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Part 2. INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT OF RESPONSE

Section 2: CORE REQUIREMENTS

2.11.1 The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. The member institution provides the following financial statements: (1) an institutional audit (or Standard Review Report issued in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services issued by the AICPA for those institutions audited as part of a system-wide or state-wide audit) and written institutional management letter for the most recent fiscal year prepared by an independent certified public accountant and/or an appropriate governmental auditing agency employing the appropriate audit (or Standard Review Report) guide; (2) a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, which represents the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the most recent year; and (3) an annual budget that is preceded by sound plan. (Financial Resources)

X Compliance  Partial Compliance  Non-compliance

Off-Site Committee Comments

The University provided audited financial statements for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2008 through June 30, 2012. The institution received an unqualified opinion for each year from the State of Florida Auditor General. The University's net assets increased as follows:

FYE 2009 $75.5 million
FYE 2010 $135.3 million
FYE 2011 $118.4 million
FYE 2012 $36.9 million

The audit report for the most recent fiscal year ended June 30, 2013 is not expected to be available until December 2013. In addition, the University did not provide a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets attributable to operations for the most recent fiscal year.

With regard to the budget development process, the University has a well-established process including a University Budget Advisory Committee (members include senior leadership, the Faculty Senate President, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Advisory Committee, and four faculty members). Units are requested to summarize accomplishments, justify expenditure priorities in the current fiscal year, provide goals and objectives for the upcoming fiscal year, identify potential changes, and catalog their requests for allocation of funds. The University Board of Trustees approves a tentative
budget in June with final approval normally given in August.

**Focused Report Response**

**Institutional Audit**

The State of Florida Auditor General audits Florida State University in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States and contained in Government Auditing Standards issued by the Comptroller General. These standards require the Auditor General to obtain reasonable assurance that our financial statements are free from material misstatement. The Auditor General determined that our financial statements were presented fairly and applicable and they released their [unqualified opinion on the University's 2012-2013 Financial Statements December 31, 2013. The University's 2012-2013 Annual Report was made available in January 2014.](FSU Annual Report 2012-2013)

**Statement of Financial Position of Unrestricted Net Assets**

The University's 2012-2013 Annual Report includes a Statement of Financial Position for Unrestricted Net Assets, Exclusive of Plant Assets and Related Debt as of June 30, 2013 [Unrestricted Net Assets, FSU Annual Report, p. 40; Statement of Financial Position]. The latest Annual Report was released by the State Auditor General on December 31, 2013. Total current and noncurrent assets totaled $477,586,693, current and noncurrent liabilities totaled $140,805,613 and the total net position is $336,781,080. Overall, the University increased its Unrestricted Net Assets, exclusive of Plant and Plant-Related debt, over the past 6 years.
Section 3: COMPREHENSIVE STANDARDS

3.2 GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

3.2.5 The governing board has a policy whereby members can be dismissed only for appropriate reasons and by a fair process. (Board Dismissal)

- Compliance  - Partial Compliance  - Non-compliance

Off-Site Committee Comments

The Florida constitution states that a board of trustees shall govern each public university. The constitution further specifies that Governor of Florida may suspend a state officer for malfeasance, misfeasance, neglect of duty, drunkenness, incompetence, permanent inability to perform official duties, or commission of a felony. The Florida Senate would then determine whether a board member should be removed from office. Reporting channels for board member misconduct are outlined in the same constitutional statute, stating that the chair of the board of trustees is responsible for reporting misconduct to the Florida governor. Furthermore, FSU policy states that all university persons should report any actions by a member of the board of trustees that could constitute reasonable grounds for dismissal to the State Governor.

Additionally, a Florida Board of Governors Regulation states that the chair of the board of trustees should notify the state Governor or the Florida Board of Governors if a member of the board of trustee has an unexcused absence for three or more consecutive meetings. In these cases, the Florida Board of Governors may remove the board member. While a clear policy is in place for the occasion of dismissal of a Board of Trustees member, there is no evidence indicating that action to dismiss a Board of Trustees member has ever taken place. Additionally, the institution does not specifically state whether dismissal of an FSU Board of Trustees member has ever occurred.

Focused Report Response

No member of the Florida State University Board of Trustees has been dismissed and considered for dismissal. Under FSU Policy, all university persons are directed to report to the Governor any actions by BOT members that could constitute reasonable grounds for dismissal, including, but not limited to neglect of duty, permanent inability to perform official duties, or three or more unexcused absences from meetings [FSU Board Dismissal Policy]. The General Counsel's office participates in the orientation provided to all board of trustee members upon appointment. [BOT New Member Orientation]. As needed, the General Counsel's office updates the trustees at their meetings regarding
updates to state law [BOT Agenda, February 19, 2010] [BOT Minutes, February 19, 2010]. Since its inception, all board members have left their position either by expiration of term, non-reappointment, resignation or, in the case of Trustee Alan Sundberg, death. [FSU BOT Appointment History] Therefore, there are no examples of implementation of these provisions.
3.3 INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

3.3.1.3 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in academic and student support services. (Institutional Effectiveness: Academic and Student Support Services)

X Compliance  ___ Partial Compliance  ___ Non-compliance

Off-Site Committee Comments

A systematic process is in place at Florida State University to assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the delivery of academic and student support services from offices within the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. An excellent annual assessment, reporting and approval process is in place. Outcomes are identified, assessed and evaluated. Results are interpreted and improvements advanced prompted by the analysis and interpretation of assessment findings.

The university uses its Institutional Effectiveness Portal (IEP) to enter information and data associated with its review of the effectiveness of academic and student support services. As evidence demonstrating outcomes, measures, results and improvements the institution presented a 5% random sample of academic and student support programs from the IEP. This sample of 7 programs was reported to be representative of programs offered on the main campus, branch campuses, off-campus instructional sites and for distance learning. Four of the seven examples were units within the Academic Affairs Division and three were units from the Division of Student Affairs.

The Off-site Review committee concluded that the evidentiary sample of student support services from the Division of Student Affairs was insufficient to conclude that a valid cross-section of units have been presented. The institution did not provide enough examples and did not provide clarification for why the sample and its associated findings are an appropriate representation of the institutions academic and student support services.

Focused Report Response

Florida State University provides an array of academic and student support services primarily through the Division of Student Affairs and also through the Division of Undergraduate Studies (housed within Academic Affairs).

