academic Success Center

Ebru Bilgili (Faculty Member, Kent Campus) (2012-2014)

High School Completion/Pathways and English Language Training Programs

Derrick Johnson (Project Coordinator, Pathways Academy) (2012-2014)

Samantha Ertenberg (Pathways Instructor) (2012-2014)

Faculty Senate Representative

John A. Woodward, (Faculty Member, Deerwood Center) (2012-2014)

Distance Learning

Sheri Litt (E-Dean, Open Campus) (2011-2013)

John Marr (Faculty Member) (2011-2013)

Representatives from Academic and Student Support Services Effectiveness Collaborative

Melanie Clark (Associate Dean of Student Success, Open Campus) (2012-2014)

Donna Martin (Associate Dean, Library/Learning Commons, Downtown Campus) (2012-2014)

Toni Southerland (Counselor Coordinator, South Campus) (2011-2013)

Audrey Jackson (Associate Dean of Student Success, Deerwood Center) (2012-2014)

Representatives from Administrative Support Services Effectiveness Collaborative

Stan Jurewicz (Director, Risk Management, District) (2012-2014)

Janice Amos (Program Coordinator, MPSS) (2012-2014)

Karen Arlington (Project Coordinator, Open Campus) (2011-2013)

Melissa Armstrong (Instructional Program Coordinator, Kent Campus) (2011-2013)

Rose Zurawski (Facilities Planning Manager, District) (2011-2013)*

Representatives from Human Performance Enhancement Effectiveness Collaborative

Bill Ganza (Director of Professional Development, District) (2010-2013)

Representatives from Community/Public Service Effectiveness Collaborative

John Grissett (Program Coordinator, CROP and FAME) (2012-2014)

Beth Harvey (Wilson Center Operations Manager, South Campus) (2011-2013)

Don Hughes (Executive Director, Nassau Center) (2011-2013)

Cabinet Advisor: Judith Bilsky, Vice President and Provost of Florida State College Division

Committee Resources

Roxanne Jordan, Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Officer

Greg Michalski, Director of Student Analytics and Research

Theresa Lott, AVP, Collegewide Data Reporting

Naomi Sleaf, Project Coordinator

Stephanie Fisher, Administrative Assistant

Ex Officio Members

Jim Simpson, Effectiveness Process Owner, Professional Schools and Florida Coast Career Tech

Brian Mann, Effectiveness Process Owner, Florida Coast Career Tech

Nancy Yurko, Effectiveness Process Owner, School of Arts and Sciences

Tracy Pierce, Effectiveness Process Owner, Academic and Student Support Services

Steve Bowers, Effectiveness Process Owner, Administrative Support Services

Chris Arab, Effectiveness Process Owner, Human Performance Enhancement

*unable to complete the full year of committee service

Appendix “B”

Institutional Effectiveness Committee 2012-2013 Meeting Schedule

All meetings occur in ATC 140/141 (unless otherwise noted)

Friday, Sept. 21, 2012, 9:00am – 11:00am – IE Committee Meeting

Friday, Oct. 12, 2012 – Rubric Training for Non-Academic Unit/Educational Support Services IE Assessment Plans and Reports

Friday, Oct. 26, 2012, 9:00am – 11:00am – IE Committee meeting

Friday, Nov. 30, 2012, 9:00am – 11:00am – IE Committee meeting

Friday, Jan. 25, 2013, 9:00am – 11:00am - IE Committee meeting

Friday, Feb. 22, 2013, 9:00am – 11:00am - IE Committee meeting

Friday, Mar. 22, 2013, 9:00am – 11:00am - IE Committee meeting

Friday, April 19, 2013, 9:00am – 11:00am - IE Committee meeting

Friday, May 17, 2013 – Rubric Training for Academic Programs and Disciplines IE Assessment Plans and Reports

Appendix "C"

Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness Assessment REPORTS

For Academic Programs (all degree, workforce certificate programs, and programs/disciplines)

Program/Department/Unit: _____ Assessment Year: _____

Date reviewed by Institutional Effectiveness Committee _____

REPORT				
FINDINGS	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
Outcome #1 Findings				No findings are reported
Number of findings	Each measure has a related finding		Only some measures have related findings while others are unaddressed and/or unrelated	
Relationship to Measure(s)	The findings align with all aspects of the measures/targets	The findings align with some but not all of the aspects of the measures / targets	The findings do not align with the aspects of the measures / targets	

