1. **Descriptions of the specific responsibilities of key groups such as the:** Institutional Effectiveness Committee, General Education Committee, and Assessment Task Force (formerly the General Education Assessment Committee and the Student Achievement Assessment Committee).

The IE Committee is an administrative committee and the GE Committee is a standing committee of the faculty senate. Membership in these committees is largely faculty based with administrative staff representing their respective areas or providing specific expertise. The Office of Institutional Research staffs these committees.

**The Charge of the GE Committee:**
The General education Committee is responsible for the ongoing development, implementation, and assessment of an effective general education program. Responsibilities include the evaluation and approval of courses for the liberal arts curriculum as well as the periodic evaluation of the general education policies. This committee shall advise the Regional Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and report to the Faculty Senate on the development of future general education programs at the university and provide continuous assessment of the general education.

**The Charge of the IE Committee:**
The Committee on Institutional Effectiveness is responsible for maintaining and overseeing the implementation of the assessment process at USFSP. It facilitates the systematic evaluation of how well the university is accomplishing its mission, goals, and intended student outcomes. The university uses these evaluation results for continuous improvement of its instructional programs and institutional services and activities.

The Committee is comprised of representatives from a broad spectrum of constituencies. The members are appointed annually by the Regional Chancellor. Members of the Committee are appointed for one year with reappointment possible up to a term limit of three years. The Committee will meet at least quarterly, with additional meetings called as necessary. The Committee will issue an annual report. The Committee will also report annually to the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs via the Chair.

The Committee’s duties include, but are not limited to:

a. Selecting and evaluating appropriate activities necessary for accessing the outcomes identified in the institutional effectiveness process;

b. Assisting units in the process of choosing and evaluating assessment designs appropriate to their mission;

c. Reviewing the results of assessment findings to ensure the validity/reliability of the assessment procedures;

d. Assuring the assessment findings are disseminated to the appropriate units and communicated to the Vice Chancellors and Chancellor;

e. Monitoring follow-up activities in the units to ensure that assessment findings are linked to
improvement action plans;
f. Making recommendations for improvement in the assessment process and soliciting input from other governance committee as appropriate;
g. Championing and communicating a culture of assessment, evaluation, and accountability in all campus planning and improvement efforts.

Committee Membership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GE Committee</th>
<th>IE Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Jay Sokolovsky, Anthropology</td>
<td>Prof. Mark Pezzo, Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE Committee Chair</td>
<td>IE Committee Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dawn Cecil, Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Prof. Scott Geiger, Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. John Gum, Business</td>
<td>Prof. Morgan Gresham, Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Jim Krest, Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Prof. Zafer Ural, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Tina Neville, Library</td>
<td>Prof. Margaret Hewitt, former Senate Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Charles Reeves, Education</td>
<td>Dr. Diane McKinstry, Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cynthia Collins, Advising</td>
<td>Ms. Cynthia Collins, former GE Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. J. E. Gonzalez, IR, Staff</td>
<td>Dr. J. E. Gonzalez, IR, Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Task Force:
The Assessment Task Force is an *Ad Hoc* committee that consists of members of the Institutional Effectiveness and General Education Committees. In 2008-09 this Task Force was chaired by Prof. Jay Sokolovsky (Chair, GE Committee) and the Task Force’s primary work was in evaluating the efforts of the Task Force’s GE faculty subgroups for use of that information in the university’s Fourth Monitoring Report to SACS.

A diagram that describes the relationship of these committees as they relate to assessment of student learning is shown below (see Diagram 1).
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2. Descriptions of the specific responsibilities of individuals to whom the key groups listed above offer recommendations.

As noted in Item #1 and described in Diagram 1, the IE Committee is an administrative committee and the GE Committee is a standing committee of the faculty senate. Membership in these committees is largely faculty-based with administrative staff representing their respective areas or providing specific expertise. The Office of Institutional Research staffs these committees. The Assessment Task Force is an Ad Hoc Committee that consists of members of the Institutional Effectiveness and General Education Committees. In 2008-09 this task force was chaired by Prof. Jay Sokolovsky (Chair, GE Committee).

