

University of Houston-Clear Lake
2700 Bay Area Boulevard
Houston, Texas 77058

First Follow-Up Report
September 23, 2003

Most Recent Re-Affirmation Committee Visit
February 25-28, 2002

Prepared by

Dr. Carol A. Kominski
Executive Director for Institutional Effectiveness



Page left blank intentionally

RECOMMENDATIONS 2&3

Demonstrate that the university has defined expected learning outcomes for students and has developed and implemented procedures to evaluate the extent to which expected learning outcomes are being achieved. Also, provide evidence that results are being gathered regularly and that these results are being used to improve educational programs, services, and operations. (Section 3.1 – Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

(With respect to Recommendation 2) *“The institution has implemented procedures to evaluate institutional effectiveness. Since 1998-99 each instructional unit had been responsible for annually setting and documenting expected learning outcomes and assessing the performance of students.” Outside the School of Education, however, “the quality and specificity of educational outcomes and assessment strategies is frequently inconsistent, making it difficult for the programs to demonstrate what their students have learned and to make necessary improvements to the curricula. Frequently student evaluations of instruction, graduating student surveys, and alumni surveys form a substantial portion of the assessment of learning. The ‘Complete Guide To Program Review’ for academic programs does not specify clearly a requirement that instructional departments develop and report on expected learning outcomes.”*

(With respect to recommendation 3) *“Since expected learning outcomes and assessment strategies at some program levels have not been clearly defined, it is difficult for these programs to evaluate the extent to which learning outcomes have been achieved and use the results for program improvement. In some programs where learning outcomes were well defined, little or no progress has been made in developing appropriate assessment strategies and using the results of assessment to demonstrate quality and improve the program.*

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

In UHCL’s initial response to the visiting committee’s report, it stated that although the university had in 1997 defined seven university level student learning outcomes, these outcomes would not be officially approved until fall 2002. UHCL also provided copies of a) the seven learning outcomes used since 1997, b) a 4 column assessment matrix used since 1997-98 to evaluate learning outcomes in all academic programs, c) program review guidelines in effect for all academic programs, and d) a sample copy of a completed learning outcomes assessment matrix from the school psychology program.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

Actions taken since the time of UHCL's last response are as follows:

1. In November of 2002, the university's Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC) approved seven university-level learning goals (Exhibit 2.1). The Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the full Faculty Senate approved them in August 2003. (Exhibit 2.2).
2. The Program Review Guidelines in place at the time of the Visiting Team's report called for discussion of "student performance, including measurement of student gains, such as entrance and exit measurements" and for a discussion of "how this information is used in program planning." These guidelines have recently been revised to be more explicit on the subject of expected learning outcomes. (Exhibit 2.3).
3. In fall of 2002 the Executive Director for Institutional Effectiveness met with faculty and staff in each of the University's four schools to implement an improved biennial planning process. As a result, learning outcomes assessments are an integral part of the planning process. This change eliminated the cumbersome separate systems of learning outcomes assessment and academic planning. The new process to be implemented in FY 2004 emphasizes measurable objectives and the need to close the loop. It requires each academic program to develop varied measures of attainment of learning outcomes in addition to or in place of surveys. (See Exhibit 2.4).
4. The Executive Director for Institutional Effectiveness has had meetings in every school to discuss the importance of using skill or knowledge-based assessments in addition to student evaluations of instruction, graduating student surveys, or alumni surveys.

Measurable objectives, time tracking, analysis of results, and implementing improvements after examination of results have been emphasized as essential to these assessments. The university expects that incorporation of learning outcomes assessments into the university's program review guidelines will ensure that learning outcomes receive more intensive scrutiny on an ongoing basis (Exhibit 2.5 is the Power Point presentation used to provide some concrete examples of appropriate assessments).

5. To close the loop on previous years, in fall 2002 each program reported results of learning outcomes and other assessments as well as improvement actions already taken or planned for FY 2003. For assessments taking place in FY 2003, there is a reporting deadline of October 2003. Examples of assessments and improvement actions from each school for FY 2002 appear in the table below. Documentation for this table is included in Exhibits 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, and 2.9.

School and Program	Assessment	Examples of Improvement Actions Taken as a Result of Assessments
<i>School of Business and Public Administration: Master's in Health Care Administration</i>	In addition to the four-column assessment completed each year, the Accrediting Commission on Education for Health Services Administration assessed this program on a number of learning outcomes and granted full re-accreditation in spring 2003 (See Exhibit 2.6).	Several curriculum changes endorsed by the program's Advisory Board and its Alumni Association were implemented in academic years 2002-03 and 2003-04. These changes allow more flexibility to meet specific career goals and the demands of executives for training and education in specific areas.
<i>School of Education: Bachelor's in Early Childhood Education</i>	Cumulative Examination for Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) pass rate scores had declined from 97% in 97-99 to 87% in 01-02. An examination of syllabi and 25 ExCET competencies showed discrepancies between what was expected and what was taught (See Exhibit 2.7).	A new curriculum requires listing of all competencies on all syllabi and completion of a course matrix to document that the courses in this major cover all necessary competencies. Based on student feedback, two formerly elective courses, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 4131:Language and Literacy and ECED 4033:Discipline are now required.

School and Program	Assessment	Examples of Improvement Actions Taken as a Result of Assessments
<i>School of Human Sciences and Humanities: Master's in School Psychology</i>	The latest assessment results show significant improvement in pass rates on the National School Psychology exam. Pass rate increased from 67% in 1999-2001 to 100% in 2002-03. Employment remained at 100% for those desiring it. 75% of employers rated the program's graduates as "better prepared" than those from other providers.	Improvements made after analyzing 1999-2001 results were a) addressing preparation for the national exam in the PSYC 6132 Summer Seminar course and b) development of a post-graduate internship. Because of the excellent 100% employment rate, the program plans to accept more students in the future (See Exhibit 2.8).
<i>School of Science and Computer Engineering: Bachelor's in Computer Systems Engineering</i>	In addition to the four-column assessment matrix, the Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC) of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) assessed this program and accredited it for four years (See Exhibit 2.9).	Based upon the re-accreditation review, the one semester capstone course was re-designed to be a two-semester course. It now addresses shortcomings identified in design methodology, divergent and convergent thinking, decision-making, and working in a team environment. In addition, the Probability and Statistics course, MATH 4434, was replaced in the curriculum by a new course, MATH 3334, which has been monitored to ensure that sufficient application of probability is included in that course alone. The faculty has also reviewed the content of other courses in the curriculum and additional applications of probability were added where appropriate.

Documentation

- 2.1 University Level Student Learning Outcomes
- 2.2 Documentation of approval of University Level Student Learning Outcomes
- 2.3 Revised Program Review Guidelines with specific references to learning outcomes
- 2.4 Guidelines and forms for Biennial Planning Process FY 2004 and FY 2005
- 2.5 Power Point presentation of material on learning and other outcomes assessments for biennial planning
- 2.6 School of Business and Public Administration Master's in Health Care Administration: documentation of re-accreditation by Accrediting Commission on Education for Health Services Administration (ACHESA)
- 2.7 School of Education Undergrad Early Childhood Education: documentation of rationale for development of new program, results of previous assessments, improvements made in new program as a result of assessments
- 2.8 School of Human Sciences and Humanities Master's in School Psychology: learning outcomes and improvement actions taken as a result of assessment
- 2.9 School of Science and Computer Engineering Bachelor's in Computer Systems Engineering documentation of accreditation by Engineering Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)/

Page left blank intentionally

RECOMMENDATION 4

Document that the university has established goals for its research and service functions, that procedures for the evaluation of achievement of these goals have been developed, that results are being gathered, and that these results are being used to improve research and service functions.
(Section 3.1 - Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Insufficient documentation exists of the institution’s consideration of the role that research and service should have in its mission. The documentation does not provide evidence that the institution has considered the priorities for research and service and developed institutional goals for each.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

The University indicated that it expected to have explicit research and service goals approved through the shared governance process by fall of 2002. It also described the process used to evaluate tenure track faculty on research and service and pointed out that each school’s annual report assessed research and service goals.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

Research and service goals (Exhibit 4.1) were officially approved through the shared governance process in September 2003 (Exhibit 4.2). Although official approval of the university’s research and service goals did not take place until this year, each school has assessed research and service activities on an annual basis for a number of years. Annual reports completed each spring describe and tabulate progress for the previous calendar year. Research and service activities covered in these annual reports address most of the criteria for the university’s newly approved research and service goals. Examples of collected data and actions resulting from the annual reviews follow.