Detail of Findings	Findings are reported in sufficient detail to document results (e.g., sample size, precise percentages, item analysis, and/or other relevant numerical data)	Findings are reported, but more detail to describe and document the results is needed	Findings are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for the purposes of documenting results	
Details of Improvements Achieved	Improvements achieved are reported in sufficient detail to document improvements made (e.g. increased scores, improved skills, and/or other relevant improvements)	Improvement achieved are reported, but more detail to describe and document the improvements made is needed	Improvement achieved are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for describing the improvements made	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The program/discipline's findings are discussed for all students in the assessment sample, as well as per location and delivery method		The program/discipline's findings are not discussed for all students in the assessment sample, as well as per location and delivery method	Not Applicable for program/discipline.

1st Outcome Findings Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
ACTION PLAN	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
Outcome #1 Action Plan				No Action Plan Reported
Number of action plans (closes the loop)	Provides an action plan statement for every finding (e.g., even when target is met)		Provides action plans for some findings but not all	
Data-based	Action plan directly uses results from findings to attempt to improve student performance	Action plan indirectly uses results from findings and/or may not improve student performance	Action plan does not use results from findings and will not improve student performance	
Implementation	Action steps are clearly stated in sufficient detail to allow for effective implementation	Action steps are described in insufficient detail and more detail is required for effective implementation	Action steps are described without meaningful detail, making effective implementation impossible	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The program/discipline's action plan addresses any differences in IE assessment findings based on location and/or delivery method		The program/discipline's action plan does not address any differences in IE assessment findings based on location and/or delivery method	Not Applicable for program/discipline.

1st Outcome Reviewer Comments:

1st Outcome Reviewer Comments Continued:

REPORT				
FINDINGS	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
Outcome #2 Findings				No findings are reported
Number of findings	Each measure has a related finding		Only some measures have related findings while others are unaddressed and/or unrelated	
Relationship to Measure(s)	The findings align with all aspects of the measures/targets	The findings align with some but not all of the aspects of the measures / targets	The findings do not align with the aspects of the measures / targets	
Detail of Findings	Findings are reported in sufficient detail to document results (e.g., sample size, precise percentages, item analysis, and/or other relevant numerical data)	Findings are reported, but more detail to describe and document the results is needed	Findings are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for the purposes of documenting results	
Details of Improvements Achieved	Improvements achieved are reported in sufficient detail to document improvements made (e.g. increased scores, improved skills, and/or other relevant improvements)	Improvement achieved are reported, but more detail to describe and document the improvements made is needed	Improvement achieved are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for describing the improvements made	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The program/discipline's findings are discussed for all students in the assessment sample, as well as per location and delivery method		The program/discipline's findings are not discussed for all students in the assessment sample, as well as per location and delivery method	Not Applicable for program/discipline.

2nd Outcome Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
ACTION PLAN	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
Outcome #2 Action Plan				No Action Plan Reported
Number of action plans (closes the loop)	Provides an action plan statement for every finding (e.g., even when target is met)		Provides action plans for some findings but not all	
Data-based	Action plan directly uses results from findings to attempt to improve student performance	Action plan indirectly uses results from findings and/or may not improve student performance	Action plan does not use results from findings and will not improve student performance	
Implementation	Action steps are clearly stated in sufficient detail to allow for effective implementation	Action steps are described in insufficient detail and more detail is required for effective implementation	Action steps are described without meaningful detail, making effective implementation impossible	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The program/discipline's action plan addresses any differences in IE assessment findings based on location and/or delivery method		The program/discipline's action plan does not address any differences in IE assessment findings based on location and/or delivery method	Not Applicable for program/discipline.

2nd Outcome Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
FINDINGS	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
Outcome #3 Findings				No findings are reported
Number of findings	Each measure has a related finding		Only some measures have related findings while others are unaddressed and/or unrelated	
Relationship to Measure(s)	The findings align with all aspects of the measures/targets	The findings align with some but not all of the aspects of the measures / targets	The findings do not align with the aspects of the measures / targets	
Detail of Findings	Findings are reported in sufficient detail to document results (e.g., sample size, precise percentages, item analysis, and/or other relevant numerical data)	Findings are reported, but more detail to describe and document the results is needed	Findings are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for the purposes of documenting results	
Details of Improvements Achieved	Improvements achieved are reported in sufficient detail to document improvements made (e.g. increased scores, improved skills, and/or other relevant improvements)	Improvement achieved are reported, but more detail to describe and document the improvements made is needed	Improvement achieved are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for describing the improvements made	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The program/discipline's findings are discussed for all students in the assessment sample, as well as per location and delivery method		The program/discipline's findings are not discussed for all students in the assessment sample, as well as per location and delivery method	Not Applicable for program/discipline.