Responsibilities:
As noted in the charge of the GE Committee, this committee advises the Regional Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and reports to the Faculty Senate on the development of future general education programs at the university and provide continuous assessment of general education.

The IE Committee reports annually to the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs via the Chair and the Committee issues an annual report.
3. Documents that would clarify who is involved in the process of analysis, improvement, and measurement in General Education. What is the "chain of command?" Who analyzes results and determines how results are disseminated?

The decision-making process at USFSP is fairly traditional in that the Vice Chancellor is the chief academic officer for the institution and reports to the Chancellor. As noted previously, the IE and GE Committees (which are staffed by the IR Office) each report to the Vice Chancellor. Labeled as Office of IR on the diagram below, the office is responsible for institutional research, planning, and effectiveness and reports to the Vice Chancellor as well as to the Chancellor. In this way the IR Office is able to independently conduct institutional assessment studies that support the mission of the institution.

The Vice Chancellor reports IE and GE assessment findings to the college deans who are responsible for implementing changes. The feedback loop is closed when the IE and GE Committees confirm that changes have been adequately implemented.

Diagram 2
Academic Assessment
4. Minutes of meetings for groups such as those listed above or examples of memoranda describing actions related to recommendations from those groups.

Minutes from GE Committee meetings are included as Appendix 1 to this document. Minutes from the IEC have been posted routinely to the IEC website. Paper copies of GE and IE Committee minutes will be printed and available in the SACS Committee’s workrooms.

IEC website: http://www.stpt.usf.edu/ir/Institutional-Effectiveness-Intro.htm
5. Clarification regarding USFSP's plan for institutional effectiveness, i.e., how are the measurements of Student Learning Outcomes used for improvement, not just in courses but institutionally? What does department and curriculum committee input look like; what does General Education and Institutional Effectiveness Committee input look like?

Curricular improvement begins with the faculty. Faculty in each major degree program must establish an Academic Learning Compact (ALC) for each program with outcomes and measures in 4 areas. Faculty evaluate data and revise ALCS annually. Course revisions or program changes are forwarded from programs or departments to the Curriculum Committees in each of the Colleges and then through the Colleges' respective Faculty Councils, and, if approved, are then forwarded to the university's Undergraduate Council for final action. The Undergraduate Council is a committee of the Faculty Senate. Summaries prepared by the Deans of program improvements in their College's ALCS and an executive summary of program improvements for all colleges are attached as Appendix 2.

In addition to faculty and College review, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee also reviews ALCS annually to ensure that reviews by the program faculty have been done and that outcomes are appropriately documented.

For General Education, the General Education Committee receives course proposals and revisions from faculty through the appropriate College curriculum committee and College Deans. The General Education Committee implements curricular changes for the General Education program. Faculty subgroups (of the Assessment Task Force) review the areas of General Education annually and recommend changes (curricular or course-based). The General Education Committee issues a formal report to the Faculty Senate annually.

Institutional effectiveness in action can be illustrated with the Graphic Design program. In 2007-2008 faculty in the program analyzed the curriculum (including input from external stakeholders) and concluded that not only were significant curricular changes necessary, but that the degree itself needed revision. These actions resulted in a restructuring of the program, and, with review by the institution's committees, received approval by the State of Florida for a degree change from the BFA in Studio Art with a concentration in Graphic Design to the BFA in Graphic Design. This new program is more responsive to students and meets the market needs more effectively.
6. Measurement instruments cited in the report such as the Graduation Survey.

Copies of the MAPP, NSSE, Alumni, Graduating Senior Survey and Employer Surveys will be printed and available in the SACS Committee's workrooms.
7. Clarification of the relationship between the percentile levels cited for USFSP students on the MAPP and measures of proficiency and explanation of how these measures relate to the General Education Student Learning Outcomes sought for USFSP students.

The MAPP is used by USFSP to measure levels of proficiency in critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics in the context of humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. The proficiency levels of the MAPP areas are generally correlated to Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for each area of the General Education program at USFSP, but are not matched one-to-one.