In order to ensure a representative sample of FSU’s student support services, a sample from each major service unit in both Student Affairs and Undergraduate Studies is included. This provides a view of our activities campus-wide. This sample includes all
major student support activities and illustrates the breadth of services offered to students at FSU.  [Student Affairs Org Chart]  [Undergraduate Studies Org Chart]

These service units include the following:

**Student Affairs**

Examples from Student Affairs demonstrate assessment of a wide range of student support services extending beyond the classroom. These include support for new students through Orientation programming; health services, counseling programs, and services for students with disabilities; promotion of civic leadership and global engagement; recreational activities; career services; and housing services.

- **Center for Leadership & Civic Education** – The Center serves as the campus hub for linking students to service through both curricular and co-curricular experiences and assists faculty with strategies for connecting service to the curriculum.

- **Center for Global Engagement** – The Center provides programs and services to international students, visiting scholars, international faculty and their families.

- **University Health Center** – In addition to health care services, the Center promotes campus wellness in order to enhance student capacity for reaching academic and personal goals.

- **Oglesby Union** – The Union is designed to build a campus community and provide activities to FSU students.

- **University Counseling Center** -- The Counseling Center helps students explore issues that may affect their academic and emotional well-being.

- **Campus Recreation** – Campus Recreation provides quality recreational programs, services and facilities to students.

- **Housing** – The Housing Office is to create a community atmosphere that encourages academic and personal achievement of students.

- **Career Center** – The Center provides comprehensive career services, including career advising, mock interviews, on-campus interviews with potential employers, career fairs and workshops on choosing a major, career exploration and employment strategies.

- **Dean of Students** – The Dean of Students supports FSU’s academic mission by providing orientation, services for new students and their families, coordination of Greek life, student rights and responsibilities and the Student Disability Resource Center.
Undergraduate Studies

Examples from the Division of Undergraduate Studies are geared specifically to support student academic success and focus on both student retention and college completion. These programs address the needs of students in academic difficulty; assist students who have been identified as academically at-risk; provide support and academic engagement for high-achieving students; and provide academic advising and coaching.

- Center for Academic Retention and Advancement (CARE) (joint program with Student Affairs) – The CARE Center is an academic support center that implements pre-collegiate and undergraduate programs targeted to first-generation college students who are disadvantaged because of economic, educational or cultural circumstances.

- Office of National Fellowships – The Office serves students by promoting nationally competitive undergraduate scholarships, identifying qualified FSU students and mentoring them through the application process in order to prepare them to succeed.

- Office of Undergraduate Research – The Office invites students who are curious about research to explore the many opportunities available at FSU. Research can be done in a laboratory, through archival work, fieldwork, interviews or an artistic project.

- Academic Center for Excellence (ACE) – The Center helps all undergraduate students develop the study skills and personal success habits that enhance learning and promote the highest level of scholarship and academic achievement, helping undergraduate students meet their short- and long-term academic goals.

- University Honors Office – The Office seeks to attract the best students in Florida and the nation to FSU and, once enrolled, seeks to provide the university’s most talented and motivated students with the best possible educational opportunities.

- Advising First – The program takes a proactive approach to academic advising by initiating efforts that support and enhance each student’s academic and career aspirations. Advisors also service as referral agents for other support services at FSU.

- Success Coaching – Working with academic departments, colleges and the Division of Student Affairs, the Success Coaching program aims to increase student retention and ensure that students are making timely progress toward their degree.

- Community College Relations – The program seeks to attract and support
high-functioning community college transfer students who will achieve success in undergraduate and graduate education.

- Student Athlete Academic Support (SAAS) – The SAAS provides an environment that facilitates the academic success of each student athlete, culminating with graduation, job placement or graduate school.

[Student Affairs examples 2009-2010 through 2011-2012] [Undergraduate Studies examples 2009-2010 through 2011-2012]

Entries specific to the branch campuses in Panama City, FL and Panama City, Republic of Panama are also included. [Examples of academic and support services branch campuses] Academic and student support services for off-campus sites and distance learning students are coordinated through the main campus units whose outcomes are included above.
3.5 UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them. (General Education Competencies)

X Compliance  ___ Partial Compliance  ___ Non-compliance

Off-Site Committee Comments

The institution’s general education is entitled their Liberal Studies Program, and it is an integral element within the strategic plan. It encompasses five thematic areas and conforms to State Statute (1001.02 (6)) that requires a maximum of 36 semester credit hours. The Liberal Studies program is published in the General Bulletin of the institution.

The institution has policies and procedures regarding which coursework is part of general education, as well as transfer credit. The Undergraduate Policy Committee reviews and approves coursework, along with the listing of competencies for the five thematic areas. The Liberal Studies Program is also aligned with State Statute (6A-10.030) on assessment of college-level communication and computational skills.

A training manual exists for the assessment of student outcomes and an annual analysis of competencies and student outcomes with direct and indirect measures used in reporting to the Undergraduate Policy Committee, Deans, and Vice President for Planning exists. Not all courses are assessed annually. The research methodology for sampling was not provided therefore, due to a lack of detail regarding sampling, the Off-Site Committee was unable to determine compliance.

Focused Report Response

Assessment Overview

The Liberal Studies and related competency curricula that comprise the university’s general education competencies incorporate several hundred courses [Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011, 2013 v]. More than 11,000 first-and second-year students (the group most typically enrolled in these courses) were enrolled at the University each year in the three years from 2010 to 2012. [Five-Year Enrollment by Student Level] The curriculum is overseen by the Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC), a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. The UPC elected to use sampling to collect data to assess student achievement of the college-level general education competencies.

The courses selected for sampling are drawn from each of the five thematic areas of Liberal Studies (Computation, English Composition, History/Social Sciences,
Humanities/Fine Arts, and Natural Sciences) as well as from each of the three additional competency curricula (Multicultural, Oral Communication, and Computer Competency). They are representative of the institution’s mission and the mission and goals of the Liberal Studies Program. Florida State University’s mission explicitly refers to “a philosophy of learning strongly rooted in the traditions of the liberal arts.” [FSU Strategic Plan Mission Statement] [FSU General Bulletin p. 90] The selected courses provide a representative sampling of student learning outcomes that correspond to the competencies established for each of the Liberal Studies/Competency areas.