3rd Outcome Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
ACTION PLAN	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
Outcome #3 Action Plan				No Action Plan Reported
Number of action plans (closes the loop)	Provides an action plan statement for every finding (e.g., even when target is met)		Provides action plans for some findings but not all	
Data-based	Action plan directly uses results from findings to attempt to improve student performance	Action plan indirectly uses results from findings and/or may not improve student performance	Action plan does not use results from findings and will not improve student performance	
Implementation	Action steps are clearly stated in sufficient detail to allow for effective implementation	Action steps are described in insufficient detail and more detail is required for effective implementation	Action steps are described without meaningful detail, making effective implementation impossible	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The program/discipline's action plan addresses any differences in IE assessment findings based on location and/or delivery method		The program/discipline's action plan does not address any differences in IE assessment findings based on location and/or delivery method	Not Applicable for program/discipline.

3rd Outcome Reviewer Comments:

ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY/ ANALYSIS	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1
Number of Questions	All five questions were answered in meaningful manner	Three to four questions were answered in a meaningful manner	Less than three questions were answered in a detailed and meaningful manner
Quality of Responses	Program/discipline faculty provided detailed and meaningful responses to the appropriate Analysis Questions.	Program/discipline faculty provided responses to the appropriate Analysis Questions but did so with limited detail.	Program/discipline faculty did not provide detailed and meaningful responses to the appropriate Analysis Questions.

Reviewer Comments:

REPORT			
Overall	Exemplary	Progressing	Developing
	3	2	1
	The faculty has demonstrated it is using assessment to improve student learning.	The faculty has demonstrated limited use of assessment to improve student learning	The faculty has not demonstrated it is using assessment to improve student learning
	The program faculty demonstrated involvement of faculty/staff, and other relevant stakeholders, such as students and advisory committee members, in the assessment process.	The program faculty demonstrated involvement of some faculty/staff, and other relevant stakeholders, such as students and advisory committee members, in the assessment process.	The program faculty has not demonstrated involvement of faculty/staff, and other relevant stakeholders, such as students and advisory committee members, in the assessment process.

Reviewer Overall Comments regarding Report, Suggestions for Improvement, and Next Steps for Program/Discipline:

Appendix “D”

Rubric for Institutional Effectiveness Assessment REPORTS For Non-Academic Units

Unit: _____ Assessment Year: _____

Date reviewed by Institutional Effectiveness Committee _____

REPORT				
FINDINGS	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
1 st Outcome Findings				No findings are reported
Number of findings	Each measure has a related finding		Only some measures have related findings while others are unaddressed and/or unrelated	
Relationship to Measure(s)	The findings align with all aspects of the measures/targets	The findings align with some but not all of the aspects of the measures / targets	The findings do not align with the aspects of the measures / targets	

Detail of Findings	Findings are reported in sufficient detail to document results (e.g., sample size, precise percentages, item analysis, and/or other relevant numerical data)	Findings are reported, but more detail to describe and document the results is needed	Findings are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for the purposes of documenting results	
Detail of Improvements Achieved	Improvements achieved are reported in sufficient detail to document improvements made (e.g. increased scores, improved skills, and/or other relevant improvements)	Improvement achieved are reported, but more detail to describe and document the improvements made is needed	Improvement achieved are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for describing the improvements made	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The unit's findings are discussed for each campus/location/delivery method in the assessment sample		The unit's findings are not discussed for each campus/location/delivery method in the assessment sample	Not applicable to unit

1st Outcome Findings Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
ACTION PLAN	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
1 st Outcome Action Plan				No Action Plan Reported
Number of action plans (closes the loop)	Provides an action plan statement for every finding (e.g., even when target is met)		Provides an action plan for some findings but not all	
Data-based	Action plan directly uses results from findings to improve program/unit performance	Action plan indirectly uses results from findings and/or may not improve program/unit performance	Action plan does not use results from findings and will not improve program/unit performance	
Implementation	Action steps are clearly stated in sufficient detail to allow for effective implementation	Action steps are described in insufficient detail and more detail is required for effective implementation	Action steps are described without meaningful detail, making effective implementation impossible	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The unit's action plan addresses any differences in IE assessment findings based on campus/location/delivery method		The unit's action plan does not address any differences in IE assessment findings based on campus/location/delivery method	Not applicable to unit