For example, in the area of Quantitative Reasoning, the SLOs are:
1. Students will demonstrate the ability to estimate and to apply arithmetic, algebra, geometry and statistics, appropriately, to solve problems. They will demonstrate an awareness of the relevance of these skills to a wide range of disciplines.
2. Students will demonstrate the ability to represent and evaluate mathematical information numerically, graphically and symbolically.
3. Students will demonstrate the ability to comprehend mathematical arguments, formulas and graphical representations, and use this comprehension to answer questions, understand the significance of the results, and judge the reasonableness of their answers.

MAPP proficiency levels I through III focus on knowledge of and ability to perform specific mathematical operations such as simplifying algebraic expressions, solving equations, generalizing about numbers, interpreting graphs, etc. These are at a finer level of detail than the USFSP SLOs for Quantitative Reasoning. Nevertheless, some of the MAPP test content can be correlated generally to the USFSP SLOs. For example, the operations of solving equations and interpreting graphs correlate with SLO #2. Thus, the MAPP is useful as one of a set of measures to assess student achievement of SLOs for this area of General Education.

The MAPP also enables USFSP to understand how its students are performing relative to national norms – a strategy we view as an important benchmarking tool. However, we rely heavily on faculty judgment and critical assignments in the General Education courses to measure the proficiency of USFSP students in meeting both the course SLOs and the broader General Education SLOs. The fact that USFSP students perform at the 50th percentile or better on all MAPP areas is an indication that the General Education learning outcomes are sound and are being achieved by USFSP students.
MAPP Test Content information taken from: www.ets.org is presented in part below:

MAPP Test Content
The MAPP test measures:
- proficiency in critical thinking, reading, writing and mathematics in the context of humanities, social sciences and natural sciences
- academic skills developed, versus subject knowledge taught, in general education courses

Test Design
The test follows the same design as and is statistically equated to the former ETS Academic Profile assessment, allowing former Academic Profile customers to conduct longitudinal or cross-sectional studies. Questions on the MAPP test are multiple-choice and are arranged in blocks of three to eight. Each section tests the same types of skills. This integrated design prevents a particular skill area from appearing all at once late in the test when fatigue can affect student performance.

Content Flexibility
Add your own questions – Faculty can add up to 50 locally authored multiple-choice questions and nine demographic questions — to meet specific program needs.
Add an essay – Institutions can gain additional insight into students’ general knowledge and critical thinking and writing skills by adding an optional essay.

Proficiency Measures
In addition to a total score, proficiency classifications (proficient, marginal or not proficient) measure how well your students have mastered each level of proficiency within three skill areas:

Reading/Critical Thinking
Level I
Students who are proficient can:
- recognize factual material explicitly presented in a reading passage
- understand the meaning of particular words or phrases in the context of a reading passage

Level II
Students who are proficient can:
- synthesize material from different sections of a passage
- recognize valid inferences derived from material in the passage
- identify accurate summaries of a passage or of significant sections of the passage
- understand and interpret figurative language
- discern the main idea, purpose or focus of a passage or a significant portion of the passage

Level III
Students who are proficient can:
- evaluate competing causal explanations
- evaluate hypotheses for consistency with known facts
- determine the relevance of information for evaluating an argument or conclusion
- determine whether an artistic interpretation is supported by evidence contained in a work
- recognize the salient features or themes in a work of art
- evaluate the appropriateness of procedures for investigating a question of causation
- evaluate data for consistency with known facts, hypotheses or methods
- recognize flaws and inconsistencies in an argument

Writing Skills
Level I
Students who are proficient can:
- recognize agreement among basic grammatical elements (e.g., nouns, verbs, pronouns and conjunctions)
- recognize appropriate transition words
- recognize incorrect word choice
- order sentences in a paragraph
- order elements in an outline

Level II
Students who are proficient can:
- incorporate new material into a passage
- recognize agreement among basic grammatical elements (e.g., nouns, verbs, pronouns and conjunctions)
- when these elements are complicated by intervening words or phrases
- combine simple clauses into single, more complex combinations
- recast existing sentences into new syntactic combinations

