Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Plan

Executive Summary

FGCU has had in place for many years a system of institutional effectiveness (I.E.) that has been tied to its strategic plan and university mission. With the creation of the Planning and Budget Council and the updating of the university’s strategic plan through 2015, it is necessary to revisit the existing institutional system of assessment and institutional effectiveness to strengthen and enhance its efficacy and to ensure its alignment with the new planning structure.

The Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (SPIEC) of the Planning and Budgeting Council had been charged to develop an assessment and I.E. plan to support the implementation of the updated strategic plan and the new structure. SPIEC reviewed and revised as necessary key elements of the existing I.E. system:

- Institutional Effectiveness Directives
- State regulations and Institutional Policies re Academic Program Review and Academic Learning Compacts
- Organizational Framework for Institutional Effectiveness at FGCU
- Annual Planning, Assessment, and Budgeting Cycle
- Annual Report Template
- Unit Assessment Plan Template
- Program Assessment Plan (Integrated Program Matrix)
- Institutional Effectiveness FAQ

The institutional effectiveness directives provide the framework for assessment and continuous improvement at FGCU. It details what is done and by whom. The IE Directives are supplemented by an FAQ that provides detailed information of the structure of IE at FGCU, the timeline of annual events and the roles of various participants in the process.

The PBC is asked to approve the IE Directives and the procedures described in the FAQ as a statement of policy and recommend its adoption by the President and his Cabinet.
Institutional Effectiveness Directives:

The university will establish goals for all its academic programs and each of its organizational units. These goals will be derived from and consistent with the stated mission and purpose of the university and responsive to the university strategic plan.

Each organizational unit will create an assessment plan to document attainment of its goals and to use the results of the assessment to effect continuous improvement.

Assessment plans should address goals of the university strategic plan. Progress on assessment plans will be reported yearly in unit annual reports, following guidelines developed by SPIEC of the PBC.

Each academic program will create a program assessment plan that states program related goals for teaching, research, and service and other program goals and objectives including expected outcomes, particularly in the area of student learning. The program assessment plan will also address university learning goals, program-specific student learning goals; requirements of Board of Governor’s Regulation 8.016 concerning Academic Learning Compacts® (baccalaureate programs only) and professional accreditation learning goals (if applicable). The assessment plan will indicate where in the curriculum learning goals are encountered and by what means it will be determined whether or not learning is occurring. Learning goals should be both measurable and expressed in behavioral terms. Multiple assessment strategies will be used whenever possible and include at least one direct measure of student learning for each discrete academic program. The plans will show when each outcome will be assessed and how often the assessment will occur. The results of assessment activity will be well-documented and used to improve the respective programs and enhance student learning. They will be incorporated as part of each academic program review.

Academic program review will occur on a seven-year cycle (see Board of Governor’s Reg. 8.015) established in consultation with staff of the Florida Board of Governors. It will include the development of a self-study that addresses key elements of program effectiveness. An external consultant will be engaged to assist in the review that will also involve participation by the Faculty Senate’s Program Review Team. The consultant’s report with recommendations for improvement along with comments from the Program Review Team will be shared with the program and college leadership and lead to a response meeting with the Provost and a subsequent one-year follow-up. Results from the program review as well as progress made toward fulfillment of recommendations for improvement will be described in the college’s annual report.

Within the colleges and Library Services, the Blue Star Group (BSG) comprised of associate deans/directors from each of these units will be responsible for ensuring that these institutional effectiveness directives are fully implemented. The Blue Star Group will also be responsible for the assessment of core competencies defined for students completing FGCU’s general education program. This will be accomplished by a committee on general education that will report to the Blue Star Group. The Blue Star Group will meet periodically with the Council of Deans that is chaired by the Provost to
discuss progress and issues. The Office of Planning and Institutional Performance, which reports to the Provost, will support the BSG and be responsible for evaluating the success of these efforts.

Annual reports will be prepared by all major organizational units of the university. The reports will address specific guidelines developed by SPIEC of the PBC and will express goals of the university strategic plan in terms of unit goals. The reports will document past efforts at continuous improvement and guide future initiatives directed toward this end. The reports will also include goals for the coming year that may be considered as priorities for funding.

Information derived from the annual reports, along with data and information drawn from other sources, will be used to inform funding allocations and planning decisions of the President’s Cabinet and the University Board of Trustees.

Progress on the attainment of strategic planning goals intended to fulfill the university’s mission will be monitored by the university’s Board of Trustees through its annual performance review of the President and in its setting of annual presidential performance goals. The Planning and Budget Council will use the results of this process in the modification of the strategic plan as it deems necessary.