The committee identified specific courses for assessment, with more than 32,000 assessments conducted in the most recent year for which complete data is available. [Number of Students Assessed by Liberal Studies & Competency Area by Campus v] Tens of thousands of assessments were done over the three year period, 2010 to 2012. [Size and Variation of Enrollment in Courses Sampled for Liberal Studies and Competency Fall and Spring 2011_2013 v] In each area (liberal studies and competency), the group of sampled courses yielded a minimum sample of 15% of total students enrolled in all approved liberal studies/competency area courses. [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] The courses are selected by the sampling methodology described below to provide a representative sampling of student learning outcomes that correspond to the competencies established for each of the Liberal Studies/Competency areas.

Enrollment in the selected courses varies by semester, and the selection was based in part on the committee’s knowledge of prior enrollment patterns. These courses typically represent a significant percentage of students taking the Liberal Studies/Competency courses in each general education area. [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies and Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] [Size and Variation of Enrollment in Courses Sampled for Liberal Studies & Competency Fall & Spring 2011_2013 v] While it is not possible to determine which students are taking these courses with the specific intention of fulfilling Liberal Studies/Competency requirements, in 2011, almost 38% of first- and second-year students (those most typically using these courses to fulfill Liberal Studies/Competency requirements) were enrolled in the sampled courses. [Relative Size of Enrollment in Sampled Classes by Liberal Studies & Competency Area 2011_2013 v] While the UPC chose most of the courses in its sample several years ago and has retained them as part of the assessment sample to provide longitudinal information, their sample has continued to be representative over time, both in total enrollment numbers and as a percentage of student enrollment in each area [Relative Size of Enrollment in Sampled Classes by Liberal Studies & Competency Area 2011_2013 v].

The sample taken by the UPC has allowed the university to assess the performance of a large number of students annually. The large sample size ensures it will be representative of the students enrolled in the general education curriculum. Taken together, the sampled courses represent approximately 22% of all students taking Liberal Studies/Competency courses, with a total of more than 140,000 students enrolled in all liberal studies/competency areas courses each year. Almost all of the
eight areas actually assess well over 1,600 students annually. [Number of Students Assessed by Liberal Studies & Competency Area by Campus] The exception is English Composition where slightly less than 300 are evaluated. The use of portfolio assessment and the work it entails has resulted in fewer students being assessed. However, even here 5% of students enrolled in the selected English Composition Courses were evaluated in the latest year. In all, over 32,000 assessments were conducted for students in the liberal studies and competency areas during the latest year for which there is full information. [Number of Students Assessed by Liberal Studies & Competency Area by Campus]

Extent to Which Students Achieve the Competencies in the Liberal Studies/Competency Curriculum

This sample also allows the university to reasonably determine the success of our students in learning the essential elements of the liberal studies curriculum and the competency courses. Our students are successful in the liberal studies/competency courses as described in the evidence provided in the initial response to this standard. In 2011-2012, for example, scores indicate that expectations of performance were met on the main campus. For most of the liberal studies/competency courses, the criteria for success was: 80% of students will score at least 70% on a given assignment. There are two exceptions to these criteria: oral communication (90% score greater than 70%) and writing (85% score greater than 70%). [Gen Ed results 2011 2012]

For students at the Republic of Panama, results indicate successful completion at the selected standards except for Oral Communication, Writing and Mathematics. Improvements planned for Oral Communication include keynote speech workshops, greater use of drafts and reinforcement of research skills through library workshops. Improvements planned for writing include diagnostic testing along with a grammar course to supplement the basic writing courses. The improvement plans recognize that English is a second language for many students. For Mathematics, better alignment of Republic of Panama efforts with the main campus, implementation of a math placement exam and offering remedial algebra are expected to enable students at the Republic of Panama to meet university standards. [Gen Ed results 2011 2012]

Sampling Methodology

The research methodology for assessing student success in meeting general education competencies is developed, adopted and overseen by the Undergraduate Policy Committee, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate with membership representative of all of the Colleges housing undergraduate programs. [UPC Membership]

The UPC requires all departments submitting new courses for approval for any of the Liberal Studies/competency areas to certify that they will assess student attainment of the relevant competencies by collecting data on the appropriate student learning outcomes. Through a formal process, the committee identified a sample of courses for
which data would be collected and reviewed at the committee level. The committee continues to review the sampling strategy and assess data on the sampled courses each year. [UPC Minutes September 2004 Excerpt 2 v] [UPC September 2010 Minutes Excerpt v] [UPC September 2013 Minutes Excerpt v] The faculty members of the UPC determined the representative courses for sampling according to several criteria:

1) In order to provide a cross-section of the general education students receive at Florida State University, sample courses were drawn from each Liberal Studies/Competency area.

2) In order to capture the experience of a large number of students fulfilling the requirements for each Liberal Studies/Competency area, high-enrollment, multi-section courses were chosen, based on the committee’s historical understanding of the frequency distribution of enrollment in Liberal Studies/Competency Courses [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] and total enrollment in Liberal Studies/Competency courses in each area. In all cases except for Writing, assessment was based on a specific assignment or activity that required students to demonstrate the required competency and all students completing that assignment or activity were assessed.

3) In order to accommodate an approach deemed more relevant to the discipline, the assessment of students in Writing courses was based on student writing portfolios in selected sections of multi-section courses.

4) In order to compare the experience of students in the smaller course sections that characterize a majority of the offerings in the Humanities/Fine Arts area, the committee also decided to sample a small, seminar-style course focused on critical thinking and major figures in a particular discipline.

5) In order to establish a consistent assessment framework that would persist over time, courses were chosen that demonstrated relatively stable and substantial enrollment in successive years. [Size and Variation of Enrollment in Courses Sampled by Liberal Studies & Competency Area 2011_2013 v]

6) In order to ensure that department-specific offerings maintained the spirit of what had previously been offered by a single department, the committee decided to collect data on all computer competency courses (see greater detail on this rationale below).

The overall assessment design uses the post-test method and is conducted at the course level. Assessments are typically criterion-referenced, using a benchmark of a score of at least 70% on an assignment or test item selected to demonstrate the identified skills related to each student learning outcome. This benchmark is consistent with other student learning outcomes on campus and with state standards.
Overall, the breadth and extent of the sample of courses selected and number of students assessed provide a valid representation of Liberal Studies/Competency Area curricula and a valid cross-section of the Liberal Studies/Competency Area offerings (including both online courses and courses offered at the Republic of Panama).