Level III
Students who are proficient can:
- discriminate between appropriate and inappropriate use of parallelism
- discriminate between appropriate and inappropriate use of idiomatic language
- recognize redundancy
- discriminate between correct and incorrect constructions
- recognize the most effective revision of a sentence
Mathematics
Level I
Students who are proficient can:
solve word problems that would most likely be solved by arithmetic and do not involve conversion of units or proportionality. These problems can be multi-step if the steps are repeated rather than embedded.
solve problems involving the informal properties of numbers and operations, often involving the Number Line, including positive and negative numbers, whole numbers and fractions (including conversions of common fractions to percent, such as converting "1/4" to 25%)
solve problems requiring a general understanding of square roots and the squares of numbers
solve a simple equation or substitute numbers into an algebraic expression
find information from a graph. This task may involve finding a specified piece of information in a graph that also contains other information.

Level II
Students who are proficient can:
solve arithmetic problems with some complications, such as complex wording, maximizing or minimizing, and embedded ratios. These problems include algebra problems that can be solved by arithmetic (the answer choices are numeric).
simplify algebraic expressions, perform basic translations, and draw conclusions from algebraic equations and inequalities. These tasks are more complicated than solving a simple equation, though they may be approached arithmetically by substituting numbers.
interpret a trend represented in a graph, or choose a graph that reflects a trend
solve problems involving sets; problems have numeric answer choices

Level III
Students who are proficient can:
solve word problems that would be unlikely to be solved by arithmetic; the answer choices are either algebraic expressions or numbers that do not lend themselves to back-solving
solve problems involving difficult arithmetic concepts such as exponents and roots other than squares and square roots and percent of increase or decrease
generalize about numbers, (e.g., identify the values of \(x\) for which an expression increases as \(x\) increases)
solve problems requiring an understanding of the properties of integers, rational numbers, etc.
interpret a graph in which the trends are to be expressed algebraically or one of the following is involved: exponents and roots other than squares and square roots, percent of increase or decrease
solve problems requiring insight or logical reasoning
8. Where available, clarification regarding the number of respondents. Many tables report percentages without indicating the number of respondents.

In adherence to standard practice in social science research, a description of the purpose of the study, the population, sample and sample selection process, response rates, and other measures such as standard error calculations were typically included in the methodology section of each of the reports that were discussed in the Fourth Monitoring Report. However, largely as a matter of presentation style, the tables that were included in the main body of the Fourth Monitoring Report reported only percentages.

Below please find the number of respondents for each of the studies cited:

The MAPP
The MAPP requires a minimum of fifty participants in each study group to ensure valid results. The study groups included first-time freshmen, graduating seniors that were native students, and graduating seniors that transferred to USF St. Petersburg as upper-division students.

The NSSE Report
For the four years reported, the number of respondents included:
2004: 67 Freshmen and 101 Seniors
2005: 60 Freshmen and 191 Seniors
2006: 41 Freshmen and 148 Seniors
2007: 29 Freshmen and 117 Seniors

The Alumni Survey
The adjusted sample totaled 1,536 students. Surveys were received from 100 respondents for an adjusted response rate of 6.5% which represents a Standard Error (SE) of ± 9.5%.

The Graduating Senior Survey
Responses from Fall 08 Graduates totaled 209 students. The average number of responses to the general education area questions was 75.

The Employer Survey
The response rate for this study was low (N=11), but since each response carried with it employer perceptions of many USFSP graduates, the campus considers these data to be meaningful.
9. Clarification regarding how the General Education Grid maps to Student Learning Outcomes and student curricular choices. How does the institution assure coverage of Student Learning Outcomes if students select courses where the specific outcomes are not included?

This is always a challenging issue – that is, how to balance an appropriate level of student curricular choice across the areas of General Education with the need to assure coverage of the full suite of General Education Student Learning Outcomes. Over the past two years, USFSP has worked to significantly narrow and sharpen its General Education course offerings in part to address this issue. Of the large number of courses historically taught in the GE curriculum, course offerings were reduced to 90.