1st Outcome Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
FINDINGS	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
2nd Outcome Findings				No findings are reported
Number of findings	Each measure has a related finding		Only some measures have related findings while others are unaddressed and/or unrelated	
Relationship to Measure(s)	The findings align with all aspects of the measures/targets	The findings align with some but not all of the aspects of the measures / targets	The findings do not align with the aspects of the measures / targets	
Detail of Findings	Findings are reported in sufficient detail to document results (e.g., sample size, precise percentages, item analysis, and/or other relevant numerical data)	Findings are reported, but more detail to describe and document the results is needed	Findings are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for the purposes of documenting results	
Detail of Improvements Achieved	Improvements achieved are reported in sufficient detail to document improvements made (e.g. increased scores, improved skills, and/or other relevant improvements)	Improvement achieved are reported, but more detail to describe and document the improvements made is needed	Improvement achieved are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for describing the improvements made	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The unit's findings are discussed for each campus/location/delivery method in the assessment sample		The unit's findings are not discussed for each campus/location/delivery method in the assessment sample	Not applicable to unit

2nd Outcome Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
ACTION PLAN	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
2 nd Outcome Action Plan				No Action Plan Reported
Number of action plans (closes the loop)	Provides an action plan statement for every finding (e.g., even when target is met)		Provides an action plan for some findings but not all	
Data-based	Action plan directly uses results from findings to improve program/unit performance	Action plan indirectly uses results from findings and/or may not improve program/unit performance	Action plan does not use results from findings and will not improve program/unit performance	
Implementation	Action steps are clearly stated in sufficient detail to allow for effective implementation	Action steps are described in insufficient detail and more detail is required for effective implementation	Action steps are described without meaningful detail, making effective implementation impossible	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The unit's action plan addresses any differences in IE assessment findings based on campus/location/delivery method		The unit's action plan does not address any differences in IE assessment findings based on campus/location/delivery method	Not applicable to unit

2nd Outcome Action Plan Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
FINDINGS	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
3 rd Outcome Findings				No findings are reported
Number of findings	Each measure has a related finding		Only some measures have related findings while others are unaddressed and/or unrelated	
Relationship to Measure(s)	The findings align with all aspects of the measures/targets	The findings align with some but not all of the aspects of the measures / targets	The findings do not align with the aspects of the measures / targets	
Detail of Findings	Findings are reported in sufficient detail to document results (e.g., sample size, precise percentages, item analysis, and/or other relevant numerical data)	Findings are reported, but more detail to describe and document the results is needed	Findings are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for the purposes of documenting results	
Detail of Improvements Achieved	Improvements achieved are reported in sufficient detail to document improvements made (e.g. increased scores, improved skills, and/or other relevant improvements)	Improvement achieved are reported, but more detail to describe and document the improvements made is needed	Improvement achieved are reported without sufficient detail and are inadequate for describing the improvements made	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The unit's findings are discussed for each campus/location/delivery method in the assessment sample		The unit's findings are not discussed for each campus/location/delivery method in the assessment sample	Not applicable to unit

3rd Outcome Reviewer Comments:

REPORT				
ACTION PLAN	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1	Not Provided 0
3 rd Outcome Action Plan				No Action Plan Reported
Number of action plans (closes the loop)	Provides an action plan statement for every finding (e.g., even when target is met)		Provides an action plan for some findings but not all	
Data-based	Action plan directly uses results from findings to improve program/unit performance	Action plan indirectly uses results from findings and/or may not improve program/unit performance	Action plan does not use results from findings and will not improve program/unit performance	
Implementation	Action steps are clearly stated in sufficient detail to allow for effective implementation	Action steps are described in insufficient detail and more detail is required for effective implementation	Action steps are described without meaningful detail, making effective implementation impossible	
Consideration of location/delivery method	The unit's action plan addresses any differences in IE assessment findings based on campus/location/delivery method		The unit's action plan does not address any differences in IE assessment findings based on campus/location/delivery method	Not applicable to unit

3rd Outcome Action Plan Reviewer Comments:

REPORT			
ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY/ ANALYSIS	Exemplary 3	Progressing 2	Developing 1
Number of Questions	All appropriate questions (as indicated in WEAVEonline) were answered in a meaningful manner		All appropriate questions (as indicated in WEAVEonline) were not answered in a meaningful manner
Quality of Responses	The unit provided detailed and meaningful responses to the appropriate Analysis Questions.	The unit provided responses to the appropriate Analysis Questions but did so with limited detail.	The unit did not provide detailed and meaningful responses to the appropriate Analysis Questions.