Research Goals in the Schools

Each year individual faculty members compile an annual report on research, scholarly, and creative activities. The schools compile these reports into an annual report for each school (Exhibit 4.3 is a sample of the research section of the annual report from the School of Education for calendar year 2002). The following tables summarize the major statistics contained in the annual reports.¹

<i>School of Business and Public Administration</i>	<i>CY 2000</i>	<i>CY 2001</i>	<i>CY 2002</i>
Journal articles	31	33	28
Proceedings	23	24	44
Books	1	1	2
Presentations	24	53	30
Other research, scholarly, or creative work	31	11	9
Number of Grants Awarded	1	3	3
Number of faculty Involved as Principal Investigators	1	2	3
Amount of Dollars Received	\$14,997	\$259,829	\$276,604

<i>School of Education</i>	<i>CY 2000</i>	<i>CY 2001</i>	<i>CY 2002</i>
Journal articles	29	31	42
Proceedings	29	27	32
Books	1	1	18
Exhibits, Artistic Presentations, Creative Works	4	4	9
Presentations	175	176	223
Other research, scholarly, or creative work	82	75	28
Number of Grants Awarded	6	2	3
Number of Faculty Involved as Principal Investigators	5	2	3
Amount of Dollars Received	\$162,826	\$765,457	\$1,449,944

<i>School of Human Sciences and Humanities</i>	<i>CY 2000</i>	<i>CY 2001</i>	<i>CY 2002</i>
Journal articles	49	42	40
Proceedings	2	2	1
Books	15	7	2
Exhibits, Artistic Presentations, Creative Works	20	17	21
Presentations	145	174	146
Other research, scholarly, or creative work	26	34	38
Number of Grants Awarded	7	5	3
Number of Faculty Involved as Principal Investigators	3	5	1
Amount of Dollars Received	\$371,090	\$411,268	\$180,663

¹ Dollars received do not include projects that are university-wide.

<i>School of Science and Computer Engineering</i>	<i>CY 2000</i>	<i>CY 2001</i>	<i>CY 2002</i>
Journal articles	27	30	22
Proceedings	0	0	17
Books	4	2	1
Presentations	50	67	62
Patents	1	0	0
Other research, scholarly, or creative work	10	16	5
Number of Grants Awarded	9	6	9
Number of Faculty Involved as Principal Investigators	5	5	9
Amount of Dollars Received	\$320,000	\$204,816	\$222,260

Research Improvements/Changes Resulting from Assessments

The following table shows improvements or changes resulting from assessment of research goals in each of the university's four schools.

School	Improvements Made As a Result of Assessments
<i>Business and Public Administration</i>	The school has set a goal of at least two refereed publications within a five-year period per faculty member. In order to encourage faculty to attain this goal, the school provided a) an incentive of one course release per year for faculty meeting this standard and b) stipends to faculty who act as mentors to other faculty if a publication results from the relationship. Since implementing these changes in the latter part of 2000, the school has gone from 50% to 74% of faculty meeting this goal.
<i>Education</i>	Tracking of data has led to several improvements: a) teaching loads were decreased to allow more time for research, b) space was allocated for preparation of grant proposals, c) new faculty receive "release time" to jump start their research programs, d) a single orientation for new faculty has turned into several meetings each with a single focus on research, teaching, annual report, or third year review, e) the school's mentoring efforts have become formalized, and f) course releases are awarded after third year reviews in order for faculty to better address issues raised in the review.
<i>Human Sciences and Humanities</i>	Assessment of progress made in increasing the number of faculty publications has led to the development of six new school research goals. These goals are currently being tracked.
<i>Science and Computer Engineering</i>	Despite relatively heavy teaching loads, increasing mentorship of new faculty by more experienced faculty has maintained research productivity in terms of grants, publications, and presentations.

Service Goals in the Schools

Each faculty member produces an annual report documenting service activities. The schools provide a summary of these activities in their annual reports (Exhibit 4.4 is an example of the service section of the annual report for the School of Science and Computer Engineering for calendar year 2002). Following is a table summarizing faculty involvement in service leadership or supportive roles for calendar year 2002.

		<i>CY 2000</i>	<i>CY 2001</i>	<i>CY 2002</i>
<i>Business and Public Administration</i>				
	Leadership Roles	n.a.	67	42
	Supportive or Membership Roles	n.a.	638	305
<i>Education</i>				
	Leadership Roles	45	80	101
	Supportive or Membership Roles	474	580	577
<i>Human Sciences and Humanities</i>				
	Leadership Roles	63	125	66
	Supportive or Membership Roles	458	377	374
<i>Science and Computer Engineering</i>				
	Leadership Roles	42	75	97
	Supportive or Membership Roles	437	474	445

Service Improvements/Changes Resulting from Assessments

Annual assessments show that faculty in all schools have made substantial service contributions in both leadership and membership roles. Since current commitment levels are more than acceptable, the major concern is sustaining current levels and bolstering research productivity. The following table shows improvements or changes resulting from assessment of service goals in each of the four schools.

School	Improvements Made As a Result of Assessments
<i>Business and Public Administration</i>	The amount of service provided by the school's faculty is considered more than acceptable at present. If anything, participation in service has taken away from the research activities in which faculty participation is a higher priority. Research activities have increased since emphasis on research goals has increased. Statistics show only a modest drop in service as a result. Faculty are becoming more selective about what they take on and are seriously considering the impact of an activity on their research obligations.
<i>Education</i>	Assessments show that both service leadership and membership roles have been at high levels and have generally increased over the past three years. Teaching, research, and service roles remain in balance because of a newly introduced formal mentorship program and revised orientation of new faculty. The school intends to continue monitoring and sustaining service at current levels.
<i>Human Sciences and Humanities</i>	The school is concerned about the heavy service commitments of its faculty, especially in shared governance committees. As a result of assessments, the school has recommended to the provost that one of the shared governance committees, the Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC), no longer be involved in program reviews and that the program review process be examined to make sure we are getting what is most useful and needed.
<i>Science and Computer Engineering</i>	The school several years ago set goals as follows: a) 15% of faculty will be in leadership positions and b) the average full-time faculty member will provide service to two committees. The leadership percentages were 21% in 2001 and 38% in 2002 while the average number of committees per full-time faculty member was 2.03 in 2001 and 2.18 in 2002. Thus, actions taken are to recognize service, monitor it, and sustain it at current levels.

Documentation

4.1 University Research and Service Goals

4.2 Documentation of Shared Governance Approval of Research and Service Goals

4.3 Research section from School of Education annual report for calendar year 2002

4.4 Service section from School of Science and Computer Engineering annual report for calendar year

2002

Page left blank intentionally

RECOMMENDATION 5

Define the competencies expected of baccalaureate degree graduates in reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills, and the basic use of computers. Describe how these competencies are evaluated and demonstrate that graduates of baccalaureate degree programs achieve these competencies. (Section 4.2.2 - Undergraduate Completion Requirements)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Documentation indicates that the [UHCL] core conforms to all state requirements and that many students enter the institution with much of the core already completed. It appears that the institution relies exclusively upon grades in the core courses to demonstrate competencies. No policy or procedures were found outlining the levels of competencies required or how they are assessed and documented for graduates of degree programs.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September, 2002

The University noted that its mission as an upper level and graduate institution meant that most of its graduates completed all or most of their core requirements at a community college or four year institution. The university described its 42-hour core requirements and procedures used to evaluate transcripts to determine course equivalencies. Included in the documentation was a matrix showing how each of the university’s academic programs covered core competencies in one or more of the required courses for each program. Because two programs in the School of Human Sciences and Humanities had unclear or inadequate reinforcement of one of the core competencies in required courses, the university stated that it would correct this oversight in fall 2002. Specific information about how competencies were assessed was not included in the university’s original response.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

As of fall 2002 every program in each school has at least one required course to reinforce each of the five core competencies of reading, writing, oral communication, fundamental mathematical skills, and

basic use of computers (Exhibit 5.1 lists for every program in each school the courses which reinforce the core competencies).

