

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

Second Follow-Up Report
September 22, 2004

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 in February 2002

(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 Submitted in September 2002

UHCL’s initial response to the visiting committee’s report provided copies of a) the learning outcomes used since 1997, b) a four column assessment matrix used since 1997-98 to evaluate learning outcomes in all academic programs, c) program review guidelines for all academic programs, and d) a sample copy of a completed learning outcomes assessment matrix from the school psychology program.

Commission's January 2003 Letter in Response

After reviewing the university's response, the Commission requested UHCL to *"demonstrate that the university has defined expected learning outcomes for students and had developed and implemented procedures to evaluate the extent to which expected learning outcomes are being achieved."* It also required the university to *"provide evidence that results are being gathered regularly and that these results are being used to improve educational programs, services, and operations."*

UHCL Response in First Follow-Up Report on September 23, 2003

The first follow-up report documented a) official approval of university learning outcomes adopted through the shared governance process, b) revision of the university's program review guidelines to make the requirement for student performance assessments more explicit, c) an improved planning process which included learning outcomes, d) a series of meetings and workshops with faculty on learning outcomes assessment, and e) examples of academic program assessments and improvement actions taken in FY 03 as a result of assessments completed in FY 02.

Commission's Response to UHCL's September 2003 First Follow-Up Report

The commission's response is as follows: *"The institution's response continues to report planning activities and makes reference to a new process to be implemented in FY 2004. Document implementation of the new planning and evaluation process, provide evidence that evaluation results have been used for improvement of educational programs, operations, and services."*

Actions Taken In Response to January 2004 Commission Letter

All academic and non-academic units implemented a new planning and evaluation process in FY 04. All segments of the university, including all academic program units, participated in this process. Results have been achieved and improvements in educational programs, operations, and services have been or are currently being implemented. Exhibit 2.1 contains guidelines and forms for the biennial planning process that cover FY 04 and FY 05. Similar guidelines and forms are being used for FY 06 and FY 07 (Exhibit 2.2).

The following table shows learning assessment outcomes and improvement actions of representative undergraduate and graduate programs from each of the university's four schools.

| School & Program | Assessment | Examples of Improvement Actions Taken as a Result of Assessment |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| School of Business & Public Administration (BPA): <i>Undergraduate</i> Business (all specialties) | ETS (Educational Testing Service) Major Field Test in Business: Overall, performance was at 46 th percentile. Scores in international issues, legal & social environment, management, & accounting were above national average, scores in finance, quantitative business analysis, economics, & marketing below national average. Marketing & economics were weakest. | Marketing is covered in a course taken early in a student's course of study. The economics requirement is often met at a community college. Curriculum has been revised to increase amount of subject integration throughout course of study to make sure that skills & knowledge learned in lower level courses are maintained & updated. For example, more emphasis was placed on understanding domestic and global environments and additional coverage of the economic regulatory environment was included in ECON 3131 (Money and Banking). The syllabus for MKTG 3031 (Creating Value for Customers) was revised to include more in-depth coverage of the creation and distribution of goods and services. |
| BPA: <i>Graduate</i> Master's in Business Administration (MBA) | ETS Major Field Test for MBA: Overall performance was at 15 th percentile. Marketing & strategic integration were weakest areas. | Faculty conducted a comprehensive examination of course content, course sequencing, & curriculum integration. The MBA curriculum has been revised to address identified weaknesses. Additional integration of core business areas was included in ECON 5136 (Economic Policy and Applications), BAPA 5131 (Global Environment of Business), DSCI 5431 (Management Science and Operations), and MGMT 6731 (Strategic Management Seminar). Emphasis on the creation of goods and services was increased in MKTG 5332 (Executive Decisions in Marketing) and additional coverage of marketing-related topics were included in BAPA 5131, DSCI 5431, and MGMT 6731 as appropriate to course content. |
| School of Education (SOE): <i>Undergraduate</i> Geography | TExES (Texas Examination of Educator Standards) Test 118 (Social Studies 4-8) & TExES Test 132 (Social Studies 8-12) were taken by program graduates from December 2003 to June 2004. Cumulative pass rates were 69% & 47% respectively. | The following steps have been taken to increase pass rates. They are: a) interviews with geography candidates, b) interim assessments, c) reviews of course content for comprehensiveness, d) realignment of course objectives to state objectives, e) systematic analysis of scores to identify program weaknesses & root causes of failures. |