Details on Courses and Sampling Rationale

The courses chosen for each Liberal Studies/Competency area and additional rationale for their selection are as follows:

**Computation**

MAC 1105 College Algebra

MGF 1106 Mathematics for Liberal Arts

MGF 1107 Topics in Practical Finite Mathematics

This sample includes the largest enrollment course in this area (MAC 1105), with the total enrollment in the three selected courses averaging about 22% of total Liberal Studies mathematics enrollment. These particular courses are foundational courses in mathematics and are multi-section courses that are most commonly taken either by students interested in business and the sciences (MAC 1105 College Algebra) or by students opting for a liberal arts mathematics course (MGF 1106 Mathematics for Liberal Arts, MGF 1107 Topics in Practical Finite Mathematics). Courses at a higher level than MAC 1105 were seen as more major specific and therefore not as representative of the general population. Because testing for these courses is computer graded and questions for each course are drawn from a common question bank, it is possible to collect data on the responses of all enrolled students to questions demonstrating the competencies that the UPC, in consultation with the Department of Mathematics, selected to assess. While many students select a Statistics course as the second course required to satisfy the Computation requirement, the Committee’s decision to sample courses in Mathematics also reflects the state mandate that explicitly requires students to complete three hours of Mathematics courses. [Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011-2013 v] [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011-2013 v] [FAC 6A-10-030]

**English Composition (Writing)**

ENC 1102  Freshman Writing, Reading, & Research

ENC 1122  Freshman Writing About Literature: Honors

ENC 1142  Freshman Imaginative Writing Workshop

ENC 1144  Freshman Article & Essay Workshop
ENC 1145  Freshman Special Topics in Composition

This sample includes the composition course with the highest enrollment (ENC 1102), and the total enrollment in these courses averages about 76% of general-education hours in writing. [Enrollment in Liberal Studies &Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] The UPC decided to sample first-year composition courses that were second in the sequence of required writing courses since a significant proportion of FSU students complete the first in the sequence (ENC 1101) through various acceleration mechanisms and do not take the course at FSU. To satisfy the requirement for the second writing course, students may select from among the above-listed courses and, while ENC 1102 and ENC 1145 enroll the largest percentage of students, the committee decided to sample from most of the second-sequence courses available to students. [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] This sampling procedure and the associated assessment mechanism were developed in consultation with the coordinator of the First-Year Composition program. Portfolio review was chosen as a systematic way of assessing student competence that is consistent across the many sections of the courses that use portfolio grading. A common analytic grid is used, and all instructors are well versed in the mechanics of scoring. Although the number of students who take these courses in an academic year is large, the actual sample drawn within the set of selected courses is relatively small in comparison to assessed samples in the other Liberal Studies areas, given the intensive work involved in portfolio review. [Numbers of Students Assessed by Liberal Studies and Competency Area by Campus v]

History/Social Sciences

AMH 2097 Race and Ethnicity in the United States

ECO 2023 Principles of Microeconomics

GEA 1000 World Geography

This sample includes one of the largest Liberal Studies courses in each of the two sub-areas: AMH 2097 (History) and ECO 2023 (Social Sciences) and the three sampled courses average approximately 21% of student enrollment in this combined area. All three are multi-section courses that enroll large numbers of students each year. [Enrollment in Liberal Studies &Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] They are drawn from three different departments in two different colleges (Arts & Sciences and Social Sciences). AMH 2097 is used as a sample course for the Multicultural Understanding requirement but was assessed in this area in terms of the designated History/Social Science competencies.
Humanities/Fine Arts

HUM 3321 Multicultural Dimensions of Film and 20th Century Culture

PHH 3130 Plato and his Predecessors

THE 2000 Introduction to the Theatre

For this sample, the committee opted to select the two highest-enrollment courses from different colleges, one in the performing arts and offered through the College of Visual Arts, Theatre and Dance (THE 2000) and one in Humanities, offered through the College of Arts & Sciences (HUM 3321); taken together, average enrollment in these two courses comprises approximately 15% of all students taking Liberal Studies courses in this area. Both HUM 3321 and THE 2000 are multi-section courses within the content area. [Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011–2013 v]

[frequency_distribution_of_enrollment_in_liberal_studies__competency_courses_2011-2013_v] Since many courses satisfying the Humanities/Fine Arts requirement are offered in small sections, the UPC also decided to include one such course (PHH 3130) in the sample for this requirement. The broad focus and seminar format of this course presented an appropriate contrast to other, much larger lecture-oriented courses assessed in this area. HUM 3321 is used as a sample course for the Multicultural Understanding requirement but was assessed in this area in terms of the designated Humanities/Fine Arts competencies.

Natural Sciences

BSC 2010L: Biological Science I Laboratory

CHM 1045L: General Chemistry I Laboratory

For this sample, the committee chose one of the two largest courses in the Natural Science area (BSC 2010), and the two sampled courses account for approximately 18% of general-education enrollment in this area. These are multi-section courses within the content area that enroll both a significant percentage and large numbers of students each year. [Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011–2013 v]

[frequency_distribution_of_enrollment_in_liberal_studies__competency_courses_2011-2013_v] In addition, the UPC felt that these two laboratory courses would provide a better assessment of hands-on learning in the natural sciences than the large lecture classes with which they are affiliated. Though these two laboratory sections are major-specific for biology and chemistry, they are also prerequisite courses for many majors related to science and health careers, and their enrollments are typically large and consistent across years. [Size and Variation of Enrollment in Courses Sampled for Liberal Studies & Competency Fall & Spring 2011–2013 v]
Multicultural

AMH 2097 Nationality, Race, and Ethnicity in the United States
CLT 3378 Ancient Mythology, East and West
HUM 3321 Multicultural Dimensions of Film and 20th Century Culture
MUH 2051 Music Cultures of the World

This sample includes the two largest courses in this area (HUM 3321 and AMH 2097), and the entire grouping accounts for approximately 26% of the total enrollment in Multicultural courses. [Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] All are multi-section courses that enroll substantial numbers of students each year. Drawn from two different colleges (Arts & Sciences and Music), they also represent a diversity of colleges and departments. There are two components of the Multicultural Requirement, Cross-cultural Studies and Diversity in Western Culture; two of the sampled courses satisfy each component (CLT 3378 and MUH 2051 are designated as Cross-Cultural while AMH 2097 and HUM 3321 focus on Diversity in Western Culture.)