In order to demonstrate to the committee that core competencies are seriously addressed in the courses described in the matrix, illustrative examples showing how this evaluation occurs are as follows:

School of Business and Public Administration (BPA)

The School of Business and Public Administration embeds all measures of core competencies within courses. Exhibit 5.2 shows the extent to which each course in the business core covers the core competencies as well as the specific evaluation methodologies used to assess these competencies.

School of Education (SOE)

Reading

Based upon data showing that success on the standardized state assessment test (Texas Basic Academic Skills Program (TASP)/Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA)) required of all high school graduates was highly correlated with reading, the school raised the TASP/THEA reading score from 230 to 260. Students must make a 260 to be admitted to the Teacher Education Program.

Upon graduation, each certification student must pass the state assessment test which is predominantly a reading test.

Writing

Students must make at least 230 on the Writing section of the TASP/THEA to be admitted to the Teacher Education Program. In addition, the students' writing is judged in each pedagogy course. For example, in Teacher Education 4233 (Mathematics

Methods for Early Childhood), there is a scoring rubric for each of the four lesson plans and it includes grammar and spelling.

Oral Communication

Successful (C- or better) completion of a public speaking course is the preferred method to satisfy the required core. However, undergraduate candidates can also submit a Speech Competency Form signed by a UHCL instructor who has seen the public speaking skills of the candidate. However, if an undergraduate takes the Speech Competency Form route, s/he still must take a speech course.

Public speaking and oral communication are extremely important aspects of the certification process. Based on concerns regarding effective oral communication, a recent change was implemented. The change called for candidates to begin teaching lessons in their first pedagogy course. For example, in Teacher Education 4233 (Mathematics Methods for Early Childhood), each candidate presents 12 lessons to public school students. At the end of their program, the candidates are involved in two internships requiring oral communication.

Fundamental Mathematics Skills

The Early Childhood program at UHCL goes beyond “fundamental” mathematics skills. The State of Texas recently changed laws necessitating first-time certification candidates to take as much mathematics as UHCL already required for its degree-seeking graduates. Before entering UHCL (i.e., UHCL does not have freshmen or sophomores), all candidates must have made a “C-“ or higher in Mathematics 1314 (College Algebra). Before entering the Teacher Education Program, every candidate must have scored 230 or higher on the Mathematics section of the TASP/THEA, made a “C-“

or higher in Mathematics 3031 and a “C-“ or higher in Mathematics 3032. The students complete Mathematics 1314 at a community college or four-year-university and complete Mathematics 3031 and Mathematics 3032 in the UHCL Department of Mathematics.

Basic Use of Computers

Before being admitted to the Teacher Education Program, candidates must complete Instructional Technology 3133 Computer Use in Classrooms. Once students have been admitted to the Teacher Education Program and cleared for Internships, they receive additional training as part of the United State Department of Education grant *Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology*, a system enabling each to infuse technology into their lessons.

School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH)

Reading

Graduates of all HSH degree programs must pass one of the three Basic Texts (Humanities 3031, 3033, 3035: English, American, or World Literature respectively) courses which go far beyond comparable community college courses. Students must read all or large parts of difficult texts and be prepared to read and discuss them. Examples of such texts include:

- For Humanities 3031 (see Exhibit 5.3 a) Homer’s *Iliad*, *Beowulf*, and Aeschylus’ *Orestia*. Other sections require Plato’s *Phaedo*, Langland’s *Piers Plowman*, and Machiavelli’s *The Prince*.
- For Humanities 3033 (see Exhibit 5.3 b) Voltaire’s *Candide*, Descartes’ *Meditations*, and Huxley’s *Brave New World*. Examples from other sections include Marx’s *Communist Manifesto*, Freud’s *Civilization and Its Discontents*, and Camus’ *The Stranger*.

- For Humanities 3035 (see Exhibit 5.3 c and d) Ch-eng, en's *Monkey*, Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, *Black Elk Speaks*, *Sundiata*, and Confucius' *Analects*. Examples from other sections include Vargas Llosa's *The Storyteller* and *Popul Vuh*.

Writing

Graduates of every program in the school must pass Advanced Writing (Communications 3037). This course is an upper-level, junior year course, designed to build upon the lower level, freshmen writing courses required for the UHCL core, Composition and Rhetoric, I and II (English 1301 and 1302). All advanced writing courses require at least two formal papers. Writing assignments are highlighted in a sample Advanced Writing course syllabus (see Exhibit 5.4 a). In addition, each graduate must complete one Basic Texts course (Humanities 3030, 3033, and 3035). Each of these courses has a significant writing requirement (see Exhibit 5.4 b, c, d, and e for examples of writing assignments in required courses).

Oral Communication

All graduates must pass a Basic Texts I, II, or III course (Humanities 3031, 3033, and 3035) and an Advanced Writing course (Communications 3037). All these courses require the practice of effective oral skills. Attached are sample syllabi for these courses with the relevant oral requirements highlighted (Exhibits 5.5 a, b, c, d, and e).

Fundamental Mathematical Skills

Those students graduating with undergraduate degrees in anthropology, behavioral science, psychology, social work, and sociology must pass six hours of Research Design and Statistical Measurement (Psychology or Sociology 4631, Psychology 4632). These courses presume successful completion of College Algebra or

its equivalent and require the application of complex mathematical skills (see Exhibits 5.6 a, b, and c).

For those graduating with degrees in Fitness and Human Performance, Biomechanics (Health 4032) requires significant mathematical skills (see Exhibit 5.6 d). For those graduating in the remaining programs (Applied Design and Visual Arts, Communication, History, Humanities, and Literature), one of the following courses must be taken: Anthropology 3131, Anthropology 4532, Psychology 3133, Psychology 3134, Sociology 4132, and Sociology 4232. Each of these courses requires review and some practice with the quantitative techniques used in the social sciences. The sample syllabi for these courses contain sections (Exhibit 5.6 e, f, g, h, i, j, and k) which highlight these requirements.

Basic Use of Computers

Graduates of all the school's programs must pass Advanced Writing (Communications 3037). The two formal papers required in this course must be completed on a computer, with appropriate academic citations, bibliography, and grammar as stipulated by the appropriate style manual (American Psychological Association (APA), Chicago, or Modern Language Association (MLA)). A sample syllabus with these requirements highlighted is included (see Exhibit 5.7).

School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE)

Reading

Reading is a pervasive requirement of most required program courses in each of the nine academic programs offered by the School of Science and Computer Engineering. Mathematics 4136 (required of majors in mathematical sciences) is an example. In this

class, students are required to understand *The Mathematica Book* to perform computations of a numerical, symbolic, or graphical nature (see Exhibit 5.8 a). Another example is Physics 3031, required of all physics majors. In this course, students are required to read chapters from the textbook *Physics: The Nature of Things* by Lea and Burke and to perform assignments based upon these readings (see Exhibit 5.8 b).

Writing

Technical Writing (Communications 3135) is a requirement for all majors in the School of Science and Computer Engineering. Writing is required in other areas as well (see Exhibit 5.9 a for biology). For computer science and computer systems engineering, the senior projects course is an important vehicle for assessing students' writing skills. Lab reports are a way of assessing this ability in computer systems engineering, biological sciences, chemistry, environmental science, and physical sciences. Analysis reports and research projects are used in mathematics. Computer information systems students take an additional communications course.

Oral Communication

Oral communication is included as a requirement in technical writing courses taken by all majors. In addition, specific majors have additional requirements. Senior projects courses in computer science and computer systems engineering require oral communication (See Exhibit 5.10a). Students in mathematical science and physics are required to do presentations on solutions in most program courses. Biological sciences, chemistry, and environmental science programs require oral presentations in senior seminars (see Exhibit 5.10b). Students in computer information systems complete a course in management theory and practice where oral communication is critical (see Exhibit 5.10c).

Fundamental Mathematical Skills

In addition to the core requirement of college algebra, all majors in the School of Science and Computer Engineering require a minimum of calculus and at least 3 hours of mathematics or statistics beyond this level.