In addition, the faculty subgroups (of the Assessment Task Force) for each area of General Education examine the student performance information for each course in that particular area and also examine individual course learning outcomes and their relationship to the area learning outcomes. General Education courses continue to be revised and enhanced by individual faculty to address coverage of learning outcomes. The annual Task Force discussions recently revealed more coverage of learning outcomes than reported officially by faculty through the formal assessment process. The documentation of coverage of learning outcomes has been strengthened and will be reflected in the Spring 2009 data. Over time, this should ensure that no matter what array of courses students select, all of the learning outcomes for General Education will be addressed.

We also know that our students perform at about the 50th percentile in all areas assessed by the MAPP instrument. This indicates to us that students have been carefully advised and have elected a “balanced portfolio” of General Education courses addressing the full suite of learning outcomes.
10. Clarification regarding the General Education Grid and the example in Appendix 1. A Western Civilization course (EUH 2000) is provided as an example of how course assessment materials are linked to the General Education Area E: Historical Perspectives. Yet, the table showing the Coverage of Student Learning Outcomes by Courses within GE does not include EUH 2000.

The GE Philosophy Statement (Appendix 1 to the Fourth Monitoring Report) included a set of figures that were intended to illustrate the ongoing nature of general education assessment. Figure 1 detailed Phase 1 of the process, which includes course-level data. Figure 2 detailed Phase 2 of the process, which includes student-level performance data. EUH 2000 was selected for use in this section of the document because it provided a good example of course- and student-level data. EUH 2000 was taught by a well-respected faculty member—who incidentally championed the addition of this course to the GE curriculum. Figure 3a detailed the coverage of Student Learning Outcomes and as the SACS reader correctly noted, the data in the table does not include information on EUH 2000. This is not an error or an omission. The data in Figure 3a reflects 07-08 GE assessment data. As noted, EUH 2000 was approved by the GE Committee and taught for the first time in fall 2008. We can also point to the Course Offering Matrix (Appendix 3 to the GE Philosophy Statement) which shows no enrollment data for this course prior to fall 2008.
11. Sample course syllabi for general education liberal arts courses.

Each semester, faculty members that teach general education courses are asked to submit their syllabi. At Over time at USFSP, this compilation process has evolved from paper-copies to electronic copies of syllabi; and in 08-09 syllabi are embedded electronically in our GE Assessment Tool.

We have attached electronic versions as Appendix 3 to this document. Printed copies of at least two syllabi from each GE Area (A-I) for fall 08 and spring 09 will be printed and placed in the Exhibit Room. Syllabi for all courses can be viewed from the GE Assessment Tool which can be accessed from a networked computer on campus (available to the Committee in the on-campus workroom).
12. Clarification as to whether graduates of other areas besides those in the College of Education are subject to licensure examinations. If so, what are the results of those examinations and how are those results used to evaluate student success?

The only graduates that must take licensure examinations before they can work in their profession are those from the College of Education.
13. Who evaluates student achievement, and how is this action part of a process used to evaluate success? How is this process articulated and made useful within USFSP? Who makes these decisions?

The USFSP faculty evaluate student achievement in every course every day. The faculty set the standards of achievement for each course and for graduation. For example, the minimum grade point average (GPA) needed for graduation from USFSP is 2.0. However, the Graphic Design program as well as all degree programs in the College of Education that lead to initial teacher certification require a GPA of 2.5 or better. To receive an Honors Program designation, students must achieve a GPA of 3.3 or better.

Student achievement is measured in all degree programs through the Academic Learning Compact (ALC) process. The ALCs are developed by faculty and reviewed annually. MAPP and numerous other measures evaluate student achievement in General Education (as discussed in USFSP's 4th Monitoring Report). For MAPP, students are performing at or above the 50th percentile which indicates that USFSP students are being prepared to be successful academically.