Oral Communication Competency

SPC 1017 Fundamentals of Speech
SPC 2608 Public Speaking

This sample includes two of the largest courses in this area, with the total enrollment in the selected courses averaging about 40% of total Oral Communication enrollment. These courses focus exclusively on oral communication and are high enrollment courses that are taken by students from a wide variety of majors. The only other large enrollment Oral Communication course (GEB 3213 Business Communications) is offered by the College of Business and is assessed annually as part of that College’s discipline-specific accreditation. [Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] [Frequency Distribution of Enrollment in Liberal Studies & Competency Courses 2011_2013 v] There are 26 additional, major-specific courses that satisfy the OCCR requirement, but they enroll much smaller numbers of students each term.

Computer Competency

Beginning in 2003-2004 and continuing to the next year, 2004-2005, only two courses were used for sampling (CGS 2060 Computer Fluency and CGS 2100 Microcomputer Applications for Business and Economics). These were the courses that the majority of students took to satisfy the competency. In 2005, the Faculty Senate decided to devolve the Computer Competency requirement to the departments and encouraged them to develop courses that would best address the computer needs of their majors. Many
departments chose to continue to require their majors to take CGS 2060 or CGS 2100, but a number of major-specific course requirements were also developed. Beginning in 2005-2006, the UPC therefore decided to sample all courses that fulfilled the Computer Competency requirement, including those courses specific to a particular major, to ensure that a similar level of competency was being assessed in these courses. Since all courses are assessed, figures on enrollment by course are not broken out. Each year the number of courses surveyed varied according to course offerings, with a low of 12 courses sampled to a high of 30 courses sampled.
3.7 FACULTY

3.7.1 The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See Commission guidelines "Faculty Credentials.") (Faculty Competence)

- Compliance  - Partial Compliance  - Non-compliance

Off-Site Committee Comments

The mission of the institution is as a research active university, along with the State definition as a “preeminent research university” However, evidence submitted does not fully address aspects of faculty hire and competency issues with regard to research. There exists a policy on credentialing faculty, along with faculty credential statements in the institutional Faculty Handbook. Evidence exists for compliance based on faculty rosters showing instructors of record having requisite minimal hours of graduate course within their disciplines. However, there remain questions about the qualifications of some faculty. Please see “Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty.”

[Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty]

Hiring practices require a complete analysis of transcripts and validation by the specific dean. There exists an office of Faculty Development and Advancement responsible for the administration of faculty position rules. Documentation is provided for the search process for each type of institutional faculty and practice for hires are the same at the main campus, branch campuses, or online faculty positions.

Focused Report Response

Research

As a Doctoral/Research University- Very High Research and one of two preeminent universities in the State of Florida, Florida State University places great value upon the research and creative activities conducted by its faculty, as well as by its students at both the undergraduate and graduate level.
Faculty members generally are hired to complete three main categories of assignments: teaching, research, and service. Each faculty member receives an annual Assignment of Responsibility (AOR) from his or her department chair or dean, with varying percentages of assignment in each category. There is a considerable range of percentages assigned to research across campus units, as faculty in some departments teach more than others, while other faculty have high research assignment percentages due to grant activities and the nature of their disciplines. Faculty members are evaluated annually on their performance in meeting their assignments of responsibility, including research assignments.

All faculty searches must be listed on the FSU Human Resources website. Most full-time tenure earning faculty members will have research as part of their assignment of responsibilities. The expectations for each position are part of the listing. Faculty positions are advertised through placed solicitations such as in higher education publications or discipline-specific websites or publications, as well as through recruitment at conferences and symposia. [Psychology Position] [Philosophy Position] [English Position] These advertisements typically alert candidates to the need for considerable research expertise. This expertise is established during interviews with faculty committees before an offer is extended. Once hired, faculty are given an assignment of responsibilities. They are evaluated annually against this assignment of responsibility and, in many cases, a narrative evaluation is generated that includes research and teaching performance.

Three professors hired in the College of Education are included, for example, who each responded to an advertisement that focused on research [ELPS search ad]. Examples of faculty hired in Law, Arts & Sciences, and Business are included as well.

1. Akiba, Motoko. [ELPS search ad] [CV Motoka Akiba] [Akiba transcript] [AOR- Motoko Akiba] [2012 EVAL Akiba Motoko] [Progress ltr-3-31-13 Motoko Akiba]

2. Bayern, Shawn. [Bayern journal ad—AALS Placement Bureau] [OMNI ad] [Bayern CV] [Bayern transcript] [Bayern 2011-12 AOR] [Bayern 2012-13 AOR] [Bayern annual evaluation 2011-2012] [Bayern annual evaluation 2012-2013] [Bayern-Torts 2011] [Bayern-Closely Held Business Org 2012] [Bayern – Contracts 2012] [Bayern-Torts 2012] [Bayern-Closely Held Business Org 2013] [Bayern- Contracts 2013]

3. Cougle, Jesse. [Cougle Journal Ad] [Jesse Cougle CV] [Jesse Cougle transcript] [Cougle evaluation 2008] [Cougle AOR and evaluation 2009] [Cougle AOR and evaluation 2010] [Cougle AOR and evaluation 2011] [Cougle AOR and evaluation 2012]

4. Junglas, Iris. [Chronicle of Higher Education Ad, Iris Junglas] [OMNI Job Post, Iris Junglas] [All Applicants, Iris Junglas] [CV, Iris Junglas] [Transcript-Iris Junglas] [AOR Forms, Iris Junglas] [Annual evaluation, Iris]
Credentials

Florida State University recognizes and utilizes the appropriate guidelines for hiring competent faculty members. The Off-Site Committee noted eleven instructors of record as requiring evidence and documentation substantiating their qualifications for the courses to which they were assigned.