Basic Use of Computers

All majors require at least some use of the computing lab in order to complete course requirements. Requirements are even more intense in the three computer-related majors, and mathematical science.

Documentation

5.1 Matrix of Course Competencies by Major

5.2 School of Business and Public Administration: Matrices showing courses, skills, and methodology for assessment

5.3a HUMN 3031 (Dr. David Lopez) Syllabus

5.3b HUMN 3033 (Dr. Keith Parsons) Syllabus

5.3c HUMN 3035 (Dr. David Lopez)

5.3d HUMN 3035 (Dr. Shirley Paolini) Syllabus

5.4a COMM 3037.15 (Dr. Chloe Diepenbrock) Syllabus

5.4b HUMN 3031.02 (Dr. David Lopez) Syllabus

5.4c HUMN 3033 (Dr. Keith Parsons) Syllabus

5.4d HUMN 3035.01 (Dr. David Lopex) Syllabus

5.4e HUMN 3035 (Dr. Shirley Paolini) Syllabus

5.5a COMM 3037.15 (Dr. Chloe Diepenbrock) Syllabus

5.5b HUMN 3031.02 (Dr. David Lopez) Syllabus

5.5c HUMN 3033 (Dr. Keith Parsons) Syllabus

5.5d HUMN 3035.01 (Dr. David Lopez) Syllabus

5.5e HUMN 3035 (Dr. Shirley Paolini) Syllabus

5.6a PSYC/SOC 4631 (Dr. Lynn Tillman) Syllabus

5.6b PSYC 4632 (Dr. Brent Worthen) Syllabus

5.6c PSYC 4631 (Dr. Meier) Syllabus

5.6d HLTH 4032 (Dr. A. Eugene Coleman) Syllabus

5.6e ANTH 3131.02 & ANTH 3131.03 (Dr. Deepa Reddy) Syllabus

5.6f ANTH 3131.01 & ANTH 3131.02 (Dr. Christine Kovic) Syllabus

5.6g ANTH 4532 (Dr. Joan Few) Syllabus

5.6h PSYC (Dr. Beth Hentges) Syllabus

5.6i PSYC 3134 (Mr. Peter Kindle) Syllabus

5.6j SOCI 4132 (Ms. Ruth Dunn) Syllabus

5.6k SOCI 4132 (Ms. Shana Pribesh) Syllabus

5.7 COMM 3037.15 (Dr. Chloe Diepenbrock) Syllabus

5.8a MATH 4136 (Dr. Michael Mezzino, Jr.) Syllabus

5.8b PHYS 3031 (Dr. Honglu Wu) Syllabus

5.9a BIOL 4738.01 (Dr. R. Mills) Syllabus

5.10a CSCI 3133.02 (Dr. Bindra Shrestha) Syllabus

5.10b CHEM 4732 (Dr. Robert Hopkins) Syllabus

5.10c MGMT 3031 (Dr. Wayne Young) Syllabus

Page left blank intentionally

RECOMMENDATION 7

Document that the university has established its written policy and procedures on academic advisement of undergraduate students. Provide evidence of the regular evaluation of orientation and advisement programs and the use of these results to enhance assistance to students. (Section 4.2.5 - Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Evidence of regular advisement program review and evaluation was not clearly evident in the self-study or during campus interviews. New software and procedures for distance education advisement are being implemented, and will undoubtedly need to be evaluated for effectiveness.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

UHCL provided a copy of the assessment instruments it administers university-wide on an annual basis. These include an Alumni Survey administered since 1997, a Graduating Student Survey administered starting in 1998, and an Academic Support Services Assessment Survey (formerly Customer Service Survey) first distributed in spring 2002. In addition, the university described the procedures and instruments used in each of the four schools. The university’s response did not include specific results and improvements based on assessments of orientation and advising. In the timeline associated with its response, the university stated that a new academic advisement policy would be implemented and that results would be used to enhance assistance to students.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

The university undertook several steps to improve advising since September 2002. These are as follows:

1. The university adopted a university-wide advisement policy through its shared governance process (see Exhibits 7.1 and 7.2).
2. The Academic Support Services Assessment Survey first administered in spring 2002 as a

Customer Service Survey was revised and administered again in spring 2003. (Exhibits 7.3 and 7.4 show results of this survey for 2002 and 2003). New items relating to distance education and advisement were added (see Exhibit 7.5).

3. The university's four schools have each undertaken a number of actions after review of the spring 2002 Customer Service Survey results.

Following are school by school examples of use of assessment results for enhancement of assistance to students:

School of Business and Public Administration (BPA)

The school initiated several actions after an analysis of assessments of academic advising:

- In response to complaints from students about the time it took academic advisors to respond to e-mails, the school created a general BPA academic advising e-mail address for which the school's administrative secretary is responsible. The secretary uses the e-mail address to respond to general inquiries and forwards to the academic advisors those inquiries that require their expertise.
- In response to student complaints that academic advisors were not always available, an "on call" rotation was established so that an advisor is always available when the office is open.
- The office remains closed to student traffic Monday-Thursday until 10 A.M. This permits all advisors to process paper work and handle e-mail and telephone in a timely fashion. In the past it became necessary from time to time to suspend office hours because of paperwork backlogs. As a result, students complained about the unpredictability of office hours.

School of Education (SOE)

Given the complexity of teacher certification and some changes implemented by the state

of Texas recently, advising has been a critical issue in the School of Education. Two major complaints emerged after an analysis of recent surveys and open-ended student comments: a) students were not always able to come during regular office hours and were not always welcome when they did come and b) the timeliness of responses was not always the best.

The school has taken major steps to address these student concerns as follows. To improve the perception of convenience and to provide a welcoming atmosphere, the entire lobby staff was replaced, printed information was moved outside the office so students could access it at any time, on-line advising was initiated, and the programs and major offices have been assigned an advisor as a liaison so that faculty, staff, and students all have a contact person. To improve the timeliness of responses, advisors have been re-scheduled to allow face-to-face contact with 135 students per week, all phone calls and e-mails are returned no later than the following day, every process has been reviewed to cut the turn-around time, and advisors are meeting on a weekly basis to plan the following week.

School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH)

The school uses input from a variety of sources including its own Advising Office Survey sent out every other year to recent graduates (Exhibit 7.5). Analysis of results of these surveys resulted in the following actions:

- The advising staff meets weekly to discuss specific as well as university issues.
- A general mailbox has given all staff access to student e-mails.
- An additional secretary has increased the efficiency of telephone response – the phone is usually answered in person, many of the calls are handled by the secretaries, and the advisors are able to spend more time for one on one student contact.
- Some changes were made on some degree plan formats to add additional explanations on program requirements and university policy (such as a notation on some graduate plans

as to minimum number of graduate hours, indication of minimum grades, etc.)

- Surveys showing that the most effective way to reach students is still direct mail. Direct mail is being used as much as possible and all major documents are mailed, e.g., degree plans, degree changes, etc.

School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE)

In recent surveys of enrolled students as well as in graduating and alumni surveys at least 60% of those responding have indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with various aspects of advising services. Based upon comments made by students in various assessments, accessibility and convenience have been increased. The hours for walk-ins have been increased, weekly trips are made to the Delta Building to advise students, a specific e-mail address was created to answer advising questions, an advising newsletter for students has been developed, and Advising Notes alerting faculty to critical dates, event, and changes has been created.