Decisions about individual student achievement are made by individual faculty. Decisions that bear on evaluation of programs and student success are made by faculty working collegially through their College curriculum committees and faculty councils, through the General Education Committee and its counterpart for degree programs, the Undergraduate Council, all overseen by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee. Faculty are both data providers and policymakers (with policy decisions based on data provided). The overall responsibility for student achievement rests with Deans and, ultimately, the Chief Academic Officer (USFSP's Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs).
14. How is program assessment related to majors’ graduation rates or success in employment or discipline-specific standards?

Until 2005-06, all data on USFSP graduates were grouped with USF system graduates. Data on graduation rates is useful but not definitive for program assessment purposes at this time. USFSP uses information from its graduation survey (given to seniors in the semester of their graduation), the Alumni Survey (an ACT product), employer surveys (both formal and informal), as well as information from program and departmental faculty to inform program assessment. All Colleges have active professional advisory councils of external stakeholders (including employers) that inform program assessment and curricular revisions. In addition, programs such as Graphic Design require students to complete internships in the field. Internship supervisors are asked to complete an evaluation of both the student and the program content (based on their assessment of the student’s preparedness). These evaluations are reviewed carefully by program faculty and used to support program revisions.

These data sources are important inputs to program assessment, and are additive to assessment of student learning outcomes and periodic reviews of programs by external peers or professional accreditation groups (AACSB (business), Florida Department of Education, ACEJMC (journalism).
15. Does USFSP take any steps to track graduates who, according to FETPIP, are not employed or continuing their education.

FETPIP does not provide data on specific individuals. Rather, from student-specific identifiers that it receives from USFSP, FETPIP provides aggregated information on employment, continuing education, public assistance, and incarceration. It is not possible to disaggregate the information we receive from FETPIP. Until 2005-06, all data on USFSP graduates were grouped with USF system graduates. We have conducted surveys of graduating seniors, an alumni survey and an employer survey all of which have provided additional data on graduates' current status. We have also strengthened the USFSP Career Center and extended services to alumni. Graduates can return to the Career Center and use its services, including the annual Career Fair.

We have high interest in this issue and believe that there may be important information on graduates that resides with departments and programs (or with individual faculty members within academic units). We are pursuing this information.
16. What are the explanations for any data inconsistencies? For example, why is the number of graduates that USFSP reports in other places different from those on the FETPIP?

FETPIP compiles quarterly employment databases and posts its final database in December, which lags by one calendar year. This is the industry standard methodology for dealing with employment data. Universities compile the best graduation data at the end of each academic year (after graduates are certified in late summer). The effect of synchronizing the USFSP’s data submission with the FETPIP process was most evident in the first use of the data. In the first iteration of the process, our baseline year, USFSP student-level data was matched against the existing FETPIP database (a dated file). In the second and subsequent iterations of the process, students that were not matched in the first iteration are held in a cue and matched against updated FETPIP databases. With subsequent iterations, match rates tend to increase and new reports are issued if changes result. USFSP will replace its current reports with subsequent updated reports if match rates change.
17. Reports or other explanation of ways that information regarding data demonstrating student achievement such as success on licensing examinations and job placement rates is used to evaluate success at the programmatic as well as the institutional level.

We have addressed this question in the responses to questions 12, 13, 14, and 15.
Appendix 1
Minutes from the GE Committee

October 7, 2008
October 13, 2008
November 10, 2008
November 24, 2008
December 10, 2008
January 15, 2009
January 31, 2009
Dear Dr. Gratz:

Based on our conversation today and the email below, I'm sending back a draft schedule of interviews for your review and consideration. All of the individuals have been contacted and are ready to speak with you. We have identified places for the interviews that are only a few steps away from the Committee Workroom (BAY 220). Please let me know if Dr. Cuevas has others that she wishes to interview.

Thank you again for taking the time to discuss some of the items requested. Your clarifications were most helpful.