*The Academic Learning Compact is a statement developed for each baccalaureate program that a graduate of that program has completed a course of study with clearly articulated core student learning expectations in content/discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills. The procedures for implementing the Academic Learning Compacts at FGCU are described in FGCU policy 2.005.
Institutional Effectiveness (IE) FAQ

Why is IE important?

Because it allows the university to gauge how well it is accomplishing its mission and provides a sound foundation for informed decision-making. It also allows the university to share its performance story with its accreditors, regulators, and its constituents to assure them it is effectively accomplishing its purposes.

How is IE being carried out at FGCU?

FGCU recently has revised its organizational framework (link to org structure chart) for IE. The new organizational framework includes its Board of Trustees the President and his Cabinet, the colleges and other academic units (e.g., Library Services, Curriculum and Instruction), the administrative units (e.g., admissions, finance and accounting, computing services) athletics, student affairs, university advancement, the Council of Deans, the Faculty Senate, the Staff Advisory Council, and Student Government.

IE work is carried out through the Planning and Budget Council (PBC) (link to by-laws) that is chaired by the Provost and VP for Academic Affairs. It includes broad representation from across the university that directly involves most of the aforementioned entities/individuals (link to membership). The PBC meets regularly throughout the year as a committee of the whole and comprises six committees focusing on key aspects of the university that contribute to fulfillment of its mission, including: Budget, Enrollment/Retention Management, Environmental Sustainability, Information Resources, Safety and Facilities, and Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness (link to PBC homepage). It has established a series of Institutional Effectiveness Directives that guide institutional performance and continuous improvement (link to IE directives). The institutional effectiveness directives drive an annual cycle of planning, assessment, and budgeting that uses assessment data to effect institutional improvement (link to annual planning, assessment, and budgeting cycle).

What does PBC do exactly?

The PBC is responsible for linking planning, assessment, and budgeting to foster continuous improvement that leads to goal attainment. This is accomplished through its work and that of its six committees. Upon completion of the university’s strategic plan for 2010-2015, the PBC also will be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the university strategic plan and reporting on its progress. Through its Strategic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness Committee (SPIEC) (link to PBC by-laws re SPIEC functions), the PBC creates guidelines for the establishment of assessment plans and guidelines for annual reports. The annual reports are used to inform planning priorities. The PBC updates the strategic plan based upon the review of the annual reports and feedback derived from the Board of Trustees through its annual performance review of the president and its annual presidential goal setting (link to current examples of these).
How does this work in practice?

Assessment Plans
The university adopted a revised model of IE recently that is based on its strategic plan (link to SP). There are 7 key goals of the strategic plan covering the following: academic excellence; student life, growth and development; strategic growth; provide an enhanced campus climate; environmental sustainability and innovation; community engagement; and the discovery and application of knowledge. The assessment plan sets longer-term overarching goals for each major organizational unit both academic and administrative within the university in line with that unit’s purpose. Every major organizational unit within the university has an assessment plan that ties its mission and overarching goals to the university’s strategic plan goals. The assessment plan includes assessment methods and indicates when assessments should occur and how the results of the assessment will be used to effect continuous improvement.

Who is responsible for developing the assessment plans at the organizational unit level?

Ultimately reporting to one of the vice presidents, each college dean or administrative unit supervisor is responsible for the creation and implementation of unit assessment plans. Each of the colleges has an associate dean/director appointed by the dean for the purpose of coordinating the assessment activities of that unit who collectively constitute the Blue Star Group. Each college Blue Star Group (BSG) representative is responsible for coordinating implementation of both the unit-level assessment plan and program-specific assessment plans and working with the college dean and program faculty to accomplish these purposes. A committee on general education, reports to the Blue Star Group and is charged with the assessment of the university’s general education program. The administrative units’ directors or senior supervisors (i.e., the person the director reports to) are responsible for the creation and implementation of their respective unit’s assessment plan.

The Office of Planning and Institutional Performance provides support and guidance to the BSG (and units) and monitors compliance with the institutional effectiveness directives.

Unit-level Assessment Plans

Each major organizational unit has an assessment plan. That assessment plan has been reviewed by the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance. Comments have been shared with the units and revisions submitted as necessary. Each year in October, the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance asks each unit to review its assessment
plan and update it as necessary (e.g., a unit’s responsibilities may change, a new strategy wishes to be pursued, etc.). When units are reorganized or newly established, the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance works with them to create an appropriate assessment plan.

**What about academic degree programs are they included in the unit level assessment plans?**

No, each academic program produces a program assessment plan which includes program goals and an Integrated Program Matrix (IPM) that relates university student learning goals to specific academic program goals with associated student learning outcomes and assessment methods. The IPM then describes how and when assessment of those student outcomes will be used to improve the program overall.