Documentation

- 7.1 Undergraduate and Graduate Faculty and Non-Faculty Academic Advising Policy
- 7.2 Documentation of official approval of Undergraduate and Graduate Faculty and Non-Faculty Academic Advising Policy
- 7.3 Results of 2002 Customer Service Survey
- 7.4 Results of 2003 Academic Support Services Assessment
- 7.5 New distance education and advising items in Academic Support Services Assessment
- 7.6 School of Human Sciences and Humanities Advising Office Survey

RECOMMENDATION 9

Document implementation of the policy designed to ensure appropriate attention to graduate and undergraduate students in courses offering combined instruction to both groups. Indicate the number of courses affected by the policy and provide examples of course syllabi that ensure appropriate attention to both undergraduate and graduate students. (Section 4.3.4 – Graduate Curriculum)

Visiting Committee Concern

In addition, “discussions [between the Committee and University personnel] revealed that in combined instruction courses, there was not a clear distinction between graduate and undergraduate study. The level of graduate courses should be clearly distinguished from undergraduate courses.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September, 2002

The university stated that in practice all courses cross-listed for undergraduate and graduate students have qualitatively and quantitatively distinct requirements. It acknowledged, however, that syllabi for such courses did not necessarily represent the full range of distinctions between the two student levels. The university provided a timeline stating that all cross-listed courses would have separate syllabi by fall 2002 and that a university-wide policy would be approved in December 2002.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

A policy on combined graduate and undergraduate courses was officially approved through the shared governance process in April 2003 (see Exhibits 9.1 & 9.2). Although there were a few remaining courses that did not have distinct undergraduate and graduate syllabi in spring 2003, the university has verified that all courses offered at the university had separate syllabi by fall 2003. All such syllabi are on file in each school’s central office as well as in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The following table gives the number of courses affected by the policy by school.

School	Fall 2002	Spring 2003	Fall 2003
Business & Public Administration (BPA)	7	4	3
Education (SOE)	4	1	9
Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH)	21	28	18
Science and Computer Engineering (SCE)	4	4	4
Total	36	37	34

Documentation includes samples of separate syllabi from each school (Exhibits 9.3 a & b through 9.6 a & b) as listed below:

School	Cross-Listed Course	Description of Differences
Business & Public Administration (BPA)	ACCT 6735 cross-listed with ACCT 4434 (Exhibits 9.3 a and b)	Graduate students are required to conduct a graduate project accounting for 15% of the final grade. Three tests count for 15% each for graduate students and 20% each for undergraduate students.
Education (SOE)	LLLS 5134.01 cross-listed with LLLS 4131.04 (exhibits 9.4 a & b)	Graduate students are required to read an extra text and prepare a class presentation.
Human Sciences & Humanities (HSH)	PSYC 6336/BIOL 5931 cross-listed with PSYC 3335/BIOL 4931 (Exhibits 9.5 a & b)	Graduate students are required to complete a research paper whereas undergraduate students do a library research summary. For graduate students the research paper counts for 35% of grade and for undergraduates the research summary counts for 20%.
Science and Computer Engineering (SCE)	BIOL 5931 cross-listed with BIOL 4436 (Exhibits 9.6 a & b)	In addition to the four exams required of undergraduate students, graduate students are required to complete a term paper with references to at least 3 original papers from peer-reviewed literature published within the last ten years. Topic suggestions are those covered in the textbook but not discussed in class.

Documentation

9.1 Combined Graduate and Undergraduate Courses Policy

9.2 Documentation of Official approval of Combined Graduate and Undergraduate Courses Policy

9.3a Syllabus for ACCT 6735 (Oil and Gas Accounting): Graduate Students

9.3b Syllabus for ACCT 4434 (Oil and Gas Accounting): Undergraduate Students

9.4a Syllabus for LLLS 5134.01 (Survey of Reading): Graduate Students

9.4b Syllabus for LLLS 4131.04 (Survey of Reading): Undergraduate Students

9.5a Syllabus for PSYC 6336/BIOL 5931 (Behavioral Pharmacology Research): Graduate Students

9.5b Syllabus for PSYC 3335/BIOL 4931: (Behavioral Pharmacology Research): Undergraduate Students

9.6a Syllabus for BIOL 5931 (Pathophysiology): Graduate Students

9.6b Syllabus for BIOL 4436 (Pathophysiology): Undergraduate Students

Page left blank intentionally

RECOMMENDATION 10

Provide evidence of the opportunity for scholarly interaction and accessibility among faculty and graduate students with particular reference to graduate instruction at off-campus sites and in on-line graduate degree programs. (Section 4.3.5 - Graduate Instruction)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Several discussions between faculty and members of the committee revealed that, although the graduate syllabi were clearly laid out, it was not clear that there was significant focused interaction between graduate students and full-time faculty advisers. This problem could possibly be exacerbated by the extensive use of part-time adjunct faculty.” While employment of experienced adjuncts exposes students to “‘practitioners,’...there is also a distinct possibility that over-use of adjuncts carries the risk of minimizing valuable scholarly interaction between graduate students and full-time advisers.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

UHCL discussed its requirements for graduate faculty office hours and cited their accessibility through voice mail and email. The university stated that these requirements for accessibility apply to regular and adjunct faculty. It also provided a table of graduate capstone experiences (repeated below) in each major. It did not specifically address interaction and accessibility among faculty and graduate students at off-campus sites and in on-line degree programs.

GRADUATE CAPSTONE EXPERIENCES BY DEGREE PROGRAM

Program	Thesis	Project	Internship/ Residency/ Practicum	Course Work & Exam	Capstone Course
<i>School of Business and Public Administration</i>					
Accounting, integrated B.S. and M.S.					X
Accounting	X				X
MBA					X

Program	Thesis	Project	Internship/ Residency/ Practicum	Course Work & Exam	Capstone Course
<i>School of Business and Public Administration, cont.</i>					
Finance					X
Human Resource Management	X				X
Management Information Systems					X
Environmental Management	X				X
Healthcare Administration	X		X		X
Healthcare Administration/Business Administration	X		X		X
<i>School of Education</i>					
Counseling			X		
Curriculum and Instruction	X	X			
Early Childhood Education	X	X	X		
Educational Management			X		
Instructional Technology	X	X	X		
Multicultural Studies in Education	X	X			
Reading	X		X		
School Library and Information Science			X		
<i>School of Human Sciences and Humanities</i>					
Behavioral Sciences – General	X	X	X		
Behavioral Sciences – Psychology	X	X	X		
Behavioral Sciences – Sociology	X	X	X		X
Behavioral Sciences – Clinical Psychology			X		
Behavioral Sciences – Family Therapy			X		
Behavioral Sciences – School Psychology			X		

Program	Thesis	Project	Internship/ Residency/ Practicum	Course Work & Exam	Capstone Course
<i>School of Human Sciences and Humanities, cont.</i>					
Fitness and Human Performance	X	X	X		
Studies of the Future	X	X	X		
Cross-Cultural Studies	X	X	X		
History	X	X		X	
Humanities	X	X	X		
Literature	X	X		X	
<i>School of Science and Computer Engineering</i>					
Computer Engineering	X	X* ²			
Computer Information Systems	X	X*			
Computer Science	X	X*			
Software Engineering	X	X*			
Systems Engineering	X	X*			
Mathematical Science	X	X*	X		
Statistics	X	X	X		
Biological Sciences	X	X*			
Chemistry	X	X*			
Environmental Science	X	X*			
Physical Sciences	X	X*			

² The asterisk on project entries means that these are projects combined with a capstone course or with extended coursework. This arrangement is unique to the School of Science and Computer Engineering.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

UHCL has historically treated on-line and off-campus face-to-face courses in the same manner as on-campus, face-to-face classes. The expectations for faculty accessibility, course assignments, and length of classes are the same although the delivery mode may be different. The following table illustrates how each school works to ensure that the distance education experience is equivalent to that of the traditional classroom experience.

School	Steps Taken to Ensure Accessibility of Faculty for Distance Education Students
Business & Public Administration (BPA)	Faculty are charged, in their annual reports, to address the nature of assignments and how evaluations have been used to improve their courses. All of the distance education courses have mandatory chat rooms and discussion groups. Based upon evaluation results, testing procedures have been changed and group projects developed. All faculty who teach distance education courses must be readily available via e-mail and telephone. In the most recent UHCL Graduating Student Survey, 85% strongly agreed that they were able to find faculty available to talk to outside the classroom. For MBA courses, accessibility of instructors in required courses was 5.91 and in elective courses was 5.83 on a scale where 6.00 was the highest possible rating.
Education (SOE)	The school's Policies and Procedures require that faculty members engaged in teaching web-based or web-enhanced courses be "available to students at regularly scheduled office hours for every week of class." Policies and Procedures further stipulate that faculty respond to all student inquiries within one week during long semesters and within a couple of classes for short or compressed semesters. Faculty members engaged in web-based instruction are obliged to establish alternative means for students to contact them (in addition to electronic) and must publish this information in the syllabus. Faculty members using web-enhanced instruction representing 50% or less of instruction are available to students on campus during regularly scheduled class times.
Human Sciences & Humanities (HSH)	HSH faculty teach at three off-campus sites and do not teach on-line courses at present. All faculty, both regular and adjunct, hold two office hours each week for each course they teach regardless of location. To ensure access to full-time faculty, at least 3 full-time faculty are required to teach at least one course a semester at the Sugar Land site, 2 –3 full-time faculty teach each semester at the Cape Center site, and typically 2-3 faculty teach at the Texas Department of Criminal Justice site. On a scale from 1 to 5 average student ratings of faculty accessibility averaged at least 4.35, 4.22, and 4.16 at the Sugar Land, Cape Center, and Texas Department of Criminal Justice sites respectively during the past year.