Documentation

The roster [SACSCOC Cited Faculty Roster] provides additional information for each instructor noted by the committee. Links to additional documents are also provided:

1. Prince, Rosemary. [Prince transcript] [Prince CV]
2. Tillman, Kathryn. [Tillman transcript] [Tillman CV]
3. Charbel, Samer. [Charbel license verification] [Charbel CV]
4. Whitehead, Tammy Y. [Whitehead transcript] [Whitehead CV]
5. Alvarez Alvarado, Stacey. [Alvarez Alvarado transcript] [Alvarez Alvarado CV]
6. Navaei, Negin. [Navaei transcript] [Navaei CV]
7. Belinskaya, Anastasia. [Belinskaya transcript] [Belinskaya CV]
8. Coleman, Jennifer Lee Butler. [Coleman transcript] [Coleman CV]
9. Dobersek, Urska. [Dobersek transcript] [Dobersek CV]
10. Francis II, William W. [Francis transcripts] [Francis CV]
11. Melvin, Brittany R. [Melvin transcript] [Melvin CV]
The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty Evaluation)

| Compliance | Partial Compliance | Non-compliance |

**Off-Site Committee Comments**

Florida State University is not in compliance with the regular evaluation of the effectiveness of each faculty in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. The Office of the Vice President for Faculty Development and Advancement provides direct guidance to departments and colleges regarding how to implement faculty evaluation processes. Under a bureaucratic structure that spans the gambit of the Florida Board of Governors, the Boards of Trustees at the individual institutions comprising the State University System [BOG Delegation to BOT], and the university president [BOT Delegation to President]. The evaluation processes are concurrently aligned with the Florida State University Board of Trustees/United Faculty of Florida (FSU BOT/UFF) collective bargaining agreement.

The fore referenced collective bargaining agreement insists that all faculty:

"regardless of tenure status, delivery mode or location are evaluated annually". The overarching evaluative characteristics across all units and across most educational sites include "consistency with all provisions of the BOT/UFF Agreement and the departmental bylaws, be based upon each faculty member's specific assignment of responsibilities [AOR Memo]; include a peer-review component; and include clear criteria that a reasonable faculty member can interpret easily. [BOT-UFF Article 10, p. 1] [FSU Faculty Handbook, p.74] The sources of material appropriate for use in the annual evaluation process (e.g., student evaluations of instruction [Teaching Evaluation], peer classroom visitations, scholarly publications or creative works) as well as the approval and appeal sequences are specified in the BOT/UFF Agreement, yet the processes for faculty members to prepare and submit materials varies in accordance with departmental by-laws. [Bylaws English]"

This information is made available to all faculty through the Florida State University Constitution as well as in the BOT/UFF Agreement, the Faculty Handbook, and the Office of Faculty Development and Advancement website.

The documentation provided illustrates that appropriate policies and procedures are in place where distinctions are made between academic rank, evaluation differences are clearly defined, and that evaluation polices are sufficiently broad for all faculty. However, the committee cannot determine based on the provided evidence "how faculty evaluations are administered and used in ensuring the effectiveness of all faculty, especially in terms of student learning." Policies seem to be place however, evidence is
not provided to support that the stated policies and evaluative measures are actually implemented.

The fact that several of FSU’s evaluative measures (BOT-UFF Article 10, p. 5; Non Tenure Track Faculty Reclassification Provisions CBA 2012; BOT-UFF Article 10, p. 4) have recently been redesigned suggests that the requested evidence may be in process.

**Focused Report Response**

The Florida State University Constitution defines the General Faculty as those faculty members holding the academic rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor (includes Eminent Scholar) in one of the colleges or academic departments and who may not be re-appointed beyond a seven-year maximum unless awarded tenure (tenure is not awarded at the instructor and assistant professor ranks). These faculty members are commonly described as ranked faculty. All other faculty members are described as non-ranked, including Assistant In, Associate In, Research Associate, Scholar/Scientist/Engineer and Curator, the various librarian ranks, and the lecturer rank, as well as the faculty positions that carry no assigned rank. [Faculty Class Specifications] Faculty members do not include graduate assistants or adjuncts to the faculty.

Florida State University regularly evaluates all members of the faculty, regardless of tenured or contractual status, on an annual basis, in accordance with institutional, state, and collective bargaining policies. The range of evidence of faculty evaluations provided includes annual evaluations by chairs, peer reviews, student evaluations of teaching, sustained performance evaluations of senior faculty, and college and departmental evaluative letters for promotion and tenure.

All members of the faculty are reviewed annually in discussions with the department chair (or the dean in colleges without departments). The Office of Faculty Development and Advancement provides annual faculty evaluation summary forms for use in evaluating all faculty [Summary Evaluation Form]. There are differences in the evaluation processes according to differing departmental and college by-laws which allow for variation in the types of peer evaluations done by and for faculty members [English Bylaws, Communication Disorders Bylaws, Music Bylaws]. All members of the faculty who teach undergraduate classes with over 10 students or graduate classes with over 5 students are required to be evaluated by students using standardized evaluation instruments [Course Evaluation Policy and Procedures].

The off-site committee did not find evidence that existing policies were implemented and used to improve student teaching. While department bylaws result in variation, faculty evaluations do occur annually and are used to make improvements.
Reviewers are asked to scroll to the bottom of each hyperlinked file in order to see complete set of evaluative evidence.

For example, in Nursing, student evaluations of teaching helped identify teaching difficulties for a faculty member. This observation was reflected on the faculty member's annual evaluation. After peer evaluations that made suggestions for improvements, the faculty member was directed to prepare a teaching improvement plan. A year later, the results were not favorable. The faculty member then moved from a tenured to a non-tenure track position and ultimately terminated for inability to make the requisite teaching improvements. [Non-tenure Track, Nursing]

The evaluations often find faculty performing well. A professor in the Department of Psychology revised his undergraduate research methods course based on student feedback. The chair noted that his already satisfactory teaching evaluations improved through his own initiative and efforts [Professor, Psychology]. A non-tenure track faculty member in the Department of Biology was recognized for his efforts to redesign BSC 2110, a laboratory course, in order to realign its curriculum with that of the primary lecture course and to emphasize critical student learning outcomes. Based on his exceptionally strong student course evaluations and the assessment of his peers concerning his teaching, the faculty member was promoted [Non-tenure Track, Biology]. A professor in the Department of Interior Design received consistently satisfactory annual evaluations and was recognized for her exceptional teaching through a university award process based on the recommendation of her peers and students. Ultimately, she won a university-wide teaching award [Professor, Interior Design]. In Social Work, a non-tenure track faculty member was promoted in large measure due to outstanding teaching evaluations. The faculty member was rated satisfactory over a number of years and recognized within the college as "Professor of the Year" for her teaching. The dean commented most favorably on her sustained high performance in helping students realize key student learning as reflected on their evaluations of her [Non-tenure Track, Social Work]. The faculty evaluation process continues throughout their years at the university. It is used in the faculty award of tenure and in the promotion process as well as in the salary merit process. Some departments, such as Computer Science, occasionally have used quantitative rankings to assess faculty performance. This is illustrated by the written documentation over an extended period for a professor in the Department of Computer Science [Professor, Computer Science].