**How are academic programs assessed then?**

Academic programs are assessed through the university’s program review process that is mandated by the state’s Board of Governors (link to program review reg.). The program review is intended to look at program goals and student outcomes and how data concerning student attainment of those outcomes are used to improve the program itself, either through changes in curriculum or delivery method, additional faculty, upgraded facilities, etc. An outside peer reviewer is chosen to conduct the review of the program’s self-study and to write a report addressing criteria established by the university (link to program review pages). When applicable, the results of professional program accreditation can be used to address the university’s academic program review process. The academic program review process is coordinated by a Faculty Senate committee, the Program Review Team (link to Faculty Senate by-laws describing the PRT) and supported by the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance.

**How do the results of program review get addressed?**

The results of the reviews are formally discussed by the program and college leadership with the Provost and the Associate Provost for Planning and Institutional Performance. The college is asked to develop a response to the program review report. The PRT of the Faculty Senate may comment on the response. Actions for program improvement are an outcome of the meeting and a one-year follow-up meeting is convened with the Provost to review progress. Results of program reviews are shared with the state and reported on in college annual reports (see Annual Reports below).

**What about Academic Learning Compacts (ALC)?**

ALCs are now being required by the Florida Board of Governors (the State University System’s coordinating board) for each baccalaureate degree program only. Each ALC describes student outcomes in three domains: effective communication, critical thinking, and content knowledge (link to assessment website for ALCs). The Compacts are
available to students and the public to inform them of expectations and assessment methods to be used in each baccalaureate program. The ALCs are largely derived from the aforementioned IPMs. Revisions to the ALCs are overseen by the PRT and progress is reported to the state Board of Governor’s annually.

**What Information are Contained in the Unit-Based Annual Reports?**

Progress on the implementation of the assessment plans is reported through annual reports. While the assessment plans are long-term in nature, the annual reports are focused on operational or short-term objectives to attain the larger overarching goals of the organizational unit. These annual reports are both retrospective and prospective in nature. They look at goals from the previous year and the strategies used for their attainment, then focus on an assessment of whether or not the goal was achieved and/or led to improvement. At the same time, this analysis of the assessment results informs the establishment of operational goals/priorities for the coming year and associated measures of performance (link to annual report guidelines).

The PBC, through the SPIEC, reviews the annual reports and makes recommendations on strategic plan funding priorities to the President’s Cabinet. The Cabinet and the President in turn make budget and planning recommendations to the Board of Trustees (link to planning cycle diagram), and progress toward goals of the university strategic plan are tracked through the Trustees annual review of the President (link to latest report).

SPIEC has developed a template (link) for completion of annual reports that identifies objectives, action plans, assessment methods, results, and associated improvements. The template annually becomes available in late January, with training sessions for completion of the reports provided in February. Annual reports are normally first submitted for review by the end of March each year, but are worked on throughout the year as outcomes become available. The Office of Planning and Institutional Performance oversees the annual reporting process and records go back to 2004-2005.

**Where can I access more information on Institutional Effectiveness at FGCU?**

There are several websites that provide a wealth of information on IE. These can be easily reached and include the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance web pages: [http://www.fgcu.edu/planning/](http://www.fgcu.edu/planning/)

The PBC Website: [http://www.fgcu.edu/Provost/pbc.html](http://www.fgcu.edu/Provost/pbc.html) has information on the committee, its purposes, and the strategic planning process [http://www.fgcu.edu/Provost/SP2010/2643.asp](http://www.fgcu.edu/Provost/SP2010/2643.asp) at FGCU.

The Assessment Website: [http://www.fgcu.edu/planning/Assessment/index.asp](http://www.fgcu.edu/planning/Assessment/index.asp) contains information on assessment at FGCU, including links to assessment plans and IPMs, and resources to assist in the assessment process.
Annual Planning, Assessment, and Budgeting Cycle 2011-2015

January
Annual Report Template updated and disseminated to units using goals of 2010-2015 SP. PBC Committees working on updating reports and recs.

Feb/Mar
Completion of unit goals/action plans for coming year (Pt. 2 annual reports) and updating of PBC Committee Reports/Recs. for coming year.

Apr/May
SPIEC/PBC SP action plan and KPI recs. Cabinet review and approval of SP action plans and budget for the coming year.

June
BOT approvals: Budget for coming year, President’s Performance Eval. Current year President’s goals for coming year.

July/Aug
Completion of Pt. 1 of unit annual reports on goal fulfillment and programs/services improvements in the year just ended.