School	Steps Taken to Ensure Accessibility of Faculty for Distance Education Students
Science & Computer Engineering (SCE)	All faculty are required to be accessible at least two hours per week for each course taught. These hours can be on-line or in person depending upon student preference. SCE offers a master's degree program in software engineering in a web format. Two other courses in Systems Engineering are also offered on-line. All web-based courses include on-line discussions, student presentations of work via the web site, and bulletin board discussion assignments with the class and assigned discussion groups. Students have direct accessibility to faculty via e-mail and voice mail. Graduating student surveys for FY 2000 through FY 2003 show 85% of students in these courses are satisfied or very satisfied with the availability of faculty outside the classroom.

Page left blank intentionally

RECOMMENDATIONS 11 & 20

Provide evidence of the university's progress in meeting its goal of a 65/35 percent ratio of full-time faculty to part-time faculty. Demonstrate the impact of this progress on graduate programs and advising with particular attention to the number of graduate student advisees assigned to full-time faculty members. (Section 4.3.6 Academic Advising of Graduate Students)

Visiting Committee Concerns

“The documentation that was provided in the self-study shows several relatively large ratios of graduate students to full-time faculty advisers. Furthermore, interviews revealed that the process of advisement for graduate students did not appear to be significantly different from that of advising undergraduate students. Given the large ratios, it is pertinent to inquire if the large ratio of graduate students to full-time faculty interferes with the process of good advisement of the graduate students.”

“A review by the committee of the total headcount full-time faculty raised questions about the adequacy of that number to provide effective teaching, advisement, scholarship and curriculum development and planning and governance. This is especially important given that the faculty is involved in graduate level teaching and research....The institution has set a 65/35% goal [65% of all SCH's taught by full-time faculty] for the next five years....It should be noted that although the committee found the setting of this target a valuable first step, it is still only a minimal one, especially for an institution which plans to move at some time in the future to initiate doctoral programs. A strong and well-prepared complement of full-time faculty with ample research opportunities is absolutely necessary to meet the current goals of the education mission.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

UHCL's response to recommendation 11 relates to having a reasonable number of graduate student advisees per faculty member. The university analyzed data at the school rather than the program level because of the great frequency with which faculty members within schools teach in related disciplines within the same school. It presented statistics from fall 2001 showing that the numbers of advisees per faculty member in Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH), in Science and Computer Engineering (SCE), and in the School of Business and Public Administration (BPA) were reasonable and adhered to guidelines of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). However, in the School of Education (SOE), the university considered the ratio higher than desirable. The university

demonstrated that its goal to achieve a better ratio of full-time to part-time faculty with respect to SCHs taught was expected to improve the SOE ratio and that its long-term goal to achieve a 65/35 ratio would bring the ratio down to a more reasonable level. It noted that it expected to meet the 65/35 ratio in FY 2005.

The university's response to recommendation 20 relates to limiting the number of part-time faculty to enhance institutional effectiveness. The university discussed its desire to increase SCHs taught by full-time faculty to 65% in every school and presented evidence that this ratio is competitive with those existing at its peer institutions where the median in fall 2001 was 60 and the range was from 56% to 84%.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

The following table shows the ratios of number of full-time tenured or tenure track faculty to graduate advisees in each school for fall 2001 and fall 2002 and shows what the university's goal of 65/35 will achieve when fully implemented. In the School of Education where the 2001 ratio was only marginally acceptable, in fall 2002 there was a significant reduction of nearly 12% in the average number of students advised. In the other three schools the ratios increased slightly but they are still at acceptable levels. State budgetary constraints lead the university to expect slower progress to the 65/35 goals than anticipated when the initial response to this SACS recommendation was made in summer 2002. The university expects to achieve the 65/35 ratio in FY 2006.

School	Graduate Majors 2001	Full-time Tenured/ Tenure-track faculty 2001	2001 Number of Advisees per Faculty Member	Graduate Majors 2002	Full-time Tenured/ Tenure-track faculty 2002	2002 Number of Advisees per Faculty Member	Estimate When 65/35 Ratio is Achieved
BPA	976	51	19	1027	50	21	20
HSH	823	48	17	889	50	18	15
SCE	586	40	15	632	39	16	14
SOE	1060	31	34	1003	34	30	23

In the university's report to SACS, only two schools, the School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH) and the School of Education (SOE) had percentages of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty below 65%. Following is information on progress made because of the 65/35 initiative in these two schools in the last two fiscal years.

School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH)

In FY 2002 HSH was able to hire two tenure-track faculty for psychology, its largest graduate program. Its full-time to part-time faculty ratio increased from 54% to 59% from fall 2001 to fall 2002. As a result, advising loads dropped from an average of 20-25 graduate students for each faculty member in FY 2001 to between 15 and 20 per faculty member in FY 2002. In FY 2003 the school received money for two more positions, one for a lecturer in writing and another for a position in psychology. Since the lecturer position was not a tenure-track job, this had no impact on advising loads. The search for a psychology faculty member was unsuccessful but another search is underway and it is expected that a new psychology faculty member will be added by September, 2004.

School of Education (SOE)

In the School of Education steady progress has been made in reducing the ratio of full-time faculty to adjuncts teaching graduate programs. In 1996 the ratio was 50% full-time faculty. In 2002 it was 57%. In fall 2002 it was 58%. Although advising loads are still high, the average faculty member saw a reduction from the 34 to 30 in the number of graduate students advised from FY 2002 to FY 2003.

Page left blank intentionally

RECOMMENDATION 13

Demonstrate that evaluation procedures for distance learning courses and programs have been implemented, that results are being gathered, and that these results are being used for program improvement. Specific attention should be given to the substantive changes that were a part of the review by the Visiting Committee (Section 4.5 - Distance Learning Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

“The University does not currently have a means to measure the effectiveness of its distance learning program. Once a unified set of goals are achieved for all the colleges [schools] within the University, measures should be developed to evaluate the effectiveness of its distance learning program.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

UHCL provided information on course and faculty evaluation, program evaluation, student learning outcomes assessment, and student satisfaction for all of its distance learning offerings. It provided a matrix of goals, assessments for each goal, information on how the assessments were used, and improvements emanating from the assessments. Specific information about the Master of Science in Educational Leadership offered at San Jacinto Community College and Master of Science in Software Engineering offered on-line and through telecommunications delivery was not included. These latter two programs were the subject of the substantive change referred to in the recommendation.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

In fall 2002 UHCL offered 61 classes at off-campus locations and 30 web courses as follows:

School	No. of Off-Campus Face-to-Face Classes	No. of Web-Based Classes
Business and Public Administration	0	4
Education	12	15
Human Sciences and Humanities	49	2
Science and Computer Engineering	0	9
Total	61	30

Each school evaluates these courses and uses the results for improvement as shown.