Sincerely,
Norine E. Noonan

From: Gratz, Robert D [mailto:robert.gratz@bxstate.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2009 2:54 PM
To: Noonan, Norine
Cc: Beverly M. Moon (bmoon@deltastate.edu); Donna Wilkinson (dwilkins@sacscoc.org); Nuria M. Cuevas (ncuevas@nsu.edu)
Subject: Request for Supplemental Information and for Interviews

Dear Norine:

After a conference call with the members of the Special Committee that will be visiting the University of South Florida St. Petersburg next week, I am writing to request your help in securing some additional information to help our committee complete its charge. We understand that the campus was responding to specific requests from the Commission on two specific principles, 3.5.1. and 4.1. However, to help us understand the context for the data that you have presented, we are seeking some additional information regarding the overall framework for the data you have provided. We are also seeking some additional information regarding the data itself.

Specifically, we would appreciate any additional documentation that you can provide on the following questions, either by forwarding appropriate material to committee members prior to the visit or by placing appropriate responses in the hotel and campus work rooms:

- Descriptions of the specific responsibilities of key groups such as the:
  - Institutional Effectiveness Committee
  - General Education Committee
  - Assessment Task Force (formerly the General Education Assessment Committee and the Student Achievement Assessment Committee)
- Descriptions of the specific responsibilities of individuals to whom the key groups listed above offer recommendations.
- Documents that would clarify who is involved in the process of analysis, improvement, and measurement in General Education. What is the “chain of command”? Who analyzes results and determines how results are disseminated?
• Minutes of meetings for groups such as those listed above or examples of memoranda describing actions related to recommendations from those groups.

• Clarification regarding USFSP’s plan for institutional effectiveness, i.e., how are the measurements of Student Learning Outcomes used for improvement, not just in courses but institutionally? What does department and curriculum committee input look like; what does General Education and Institutional Effectiveness Committee input look like?

• Measurement instruments cited in the report such as the Graduation Survey.

• Clarification of the relationship between the percentile levels cited for USFSP students on the MAPP and measures of proficiency and explanation of how these measures relate to the General Education Student Learning Outcomes sought for USFSP students.

• Where available, clarification regarding the number of respondents. Many tables report percentages without indicating the number of respondents.

• Clarification regarding how the General Education Grid maps to Student Learning Outcomes and student curricular choices. How does the institution assure coverage of Student Learning Outcomes if students select courses where the specific outcomes are not included?

• Clarification regarding the General Education Grid and the example in Appendix 1. A Western Civilization course (EUH 2000) is provided as an example of how course assessment materials are linked to the General Education Area E: Historical Perspectives. Yet, the table showing the Coverage of Student Learning Outcomes by Courses within GE does not include EUH 2000.

• Sample course syllabi for general education liberal arts courses.

• Clarification as to whether graduates of other areas besides those in the College of Education are subject to licensure examinations. If so, what are the results of those examinations and how are those results used to evaluate student success?

• Who evaluates student achievement, and how is this action part of a process used to evaluate success? How is this process articulated and made useful within USFSP? Who makes these decisions?

• How is program assessment related to majors’ graduation rates or success in employment or discipline-specific standards?

• Does USFSP take any steps to track graduates who, according to FETPIP, are not employed and continuing their education?

• What are the explanations for any data inconsistencies? For example, why is the number of graduates that USFSP reports in other places different from those on the FETPIP?

• Reports or other explanation of ways that information regarding data demonstrating student achievement such as success on licensing examinations and job placement rates is used to evaluate success at the programmatic as well as the institutional level.

We have identified the following specific individuals we would like to interview and seek your assistance in scheduling these interviews (30 minutes each) beginning at 1:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 5, 2009:

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Dr. Moon)
Institutional Effectiveness Committee Chairman (Dr. Moon)
General Education Committee Chair (Dr. Moon)
Assessment Task Force Chair (Dr. Moon)
Director of Institutional Research (Dr. Cuevas)
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (Dr. Gratz)

If we identify any additional interview requests, I will let you know as soon as possible.

Thank you for your assistance in helping us prepare for our visit. If I can provide any further information regarding these requests, please let me know.

Sincerely,