Sept - December
Unit-based assessment plans updated. PBC considers possible changes to the SP. PBC Committees review SP plan implementation progress.

Sept - December
Unit-based assessment plans updated. PBC considers possible changes to the SP. PBC Committees review SP plan implementation progress.
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Approve the following policies pertaining to academic programs:
- Academic Learning Compacts
- Academic Program Authorization
- Academic Program Review
- Professional Certificate Programs
- Programs Offered Outside FGCU’s Five-County Service Area
- Suspension and Discontinuance of Academic Programs

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On January 25, 2007, the Board of Governors (BOG) issued public notice of intent to promulgate several regulations pertaining to academic programs. Subsequently, on March 29, 2007, the BOG adopted regulations dealing with the following topics: program authorization, program termination, limited access, hours to degree, program review, and student learning outcomes. These regulations are available on the BOG website http://www.flbog.org/BOG_regs/

The regulations codified many existing practices and brought together numerous policies relating to the above topics that had previously existed in statutes, regulations, resolutions, and policy memoranda. The regulations also clarified authority and responsibility of the BOG and the university boards of trustees, which was vague in statute. In addition, the regulations called for university boards of trustees to adopt policies in specified areas.

The attached policies presented to the FGCU Board of Trustees for review and approval respond to this mandate. The proposed policies are described in the attached executive summary. Relevant University procedures are also included as supporting documentation.
Supporting Documentation Included:
1. Executive Summary
2. Academic Learning Compacts Policy
   • Academic Learning Compacts Development and Review Procedures
3. Academic Program Authorization Policy
   • Curriculum Development Procedures
4. Academic Program Review Policy
   • Program Review Procedures
5. Professional Certificate Programs Policy
6. Programs Offered Outside FGCU’s Five-County Service Area Policy
7. Suspension and Discontinuance of Academic Programs Policy

Prepared by: Associate Vice President for Planning and Institutional Performance Paul Snyder, and Director of Program Development and Curriculum Cathy Duff

Legal Review by: General Counsel Wendy Morris

Submitted by: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Bonnie Yegidis
Executive Summary
Proposed Policies Pertaining to Academic Programs
May 23, 2007

ACADEMIC LEARNING COMPACTS

On January 25, 2007, public notice was given of the intent to promulgate a new Board of Governors (BOG) regulation on Academic Learning Compacts. On March 29, 2007, the BOG approved Regulation 6C-8.016 Academic Learning Compacts. This regulation, which was drafted with significant input from university personnel, clarified the requirements for universities to define expected student learning outcomes and to develop related assessment processes to demonstrate student achievement in all baccalaureate degree programs in the State University System. The regulation supplants existing policies and more clearly delineates the authority and responsibilities of the BOG and the university boards of trustees with regard to Academic Learning Compacts.

The proposed FGCU Board of Trustees (BOT) policy on Academic Learning Compacts and related procedures include definitions for terms that describe ALC products and processes. The policy delegates responsibility for developing, approving, implementing, and evaluating the ALCs to appropriate faculty, administrative units, and faculty teams. Approved ALCs are available to current and prospective students on the FGCU website. A student who has completed requirements for a baccalaureate degree at FGCU is certified as having completed a course of study that includes specified learning outcomes in the areas of content-discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills.

The University has had a similar policy since 2005. The earlier policy was approved by the University Faculty Senate, Deans Council, the Executive Group, and the President.
POLICY TITLE
Academic Learning Compacts

POLICY STATEMENT
The Florida Board of Governors (BOG) has determined that each State University System (SUS) institution must adopt policies and procedures for developing, implementing, and reviewing Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) consistent with BOG Regulation 6C-8.016.

The following definitions describe ALC products and processes at FGCU:

Academic Learning Compact (ALC): A student-friendly, jargon-free document that is available on the university’s website to current and prospective students. Each ALC must contain:

(a) A paragraph that describes the program’s mission or purpose,
(b) Statements that describe expected core student learning outcomes, and
(c) Statements that describe potential assessment strategies.

Core Student Learning Outcomes: Concise statements that describe what each active and successful graduate, who has participated in the joint teaching-learning-assessment process as part of a given baccalaureate degree program, will know and be able to do (competencies). Each ALC contains jargon-free statements that describe outcomes in the following areas:

(a) Content/discipline-specific knowledge and skills,
(b) Communication skills, and
(c) Critical thinking skills.

Assessment Strategies: Mechanisms or tools that may be used to assess individual student attainment of expected core student learning outcomes. The ALC lists possible assessment strategies that may be used, including the courses/locations that students might expect to encounter these strategies. The actual assessment strategies to be used by faculty are described in the Assessment Plan.