Sometimes annual faculty evaluations document difficulties and are used to ensure the effectiveness of all faculty, especially in terms of student learning. Recommendations for improvement include teaching improvement plans, peer observation and consultation, reassignment of responsibility, collaboration with mentors, more detailed course structure and improved syllabi, additional training and reflection, and modified classroom techniques and management practices. The use of these recommendations are illustrated below using the evaluation of faculty members across campus representing various departments, colleges, and different ranks and status over
a variety of different time periods.

Teaching improvement plans have been prepared in response to evaluations that noted concern with teaching. As a result of student feedback on teaching, an assistant professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning prepared a teaching improvement plan that included redesigning a course to incorporate more team-based learning. In the following year, a peer committee recognized the faculty member's efforts in implementing his teaching improvement plan, but indicated that teaching continued to be an area of concern. Subsequently, the chair indicated against renewal of the faculty member's contract. [Assistant Professor, Urban and Regional Planning] Along the same lines, a tenure track professor in Nursing prepared a teaching improvement plan in response to student evaluation of teaching and a statement of official concern by the academic dean. The teaching improvement plan included a diagnosis of strengths and weaknesses based on course evaluations, a discussion of issues with the dean, a review of materials at the Center for Teaching and Learning, and monthly conference calls relating to online courses. The plan was completed. In the next year, the faculty member was given another notice of official concern and another teaching improvement plan was completed which focused on issues of communication. Subsequently, student evaluations of teaching did improve, but the faculty member ultimately resigned. [Professor, Nursing]

Further, an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems received poor evaluations from students and adverse comment by the department chair. The faculty member was given a reduced teaching load and developed a teaching improvement plan. In the subsequent year, teaching improved, but the chair continued to have other reservations about the faculty member's performance, especially regarding follow through and advising [Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology and Learning Systems]. A teaching improvement plan was also used in the case of a professor in Social Work. The professor had received an inadequate teaching rating from the dean based on course evaluations and student comments. The faculty member developed a teaching improvement plan and was suspended from teaching opportunities until the next annual evaluation. Subsequently, the faculty member was allowed back in the classroom and teaching improved [Professor, Social Work]. In the Department of Finance, an eminent scholar experienced teaching difficulties with his teaching one semester and was asked by the department chair to develop a teaching improvement plan. The professor followed the steps outlined by the Center for Teaching and Learning and his teaching improved markedly [Professor, Finance].

Not all recommendations for teaching improvement plans, as seen above, are successful. An associate professor in the Department of Accounting received poor student evaluations in an undergraduate course in accounting. The dean recommended that the faculty member delay their pursuit of tenure until teaching improved. The chair directed the faculty member to attend a teaching enhancement class offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning and mirror a colleague's syllabus and presentations in the same class. He developed a teaching improvement plan which
included improved communication with students and attended a series of lunchtime sessions focused on team-based learning. Consistent with the teaching improvement plan, he attended a summer workshop and had observers from the Center for Teaching and Learning attend his course. Initially, the faculty member's instruction improved as indicated by student evaluations. Rather quickly though, his performance in the classroom deteriorated and he was once again given an official concern by the dean and department chair. Ultimately, the faculty member left the university for medical reasons before further evaluations were completed [Associate Professor, Accounting].

On occasion, departments have required faculty member instruction to undergo peer observation and consultation. An associate professor in the Department of Family and Child Sciences' teaching was observed by a colleague who noted that teaching was generally good with some easy fixes to make improvements. The annual evaluation was used to make differential load teaching assignments to the faculty member and teaching improved. More recently, the faculty member was given a rating of inadequate in teaching in part because of student indications that the faculty member had difficulty communicating ideas and information, but also because of the chair's concern over grade distribution. The faculty member was asked to complete a self-assessment of course content and assignments by the chair [Associate Professor, Family and Child Sciences]. Similarly, early in his career, an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology underwent peer evaluation of teaching in response to poor student evaluations of teaching. The evaluation of his methods class identified a couple of areas for improvement and, subsequently, the faculty member received a better annual evaluation on teaching. Unfortunately, he again received poor student evaluations and underwent further peer evaluation and was asked to develop a teaching improvement plan. The plan resulted in class redesign, more explicit assignments, and change in class format and assignments. Unfortunately, these changes did not entirely resolve the issues of his teaching and the faculty member was ultimately let go [Assistant Professor, Sociology].

As noted above, faculty members are reassigned on occasion as part of their evaluation. An associate professor in the College of Criminology was reassigned as a result of poor teaching evaluations. This reassignment came after the faculty member had been asked to and completed a teaching improvement plan and implemented changes to their course in response to student criticism. Ultimately, a reduced teaching load appeared to improve teaching effectiveness [Associate Professor, Criminology]. Of course, reassignments are not always a result of poor teaching evaluations. A unranked faculty librarian was reassigned from her role as engineering librarian to special projects librarian based on ongoing evaluation of her performance in promoting innovation and development in the engineering collection despite generally satisfactory evaluations of her performance in a variety of other areas [Faculty Librarian].

As might be expected, faculty with identified deficiencies in teaching are occasionally asked to collaborate with colleague mentors. For example, a non-tenure track faculty member in the Department of Civil Engineering at the Panama City, Florida, campus received student evaluations of teaching identifying a number of difficulties. The
assistant dean recommended development of a teaching improvement plan that included collaboration with faculty members having strong teaching performance. This collaboration entailed a visit to the colleague's classes [Non-tenure Track, Civil Engineering]. In another case, it was noted in a faculty member evaluation that an assistant professor in the Department of Art Education needed marked improvement in their teaching based on student evaluations and comments. The faculty member met with the chair, developed a teaching improvement plan, and received increased mentoring from several faculty in the program. Two years later, the faculty member's student evaluations were improved and she was nominated for a university teaching award [Assistant Professor, Art Education].