School	Evaluation Procedures	Use of Results for Improvement
Business and Public Administration	All web courses offered through the School of Business and Public Administration are evaluated in the same way that traditional courses are. All of the on-line courses have mandatory chat rooms and discussion groups	As a result of recent evaluations, testing procedures for two courses (Accounting 5031 and Marketing 5031) have been changed and group projects have been developed for Marketing 5031.
Education	The instructors of face-to-face and on-line courses offered either on or off campus must use exactly the same Student Satisfaction Survey for course evaluation. Web courses spend considerable time in the testing phase. One of the purposes of the testing phase is to ensure that there is no loss of academic integrity. Data from the Student Satisfaction Survey is used to compare face-to-face courses with their web counterparts. Overall, the ratings have been quite similar except for one instance where an instructor with no web experience was needed one semester to fill in for an instructor who could not teach the course.	<p>Several changes have been introduced because of student evaluations of on-line distance education courses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Instructional Technology courses, students are divided into two equal sections when enrollment reaches 24 students. This enables the instructor to maintain a high level of interaction with students. 2. All Instructional Technology on-line courses are now organized to include one third face-to-face delivery. This change increases the “esprit de corps” of the class. 3. The school now has its own person in location at the off-campus centers. This fosters better advising and interaction with students on all kinds of issues. 4. The school now has its own person in location at the UH System Centers. This allows students to receive better advising on location and to assist with all manner of issues.
Human Sciences and Humanities	The primary evaluation instrument for all distance education offerings is evaluation of faculty by students. The Division Chair and Associate Dean review quantitative scores and written comments for every adjunct faculty member every semester and for every full-time faculty member in their first three years of employment. For other full-time faculty quantitative scores are reviewed every semester or any time a problem has been identified.	Adjunct instructors with low evaluations have not been re-hired. Results of evaluation of courses in undergraduate psychology resulted in curricular changes that addressed some apparent deficiencies and concerns expressed by students.

School	Evaluation Procedures	Use of Results for Improvement
Science and Computer Engineering	Student appraisals are used in all of the school's distance education courses. In addition, certain questions are used periodically in all of the school's Software Engineering classes over the past four years. Exhibit 13.1 contains further information about these questions and a summary of results.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduate Record Examination (GRE) standards for admission to the Software Engineering program were raised to require a minimum verbal score of 350. 2. The curriculum was changed from 5 required courses and 5 electives to 7 required courses and 3 electives. 3. All courses in the program are offered both as web classes and as lecture classes. Course work is identical in both sections. The only distinction is that a lecture is given at a specific day and time each week.

The two programs that were subjects of the substantive change review were the School of Science and Engineering Master's in Software Engineering and the School of Education Master of Science in Education Leadership at San Jacinto College. Evaluation procedures and improvement actions for the first program are explained in the table immediately preceding. More detailed information about both programs follows.

Master of Science in Educational Leadership at San Jacinto College

Description

This program at San Jacinto College North (SJCN), an extension of the same program offered at the UHCL campus, provides courses to school districts in northeast Harris County, located in the UHCL service area. This extension program at SJCN is important since the UHCL campus is located approximately 20 miles away. Courses are interchangeable between UHCL and SJCN campuses. Graduate students thus have the opportunity to continue their studies if an emergency arises and they miss a sequenced cohort course. Classrooms, computer labs, library resources, and bookstore and cafeteria services are available for program and graduate student use. Moreover, graduate students who attend the SJCN program can access student services at UHCL. For instance, graduate student have access to the full UHCL Alfred R. Neumann Library

collection both on-campus and on-line.

Evaluation Procedures & Results

Students complete the same Student Satisfaction evaluations as students on the main campus and instructors are evaluated using the same forms and procedures. For the six course offerings during this summer and fall 2002 (the only semesters in which courses have been offered at SJCN), median instructor ratings were always equivalent to those on the main campus with one exception where the median for the campus course was one point higher than that for the off-campus course.

Delays in paper work completion and being closed out of classes with greater than 25 enrollment have been concerns of students.

Use of Results for Improvement

All student ratings of instruction have been high (4 –5 on a five point scale) so there was not an apparent need for a significant change in instructor or instructional procedures. Significant improvements have been made in registration procedures and students can now complete paperwork on-line. The class size limitation is unavoidable at the SJCN campus because classrooms at this campus were designed to be small and cannot accommodate additional students.

Master of Science in Software Engineering

Description

Students address the foundations, methodologies, and tools used in the development and evolution of software intensive systems. It prepares students for key roles in industry, government agencies, and other institutions where software is important. The on-line program is designed for technologically capable and mature students who need flexibility in their schedule or

live at some distance from the campus. All courses are offered in both on-line and on-campus formats with the same syllabi, assignments, exams, and subjects covered each class. Students can attend either or both classes interchangeably.

Evaluation Procedures & Results

In addition to student appraisals, questions are posted on the electronic bulletin board and handed out in class. Exhibit 13.1 contains more detail about these questions and the responses of students.

Use of Results for Improvement

Three major actions resulted from evaluations:

1. Graduate Record Examination (GRE) standards to the Software Engineering program were raised to require a minimum verbal score of 350. This change resulted from evidence that students with verbal scores below this number did poorly in web classes because of poor writing and English comprehension skills. The faculty determined that greater skill in written communication was necessary for students in web-based courses.
2. The curriculum was changed from 5 required courses and 5 electives to 7 required courses and 3 electives. This enabled the faculty to concentrate on delivering a large set of high quality core courses that could be offered as web classes.
3. All courses in the program are offered both as web classes and as lecture classes. Course work is identical in both sections. The only distinction is that a lecture is given at a specific day and time each week. Local students who prefer attending in person as well as web students who need extra help can thus be accommodated.

Documentation

13.1 Questions and Summaries of Responses for Software Engineering Students from 1998-99 to 2002-03

Page left blank intentionally

RECOMMENDATION 14

Provide evidence that the university has in place procedures for the evaluation of credit and non-credit continuing education programs. (Section 4.6 – Continuing Education, Outreach and Service Programs)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Three of the four schools at the University of Houston-Clear Lake have some type of program in continuing education/outreach and service...All of the...programs operate independently and have no systematic method of evaluation.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

UHCL stated that its continuing education programs were de-centralized at the school level. It described the methods for evaluating instruction in each school and provided copies of the evaluation instruments. The timeline UHCL included with the report showed that the School of Human Sciences and Humanities would amend its bylaws to reflect current practices where the associate dean evaluates the continuing education director and the performance of the unit.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

The School of Science and Computer Engineering does not offer any continuing education courses at present and has not done so for several years. Other schools have in place procedures as follows:

School of Business and Public Administration (BPA)

Continuing education is conducted by the Center for Advanced Management Programs (CAMP) and is evaluated by the dean every year in conjunction with the evaluation of the center director. The center director submits an annual report for the center.

The dean evaluates the continuing education offerings on the following criteria:

- Congruence of the offerings with the mission of the school.
- Congruence of the offerings with the mission of CAMP.
- Financial viability

Program participants evaluate the programs offered by CAMP (Exhibit 14.1). Based upon these evaluations, adjustments are made. Examples in three courses of these types of adjustments are:

- Enhancing and Measuring Customer Satisfaction: Participants requested more in-depth coverage of using ISO 9000 in the customer satisfaction process. Changes in the curriculum accommodated this request.
- E-commerce: The Supply Chain Super Tool: Based upon student feedback, the entire course outline was changed and modified to enhance the coverage of subjects in certain areas and delete certain topics in other areas.
- Using Teams to Enhance Problem Solving: Participants requested more hands-on exercises. Some of the topics had coverage shortened to allow more time for these exercises..

School of Education (SOE)

The Center for Educational Programs (CEP) is the unit within SOE which offers the Continuing Education programs. In FY 2003, CEP offered the following:

Mentoring Seminars

Offered once each long semester, 96 attended in FY 03. After each seminar data are gathered via a survey instrument called *Post-Then* (Exhibit 14.2). Analysis of the data resulted in a) the addition of a fourth mentoring day focusing on technology and b) an

additional day of Update and Support for Experienced Mentor teachers. This series of mentoring seminars has been offered for 10 consecutive years and receives extremely positive ratings.

Gifted and Talented Seminars

The actual number of times (and the dates of each) are worked out in cooperation with the Southeast Co-op for Gifted and Talented Education. 496 attended in FY 03.. Based on the *Post-Then* data and additional feedback received, individual sessions have been altered and new seminars have been developed and offered.