Assessment Plan: A description of how every student in a given undergraduate degree program is assessed to determine the extent to which the student has met the expected
core student learning outcomes. The plan must (a) be feasible, (b) identify the specific assessment strategies to be used to assess individual student attainment of every core student learning outcome, (c) be of adequate quality to withstand external review, and (d) compare favorably to best practices in the discipline. Data collected for the assessment plan is stored, analyzed, and summarized in accordance with the Evaluation Plan.

**Evaluation Plan:** A description of the system used to substantiate the assertion that graduates have truly achieved the expected core student learning outcomes. The plan and its components (a) can involve sampling, (b) must be robust with appropriate measures of validity and reliability, and (c) may include comparisons of student performance to the student performance at other institutions or to national norms.

**Use of Results:** A description of how results of student assessment and program evaluation are used to continuously improve program effectiveness and student learning.

**RESPONSIBLE EXECUTIVE**
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICE**
Office of Curriculum and Instruction

**WHO SHOULD READ THIS POLICY**
- All faculty and administrators charged with delivering baccalaureate degree programs.
- All enrolled and prospective undergraduate students.

**PROCEDURES**
The Office of Curriculum and Instruction coordinates development, approval, and implementation of ALCs in consultation with appropriate teams of the FGCU Faculty Senate, including the Undergraduate Curriculum Team, the Program Review Team, and the General Education Council. ALC processes are described in the document entitled Academic Learning Compacts Development and Review Procedures.

Approved ALCs are available to current and prospective students on the FGCU web site. Students completing baccalaureate degree requirements are certified as having completed a course of study that has included student learning outcomes that address communication skills, critical thinking skills, and content/discipline knowledge and skills with appropriate methods of assessment.

The efficacy of ALC efforts is evaluated as part of FGCU’s program review cycle at least once every seven years as required by BOG Regulation 6C-8.015 Academic Program Review 2007-2014. Each FGCU baccalaureate degree program review must state how results of the assessments have been used to improve student achievement and program effectiveness. The review will also examine the rigor of the assessment methods used in the program.

8.016 Academic Learning Compacts

(1) Introduction
(a) “Explicit identification of learning expectations facilitates the department’s coherence about their goals. Sharing those expectations explicitly with students can provide an effective learning scaffold on which students can build their experiences and render effective performance.” American Psychological Association (March 2002). In recent years, there has been increased emphasis on the identification and assessment of core student learning outcomes in higher education. The Florida Board of Governors has articulated the importance of student achievement in its strategic planning and accountability processes. Research indicates that university students are served best when students and faculty fully engage in a teaching-learning partnership, and this partnership is all the more meaningful if it is made as clear as possible to students what it is they will learn and how program faculty will assess that learning. Therefore, the Board has determined that universities must develop “Academic Learning Compacts” and related assessment processes to define and demonstrate student achievement in baccalaureate degree programs in the State University System.

(b) University Infrastructure for Developing, Implementing, and Reviewing Academic Learning Compacts and Related Assessment Processes. The Board of Governors supports the ongoing devolution of authority to the universities, campus-level decision making, and institutional accountability under the constitutional framework established by Floridians for their system of public universities. The Board also expects university and BOG personnel to ensure that the Academic Learning Compacts and corresponding assessment processes are of high quality and that they comply with the expectations outlined in Board of Governors and university regulations. The infrastructure outlined below is in place to ensure such compliance.

(2) Policies and Procedures
(a) Each university Board of Trustees must approve a process for certifying that each baccalaureate graduate has completed a program with clearly articulated core student learning expectations in content/discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills.

(b) Each university must construct clearly defined policies and procedures for developing, implementing, and reviewing Academic Learning Compacts and related assessment activities. These policies and procedures must be aligned with this System regulation.
(3) Processes: For all baccalaureate programs (or that an institution intends to place on) the State University System Academic Degree Inventory:

(a) Program faculty must develop Academic Learning Compacts that identify, at a minimum, the expected core student learning outcomes for program graduates in the areas of (i) content/discipline knowledge and skills; (ii) communication skills; and (iii) critical thinking skills. Input should be sought from the business and professional community to identify learning outcomes that students need for success in the global marketplace and society.

(b) Program faculty must identify the corresponding assessment tools and procedures that faculty use within the context of the program to determine if individual students have met each of the articulated core student learning expectations.

(c) University personnel must develop robust and effective program assessment/evaluation systems (which can involve sampling), including external corroboration, to substantiate that graduates have truly attained the expected core competencies. Such program assessments/evaluations should provide assurance that completion of the baccalaureate degree programs indicates that individual students have attained the articulated core learning requirements.