Reviewer Comments:

REPORT			
Overall Report	Exemplary	Progressing	Developing
	3	2	1
	The unit has demonstrated it is using assessment to improve processes, services, and/or educational programs	The unit has demonstrated limited use of assessment to improve processes, services, and/or educational programs	The unit has not demonstrated it is using assessment to improve processes, services, and/or educational programs
	The unit demonstrated involvement of staff, and other relevant stakeholders, such as students and advisory committee members, in the assessment process.	The unit demonstrated involvement of some staff, and other relevant stakeholders, such as students and advisory committee members, in the assessment process.	The unit has not demonstrated involvement of staff, and other relevant stakeholders, such as students and advisory committee members, in the assessment process.

Reviewer Overall Comments regarding Report, Suggestions for Improvement, and Next Steps for Program/Unit:

Appendix “E”

Institutional Effectiveness Process Timeline

Educational Support Services, Administrative Support Services, Human Performance Enhancement and Community/Public Services

When does my department or unit submit information?

Cycle 3 in WEAVEonline

Sept. 28, 2012	Submit 2011-2012 IE Assessment Report; and begin implementing action plan (Phase IV) Submit 2012-2013 IE Assessment Plan in WEAVEonline (Phase I)
Oct. 8-Nov. 28, 2012	Refrain from making edits to IE Assessment Plan and Report in WEAVEonline until program receives feedback
Nov. 28, 2012	Receive IE Committee's first round of feedback on 2011-2012 IE Assessment Report (<i>Phase V</i>) and 2012-2013 IE Assessment Plan (Phase II)
Dec. 17, 2012	Submit revised 2011-2012 IE Assessment Report, if requested (Phase V) and 2012-2013 IE Assessment Plan in WEAVEonline, if requested (Phase II)
Jan. 18, 2013	Receive second round feedback on your revised 2011-2012 IE Assessment Report and 2012-2013 IE Assessment Plan, if applicable
Spring/Summer, 2013	Implement IE Assessment Plan and Collect Assessment Data (Phase III)
Sept. 2, 2013	Begin analyzing data, submit findings, and design action plan by this date (Phase III and IV)
Sept. 27, 2013	Submit 2012-2013 IE Assessment Report; and begin implementing action plan (Phase IV) Submit 2013-2014 IE Assessment Plan in WEAVEonline (Phase I)

Appendix “F”

Institutional Effectiveness Process Timeline

Academic Programs

This includes baccalaureate programs; A.A./Liberal Arts/General Education; Academic Success Centers/Developmental Education; A.S./A.A.S./Technical Certificate/Advanced Technical Certificate/and Applied Technology Diploma programs (Professional Schools); Florida Coast Career Tech; High School Completion and English Language Training programs.

May 15, 2012	Submit 2011-2012 IE Assessment Report; and begin implementing action plan (Phase IV) Submit 2012-2013 IE Assessment Plan in WEAVEonline (Phase I)
May 16-July 10, 2012	Refrain from making edits to IE Assessment Plan and Report in WEAVEonline until program receives feedback
July 9, 2012	Receive first round of feedback on 2011-2012 IE Assessment Report and 2012-2013 IE Assessment Plan (<i>Phase II</i>)
Sept. 17, 2012	Submit revised 2011-2012 report and/or revised 2012-2013 plan in WEAVEonline, if requested (<i>Phase II</i>)
Oct., 2012	Receive second round feedback on your revised IE Assessment Report and/or Plan, if applicable (Phase II)
Summer 2012 to Spring 2013	Implement IE Assessment Plan and Collect Assessment Data (Phase III)
Spring 2013	Begin analyzing data and designing action plan (Phase III and IV)
May 15, 2013	Submit 2012-2013 IE Assessment Report; and begin implementing action plan (Phase IV) Submit 2013-2014 IE Assessment Plan in WEAVEonline (Phase I)
May 16, 2013 to July 15, 2013	Refrain from making edits to 2012-2013 IE Assessment Report and 2013-2014 Plan in WEAVEonline until program receives feedback
Summer 2013	Receive feedback on IE Assessment Report for 2011-2012 (Phase V)
Sept. 18, 2013	Submit revised IE Assessment Report for 2011-2012 if requested (Phase V)
Oct., 2013	Receive feedback on your revised IE Assessment Report, if applicable