Evaluations often require more than one technique be tried in order to improve teaching. At times, a faculty member is directed to development a more detailed course structure and improved syllabi in response to student evaluations of teaching. For example, an associate professor in the Department of Family and Child Sciences had received generally favorable student evaluations over a number of years. However, student comments concerning course objectives, communication of ideas, and stimulation of interest in the course gradually identified these as problem areas as a matter of official concern in the view of the department chair. The faculty member was asked to make alterations in the course syllabus and some course management issues. Within a year, the chair expressed her appreciation for the faculty member’s improvement in teaching [Associate Professor, Family and Child Sciences]. An assistant professor in the Department of Communication Disorders was given an official concern for teaching by the academic dean. The faculty member was told of problems about course content and asked to develop a remediation plan in consultation with the Center for Teaching and Learning. The faculty member was directed to try out a revised syllabus using the asynchronous venue. A year later, her teaching had improved considerably and the department directed the faculty member to continue attention to teaching using the suggestions of peers in the department [Assistant Professor, Communication Disorders].

Faculty evaluations often turn on the need for improvements in teaching and research. Occasionally, other problems arise. For example, a non-tenure track faculty librarian had difficulties with appropriate workplace behavior despite otherwise satisfactory performance. Supervisors within the library identified a need for improved communications skills and an improved ability to adapt to changes. The supervisors directed the faculty member into training concerning the operations of her area, university business practices, and improved correspondence skills. While the supervisor noted additional progress could be made, he also noted considerable improvements in interpersonal relationships and management skills [Faculty Librarian].

An associate professor in the School of Teacher Education had an official concern on an annual evaluation in the area of teaching identified by the director. Part of the difficulty, students' comments suggested, had to do with the somewhat antiquated nature of the course given the faculty member's extended departure from the classroom. The director suggested professional development opportunities to help
make the course more contemporary [Associate Professor, School of Teacher Education]. In another example, a new faculty member in the Department of Sociology initially received poor student evaluations and adverse comment from the chair. She sought help from the experts at the Center for Teaching and Learning. Her student evaluations gradually improved. Ultimately, she was nominated for a teaching award and the chair noted her outstanding performance in instruction in the annual evaluation. [Associate Professor, Sociology]

In the College of Music, a Professor of Winds received teaching evaluations that warranted concerns from the Music Education Peer Review Teaching Committee concerning rehearsal techniques. After working with the faculty member for a year, the coordinator of music education noted that certain students did not respond in a positive manner to the faculty member's instruction. To improve the coordinator asked the faculty member to make at least five videotapes of each ensemble during the semester, analyze the tapes, and provide a complete taped recording to the coordinator. The coordinator noted that "being a good teacher is an absolute requisite for receiving tenure" at the university and reported that the faculty member had "turned the corner" in teaching. The faculty member's student evaluations of teaching improved steadily over time [Professor, Music].

The College of Medicine, as might be expected, is heavily involved in assessment of faculty and students. A tenured professor in Medicine teaching one of the college's critical doctoring courses received generally favorable comments from her students. However, a significant percentage of students expressed issues with the instructor's teaching performance. The chair recommended the faculty member increase delegation within the course and consultation with the senior associate dean of academic affairs. On the basis of such comments, the faculty member was urged to develop more collaborative work and increase flexibility. A year later, the faculty member's student evaluations had improved as noted in the evaluation by the chair. Most recently, the faculty member's teaching performance has been rated as outstanding as indicated by student comments. A student noted "the faculty member was one of the most effective teachers at the FSU College of Medicine." [Professor, Medicine]

Sometimes faculty evaluations result in recommendations for and implementation of modified classroom techniques and management practices. In the College of Law, a professor recognized widely for his superior research, was identified as having difficulties in a particularly rigorous course on taxation. The dean gave the faculty member an inadequate ranking for teaching based, in part, on student evaluations and concerns raised by students. Based on this observation, the faculty member was moved into a room better suited to teaching. The dean advised the faculty member to modify his classroom techniques to incorporate variation in presentation and to develop better classroom management techniques that emphasize communication with students such as establishing a more personal relationship with them. The dean counseled the faculty member to encourage class visits by the associate dean. As a result of continued concern, the dean eliminated the teaching load in the subsequent
fall. Most recently, the dean has counseled the faculty member to collaborate with new members in the taxation program [Professor, Law]. An assistant professor in the Department of Art received poor teaching evaluations for a graduate course, while receiving satisfactory evaluations for an undergraduate course. The chair recommended that the faculty member modify her classroom techniques to better communicate objectives and assignments. The faculty member altered the syllabus in what was a new course offering and discussed the issue with the chair of the department. Upon analysis, the chair decided student engagement was also a concern. In her latest evaluation, the faculty member is commended by the chair for efforts to improve communication about course objectives and assignments to her students [Assistant Professor, Art].

Most of these examples deal with improvements in teaching aimed to promote student learning as noted by the off-site reviewer's comments. For each example, evidence is provided demonstrating both annual and periodic evaluation of faculty and the use of those evaluations in making improvements involving a number of different techniques. Faculty evaluations typically involve more than one suggested improvement. In the Department of English, for example, an assistant professor's less than satisfactory student teaching evaluations resulted in concerns voiced by the department chair. The chair recommended that the faculty member meet with the chair and a senior faculty mentor to review the evaluations, consider her syllabi and course materials, and discuss possible modifications of her teaching strategies. In addition, two peer teaching observations were scheduled and a teaching improvement plan was developed with specific steps designed to improve course expectations and improve accessibility to the students. The chair further counseled the faculty member to develop teaching expertise in a regular repertoire of undergraduate courses (at least two of which were at the upper level). The teaching improvement plan called for reassessment by the chair in a year. In the following months, the associate chair visited one of the faculty member's classes and made specific recommendations for improvement, including advice concerning class participation and the format of an editing exercise. The chair also scheduled another classroom visit by another professor who also offered similar advice. Notably, the department acknowledged its own responsibility by assigning the faculty member so many disparate preparations during her first years at the university. The chair noted that when the faculty member taught a course repeatedly then student evaluations improved. The chair emphasized the importance of improved teaching for the tenure decision to be made in two years. The chair also recommended continuation of classroom visitations. The next evaluations are due in May 2014 [Assistant Professor, English].

Evidence has been provided on how faculty evaluations are administered and used in ensuring the effectiveness of all faculty, especially in terms of student learning. It includes faculty members across campus representing various departments, colleges, and different ranks and status over a variety of different time periods.