(d) Program faculty must demonstrate the use of results from program assessments/evaluations to continuously improve program effectiveness and student learning.

(4) Products:

(a) A current copy of each university’s policies and procedures regarding both Academic Learning Compacts and corresponding assessment/evaluation processes must remain on file in the Board of Governors Office of Academic and Student Affairs.

(b) Program faculty must provide current and prospective students with student-friendly, jargon-free Academic Learning Compacts for each baccalaureate program on (or that an institution intends to place on) the State University System Academic Degree Inventory. Each Academic Learning Compact must be made available on the university's Web site and must include, at a minimum:

(i) concise statements of what active and successful students participating in the joint teaching-learning-assessment process will know and be able to do, expressed in terms of the core student learning outcomes embodied in the requirements for each baccalaureate degree;

* It will be a university decision as to whether there will be institutional-level definitions and/or required outcomes in the areas of communication and critical thinking skills. Some institutions may decide instead that definitions and/or required outcomes will be established (or supplemented) at the program level.
(ii) a list of the types of assessments students might encounter in the program (e.g., capstone projects, juried performances, standardized exams, common embedded exam questions, portfolio requirements, etc.).

(c) As part of the mandated review and continuous improvement process for State University System degree programs (refer to the Board of Governors Regulation on Academic Program Review), university personnel must submit an up-to-date hyperlink to a copy of the Academic Learning Compact for each baccalaureate degree program under review. University personnel are expected to demonstrate how results from the periodic review of student learning outcomes, as well as from the evaluation of corresponding assessment mechanisms, have been used to continuously improve program effectiveness and student learning.

(d) Initially, university personnel will be asked to submit periodic status reports to the Board of Governors Office of Academic and Student Affairs on the progress baccalaureate degree program faculty are making on developing, implementing, and reviewing Academic Learning Compacts and corresponding assessment/evaluation policies, procedures, and products.

(5) Responsibilities of the Office of Academic and Student Affairs. The Board of Governors, Office of Academic and Student Affairs will:

(a) Review institutional policies and procedures to ensure that they comply with the expectations outlined in this regulation.

(b) Offer technical assistance to university personnel as they work to improve the quality of program assessment/evaluation processes to demonstrate that individual students receiving the baccalaureate have attained the articulated core learning requirements.

(c) Convene periodic meetings of representatives from the State universities to review institutional progress in developing, implementing, and reviewing Academic Learning Compacts and corresponding assessment policies, procedures, and products, as well as to share related best practices.

(d) Provide periodic updates to the Board of Governors on efforts in the State University System to demonstrate student achievement in the baccalaureate degree programs.

Authority: Section 7(d), Art IX, Fla. Const.; History: New 3-29-07
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Approve the following policies pertaining to academic programs:

- Academic Learning Compacts
- Academic Program Authorization
- Academic Program Review
- Professional Certificate Programs
- Programs Offered Outside FGCU’s Five-County Service Area
- Suspension and Discontinuance of Academic Programs

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On January 25, 2007, the Board of Governors (BOG) issued public notice of intent to promulgate several regulations pertaining to academic programs. Subsequently, on March 29, 2007, the BOG adopted regulations dealing with the following topics: program authorization, program termination, limited access, hours to degree, program review, and student learning outcomes. These regulations are available on the BOG website http://www.flboq.org/BOG_regs/

The regulations codified many existing practices and brought together numerous policies relating to the above topics that had previously existed in statutes, regulations, resolutions, and policy memoranda. The regulations also clarified authority and responsibility of the BOG and the university boards of trustees, which was vague in statute. In addition, the regulations called for university boards of trustees to adopt policies in specified areas.

The attached policies presented to the FGCU Board of Trustees for review and approval respond to this mandate. The proposed policies are described in the attached executive summary. Relevant University procedures are also included as supporting documentation.
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1. Executive Summary
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ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

The BOG adopted a rule at its March 29, 2007, meeting that requires each university to conduct a seven-year cyclic review of all its academic degree programs. Program reviews must document how individual academic programs are achieving stated student learning and program objectives within the context of the university’s mission, as illustrated in the academic learning compacts. The results of the program reviews are to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level, and, when appropriate, at the state level. The university policy and accompanying procedures ensure that the program review and continuous improvement processes include the following required elements:

- A review of the mission and purpose of the program within the context of the university mission and the Board of Governors’ Strategic Plan.
- The establishment of teaching, research, service, and other program goals and objectives including expected outcomes, particularly in the area of student learning.
- An assessment of how well the program goals/objectives are being met; how well students are achieving expected learning outcomes; how the results of these assessments are being used for continuous improvement; and the sufficiency of resources and support services to achieve the program goals/objectives.
- In the case of baccalaureate programs, a review of lower level prerequisite courses to ensure that the program is in compliance with State-approved common course prerequisites and (if appropriate) a review of the limited access status of the program to determine if such status is still warranted.