Early Childhood Education Conference

The conference was held in February and organized by the CEP for the Gulf Coast Association for the Education of Young Children and UHCL's Early Childhood Education program. There were 320 in attendance. The conference personnel gather and analyze data on every session and on the overall conference. Based on the data gathered this year, the lunch schedule, the nature of the final session, and even the length of the conference are to be changed. Also based on the data, the focus of the conference is going to shift more toward training.

School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH)

HSH amended its bylaws to reflect current practices where the associate dean evaluates the continuing education director and performance of the unit (Exhibit 14.3). HSH offers non-credit foreign language programs in six languages through Continuing Education as well as English enhancement for foreign professionals. Every class is evaluated but not at the same time. Each student has the opportunity to evaluate each class taken. Spot evaluations are conducted on a random basis. Enclosed is a copy of the evaluation form used (Exhibit 14.4)

Documentation

14.1 School of Business and Public Administration: evaluation instrument for continuing education

14.2 School of Education: Post-Then survey instrument

14.3 School of Human Sciences and Humanities: Section of appropriately amended bylaws

14.3 School of Human Sciences and Humanities: Evaluation form used in continuing education

RECOMMENDATION 17

The Committee recommends that the institution keep on file for all full-time and part-time faculty members documentation of academic preparations, such as official transcripts as well as official documentation of professional and work experience where appropriate. (Section 4.8.2.1 - Academic and Professional Preparation – Baccalaureate)

RECOMMENDATION 18

The Committee recommends that the institution provide evidence that all faculty teaching at the master's level hold the terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline, or provide justification on an individual basis of exceptional scholarly or creative activity or professional experience in lieu of the terminal degree. (Section 4.8.2.2 - Academic and Professional Preparation – Graduate)

Visiting Committee Concern (undergraduate)

“After extensive review of the credentials of full and part-time faculty members’ files, the committee found official transcripts or adequate justification for exceptions were missing from the files of some part-time faculty.”

Visiting Committee Concern (graduate)

“A review of the faculty credential files identified files of faculty members who were teaching graduate courses, but did not have documentation that they have a terminal degree in their disciplines.” This was true of both part-time and full-time faculty. In one instance a faculty member lacked an official transcript.

C&R Review Committee Statement on Recommendations 17 & 18

“The institution’s response combined three recommendations for baccalaureate, graduate, and part-time faculty and provided no narrative explanation. Documentation of outstanding professional experience and continuing contributions to the teaching discipline was lacking for those individuals requiring justification on an individual basis in lieu of formal academic preparation. Justification and adequate documentation is needed for faculty identified on the enclosed form. The institution must use the Commission’s “Roster of Instructional Staff” (enclosed) and document compliance for each full-time and part-time faculty member teaching in these programs in the spring and fall 2003 terms. Information should clearly differentiate those individuals with undergraduate teaching assignments and those with graduate teaching assignments.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

Documents were included for the faculty whose credentials were questioned by the Visiting Committee. However, the university did not distinguish between faculty teaching exclusively undergraduate courses and those teaching graduate courses. A narrative explanation of individuals on which the visiting committee had questions was also not provided.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

Documentation regarding the qualifications of graduate, undergraduate, part- and full-time faculty is kept in the Provost's Office and is updated at the beginning of every semester. At present all files include complete documentation, including transcripts, additional qualifying experiences, letters of recommendation, and professional résumés. Required academic preparation to teach a graduate course, either full-or part-time includes a terminal degree in the target area or related discipline. In the event that the faculty member does not hold a terminal degree, the university requires documentation supporting outstanding professional experiences, scholarly, or creative activities related to the teaching area.

Undergraduate faculty, either full-or part-time, must have a minimum of a master's degree in the discipline, or related area, or a master's degree with a minimum of 18 hours in the teaching discipline. In exceptional cases, a faculty member with outstanding professional experiences or contributions to the discipline can be accepted. Exceptions are documented and filed in the Provost's Office.

The visiting committee requested additional information on the following five faculty members in the School of Business and Professional Administration: Donald J. Minnich, Katrina LeVert, Michael Hagan, Joanne Ashland and Carol J. Olson. Three no longer work at the university. Justification for each individual follows.

- Donald J. Minnick (part-time) holds a PhD. From the University of Texas-Austin in Clinical Psychology. He a) has completed post-graduate education at the National Training Laboratory (NTL) in organizational development, process consulting, experiential learning and debriefing, and team facilitation, b) is certified by Development Dimensions International in leading training programs, and. c) has extensive experience in management organization and behavior with clients such as Kraft Foods, Texas Instruments, Tenneco Oil, and Transco Energy. He has taught an *undergraduate* course (MGMT 4536) in Organizational Development.
- Katrina LeVert (part-time) holds a Doctor of Jurisprudence and has taught an undergraduate course, Political Science 4133: Civil Liberties in America. As a student at the Thomas M. Cooley Law School, she took numerous courses in Civil Procedure, Advocacy, Equity and Remedies, among others. Her area of specialization as a JD is litigation of discrimination and civil rights cases. In particular, Ms. LeVert was instrumental in the creation and development of *Keepseagle v. Glickman*, the Native American farmers' racial discrimination class action lawsuit. This alone is an invaluable experience for undergraduate students being exposed to the meaning of "Civil Liberties in America" for the first time. **Dr. LaVert is no longer employed by UHCL.**
- Michael Hagan (part-time) has taught an undergraduate course, Marketing 3031: Creating Values for Customers. He has over 18 years of experience in marketing positions (marketing manager, director of sales, business development manager) with blue chip companies such as Coca-Cola, Procter and Gamble, and Riviana Foods. He negotiated multi-year contracts with the local sports teams and venues, including the Houston Oilers, Astros and Rockets and accomplished marketing goals at a cost of 5% below budget. He has successfully launched six new products including Minute Maid Juices, Nestea, and PowerAde that resulted in an increase of overall corporate market share. In addition, Mr. Hagan holds two master's degrees (finance and business administration) including nine graduate hours in marketing. Notwithstanding his academic

preparation, his professional experience alone infuses a wealth of knowledge for the undergraduate course he has taught.

- Joanne Ashland (part-time) has taught a graduate course, ACT 5335/ISAM 5731: Audit and Security within the MIS program. She has an MBA with a Masters of Information Systems (MIS) concentration (21 graduate hours). In addition, Ms. Ashland is a certified Information Systems Auditor with approximately 18 years of experience in information systems-related positions, including 12 years at Continental Airlines. **Dr. Ashland no longer is employed by UHCL.**
- Carol J. Olson, CPA (part-time) has taught a graduate course, Accounting 5231: Individual Income Tax. She holds a Master's of Science in Accounting with 39 credit hours in the area of accounting. She is a certified public accountant with over six years of experience in various related areas including compilation and review for corporate, partnership, and LLC clients, tax compliance, projection and planning, and preparation of individual, corporate, partnership, trust, estate, and payroll tax returns. She teaches a course in which her professional experiences significantly enrich her students. **Dr. Olson no longer teaches graduate courses at UHCL.**

In addition, the university is submitting justification for each full-time and part-time faculty teaching in these programs during spring and fall 2003 terms. This information is appended using the Commission's Roster of Instructional Staff. (Exhibit 17.1)

Documentation

17-18.1 Roster of Instructional Staff

RECOMMENDATION 19

Document that eligibility requirements for faculty teaching graduate courses are clearly defined and publicized. The previous response appeared to defer the responsibility to individual schools within the university. (Section 4.8.2.3 - Academic and Professional Preparation – Graduate)

Visiting Committee Concern

“Documentation is provided that tenure and tenure track faculty must have a terminal degree, however, no additional requirement could be found for faculty teaching graduate courses.”

UHCL Response to Visiting Committee Report in September 2002

The university stated that it planned to introduce an amendment to its graduate faculty definition to satisfy the committee’s concern. The timeline specified that this amendment would be approved by the appropriate shared governance committee and added to the Faculty Handbook during FY 2003.

Actions Taken Since September 2002

The proposed graduate faculty definition was approved through the shared governance process and is now part of the Faculty Handbook (Exhibits 19.1, 19.2, and 19.3).

Documentation

- 19.1 Graduate Faculty Definition
- 19.2 Documentation of Approval of Graduate Faculty Definition
- 19.3 Graduate Faculty Definition from *Faculty Handbook*, Section 3.7