The attached policy and procedures are designed to meet all these requirements and the procedures themselves have been in operation within the University for the last several years.
POLICY TITLE
Academic Program Review

POLICY STATEMENT
The Florida Board of Governors (BOG) has determined that each state university system institution should have a policy concerning the periodic peer review of all its academic degree programs to occur between 2007 and 2014. According to BOG regulation 6C-8.015, each university must do the following: establish and maintain a schedule for submission of program review summary reports for every degree program to occur between 2007-2014; publish clearly defined policies and procedures for reviewing academic degree programs during this time frame; and ensure that the program review leads to continuous improvement. This requirement is a continuation of a longstanding requirement within the SUS and codifies a directive from the Chancellor dated August 11, 2004. Consequently FGCU already has policies and procedures in place to accomplish these purposes. The current regulation is intended to devolve the responsibility for program review upon the university boards of trustees

RESPONSIBLE EXECUTIVE
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

RESPONSIBLE OFFICE
Office of Planning and Institutional Performance

WHO SHOULD READ THIS POLICY
All faculty and academic administrators charged with the oversight and delivery of academic degree programs within FGCU.

PROCEDURES
Academic program review is coordinated by the Office of Planning and Institutional Performance in consultation with the Program Review Team of the University Faculty Senate according to a timetable mutually agreed upon by the division of the university offering the program and the office of Planning and Institutional Performance. Procedures and a schedule for all academic program reviews can be found on the Planning and Institutional Performance website and by referencing the March 2006

*History*: *This is the first policy to address this subject matter*
8.015 Academic Program Review 2007-2014

(1) Statement of Intent
(a) Academic program review has a lengthy history in the State University System of Florida, as efforts have been made to periodically analyze how degree programs provide students with high quality education and preparation for success in our global economy. Well aligned with regional and discipline-specific accreditation expectations, program review processes in the State University System must emphasize the assessment of student learning outcomes and continuous program improvement.

(b) The Board of Governors (BOG) requires the cyclic review of all academic degree programs in State universities at least every seven years. Program reviews must document how individual academic programs are achieving stated student learning and program objectives within the context of the university's mission, as illustrated in the academic learning compacts. The results of the program reviews are expected to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level and, when appropriate, at the state level.

(c) The Board of Governors supports the ongoing devolution of authority, campus-level decision making, and institutional accountability under the constitutional framework established by Floridians for their system of public universities. The Board also expects university and BOG personnel to ensure that program review processes and summary reports are of high quality and that they comply with the expectations outlined in Board of Governors and university regulations.

(2) Program Review Schedule
(a) Each university must establish and maintain a schedule for submission of program review summary reports for every degree program within the 2007-2014 cycle.

(b) The Office of Academic and Student Affairs shall review each university’s program review schedule to ensure that all programs receive sufficient review, with appropriate input from external experts, within the established seven-year cycle. Exceptions to the seven-year cycle may be negotiated to align a review with a specialized accreditation cycle.

(3) Program Review Policies and Procedures
(a) Each university must establish and publish clearly defined policies and procedures for reviewing academic degree programs during the 2007-2014 cycle and for ensuring continuous program improvement.

(b) University policies and procedures must ensure that the program review and continuous improvement processes include the following components:
1. The review of the mission(s) and purpose(s) of the program within the context of the university mission and the Board of Governors’ Strategic Plan;
2. The establishment of teaching, research, service, and other program goals and objectives, including expected outcomes, particularly in the area of student learning;
3. An assessment of:
   a. how well program goals/objectives are being met;
   b. how well students are achieving expected learning outcomes;
   c. how the results of these assessments are used for continuous program improvement; and
   d. the sufficiency of resources and support services to achieve the program goals/objectives.

4. For baccalaureate programs, a review of lower level prerequisite courses to ensure that the program is in compliance with State-approved common prerequisites and (if appropriate) a review of the limited access status of the program to determine if such status is still warranted.
   a. The Office of Academic and Student Affairs shall review all university program review policies and procedures.
   b. Each university must electronically submit its program review policies and procedures for the 2007-2014 program review cycle to the Office of Academic and Student affairs by April 1, 2007. Thereafter, revisions and updates to university procedures must be submitted to the Office for review by December 15 of each year of the cycle.

4) Program Review Summary Reports
   (a) A program review summary report must be completed for every program review that is conducted during the 2007-2014 cycle. Each summary report must include the following components:
      1. The CIP/degree combinations for the program that is reviewed.
      2. An electronic copy of the current Academic Learning Compact for each reviewed baccalaureate program.
      3. An indicator identifying whether or not the program review was conducted in conjunction with any external reviews (e.g., accreditation reviews).
      4. The date of the last review of this program.
      5. A brief description of major changes made since the previous program review.
      6. A summary of the current strengths of the program.
      7. A summary of the current weaknesses of the program.
      8. A summary of the recommendations and/or proposed action plans made as a result of the review.
      9. An official signature of the university provost that will verify that the program review included all of the processes outlined in this BOG regulation and was conducted according to approved university policies and procedures.
         a. A copy of all full program review reports must be maintained at a campus location specified by the university provost.

5) Program Review Summary Report Submission
   Each university must provide its schedule for submission of 2007-2014 program review summary reports in a prescribed electronic format to the Office of Academic and Student affairs by April 1, 2007. Thereafter, revisions and updates to the university’s schedule should be submitted to the Office for approval by December 15 of each year of the cycle.
   (a) For each program review conducted during the 2007-2014 cycle, a program review summary report must be electronically submitted to the Office of Academic and
Student Affairs during the year in which the summary report is scheduled for submission.

(b) The Board of Governors home Web page will have a link to a secure Academic Program Review Web page that will contain a standardized Summary Report template. This form will be accessible by university program review administrators and will allow each university’s program review summary reports to be submitted on-line to the BOG office, according to the timeline expressed in the university’s schedule for the submission of program review summary reports and in this Board of Governors regulation. The template will contain the components of the summary report listed in (4)(a).

(c) The Academic Program Review Website and all submitted university program review summary reports will be maintained by the Office of Academic and Student Affairs.

(d) The program review summary reports will be utilized by the Office of Academic and Student Affairs to gain knowledge of specific discipline or system-wide issues and to review topics or issues that cross over programs within a university or that cross over universities within the State University System.
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## Assessment Plan

### Unit

Enter Unit Name - must not be left blank

### Unit Mission Statement

Enter Unit Mission Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Strategic Plan Goal</th>
<th>Unit Goals, Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria and Measures</th>
<th>Process for Using Assessment Results for Continuous Improvement</th>
<th>Timetable for Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University Strategic Plan Goal this assessment links to.</td>
<td>Unit Goal measured by this assessment</td>
<td>Specific criteria and measures</td>
<td>Specific process for using these results</td>
<td>Timetable for assessments to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which University Strategic Plan Goal does this Assessment link?</td>
<td>Enter the Unit Goal this assessment will measure</td>
<td>Enter specific assessment criteria and measures</td>
<td>Enter specific process for using assessment results for continuous improvement</td>
<td>Enter timetable for assessments to occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which University Strategic Plan Goal does this Assessment link?</td>
<td>Enter the Unit Goal this assessment will measure</td>
<td>Enter specific assessment criteria and measures</td>
<td>Enter specific process for using assessment results for continuous improvement</td>
<td>Enter timetable for assessments to occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Insert assessment plan item]
### Integrative Program Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Student Learning Goals &amp; Outcomes (Abbr.)</th>
<th>College Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Program Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria and Measures</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results for Continuous Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic Sensibility:</strong> know, understand, analyze, and evaluate the variety of aesthetic frameworks and principles at work; collaborate in projects involving aesthetic awareness/analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culturally Diverse Perspective:</strong> know and understand diversity in local/global communities; analyze and evaluate the impact of cultural differences; and participate in projects involving interaction with diverse people, ideas and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecological Perspective:</strong> know issues of ecological/economic sustainability; analyze and evaluate local &amp; global ecological issues; participate in ecological/environmental projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Communication:</strong> know principles for effective communication; organize thoughts and compose ideas; and participate in collaborative communication projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical Responsibility:</strong> know and understand ethical issues; analyze and evaluate ethical issues in a variety of contexts; and participate in collaborative projects involving ethical analysis and/or discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Literacy:</strong> identify and locate sources of information; analyze and evaluate information in a variety of contexts; and participate in collaborative analysis/application of information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem-Solving Abilities:</strong> Understand multi/interdisciplinary nature of knowledge; apply critical, analytical, creative and systems thinking; and work individually and collaboratively to recognize and solve problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technological Literacy:</strong> Develop knowledge of modern technology; process information through use of technology; and collaborate with others using technology tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Awareness and Involvement:</strong> Know and understand relationships between individuals and their communities; analyze, evaluate and assess human needs and practices; and participate collaboratively in community service projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>