| School & Program | Assessment | Examples of Improvement Actions Taken as a Result of Assessment |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SOE: <i>Graduate</i> Library Science | TExES exam pass rates, percent of graduates hired after graduation, internship ratings, focus groups, student surveys, & alignment with NCATE standards are major outcomes measures. For example, for FY 04 pass rates were 100%, placement rates 90%, & overall degree of satisfaction high in internship ratings & questionnaires. Much work on NCATE standards remains but substantial progress is being made. | Improvement actions: Faculty continue to monitor TExES results & focus on domains that need improvement. Web site for gathering employment data has been revised and positions are now posted there. A faculty member with assessment responsibilities was hired to refine existing assessment tools and develop new ones. |
| School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH): <i>Undergraduate</i> Social Work | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage of graduates passing the Texas Baccalaureate Licensure Exam. FY 04 pass rate was 100%. 2. Percentage of students applying to social work school who were accepted with advanced standing. FY 04 was 91%. 3. Scores of all graduates on Baccalaureate Education Assessment Plan (BEAP) question bank. Average score was 7.31 on 10 question bank. 4. Scores of students on Field Supervisor Evaluation – a 5 point scale with specified levels of performance at each point. 5. Analysis of all graduates for average field work time spent on eight areas of social work practice. | Students' performance on measures 1 through 4 exceeded expectations. On measure 5, time spent working with communities and organizations was lower than expected. During FY05, Director of Field Education is working with field supervisors to increase student exposure to macro level practice (work with communities and organizations). |
| HSH: <i>Graduate</i> Master's in School Psychology | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Passing rate on National School Psychology Exam (NSPE) – goal is 80% - 86% passed. 2. Ratings of interns by field supervisors on five-point scale – goal is 90% achieving at least a 4 rating – 90% achieved goal. 3. Percentage of graduates obtaining LSSP or Trainee Status – goal is 90%, attainment was 100%. 3. Percentage of graduates employed in field or obtaining further training within one year of graduation – goal is 90%, attainment was 100%. | Since goals were exceeded or met on all assessments, faculty decided to develop additional means to measure student learning. A portfolio assessment is being developed. |
| School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE): <i>Undergraduate</i> Computer Engineering | A faculty review panel reviewed senior projects to determine extent to which projects demonstrated an awareness of their societal & global contexts and the impacts of the designs proposed. In addition, students in each course in the CENG curriculum are administered a course objectives survey instrument & the results evaluated each semester. Maintenance of ABET accreditation requires performance assessment (last re-accreditation was in 2003). | As a result of the assessments, a design experience course (CENG 3624) was added to the curriculum to address deficiencies that were identified by the faculty panel. This course introduces engineering design methodology, teaming concepts, engineering tools, & ethics and is typically taken early in the course of study. |

| School & Program | Assessment | Examples of Improvement Actions Taken as a Result of Assessment |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SCE: <i>Graduate</i> Master's in Biology | A four member panel of Biological Science faculty reviewed the performance of students who completed the Research Project and Seminar (capstone course) during the 2003-04 academic year. Student's performances were rated as Excellent, Good, or Poor on three skills: 1) ability to critically evaluate scientific literature, 2) ability to synthesize scientific literature in major review paper, and 3) ability to present scientific information orally in an effective manner. | As a result of the assessment, the faculty made the following recommendations implemented in the capstone course in fall 2004: 1) Students continue to be required to attend a presentation by UHCL reference librarians on use of the library to research scientific literature, 2) The curriculum of the course includes enhanced discussion of the elements and organization of a scientific review article, 3) The curriculum of the course includes new instruction on the use of PowerPoint in scientific presentations. |

Documentation

2.1 Guidelines and Forms for FY04-FY05 Planning Process

2.2 Guidelines and Forms for FY06-FY07 Planning Process

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 in February 2002

“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.

Commission’s January 2003 Letter to UHCL

The Commission reiterated the initial recommendation and commented, *“the previous response appeared to defer the responsibility to individual schools within the university.”*

UHCL First Follow-Up Report on September 23, 2003

The university provided a copy of a new university-wide graduate faculty definition, documented its approval through the shared governance process, and provided evidence of its publication in the Faculty Handbook.

Commission’s January 2004 Letter on First Follow-Up Report

The commission stated, *“the institutional response was confusing and unclear in its implications. The policy seems to define the qualifications for graduate faculty who are tenured or tenure-track, but then indicates*

that other faculty may teach graduate courses. Document that the eligibility requirements for faculty members teaching graduate courses are clearly defined and publicized and that the institution adheres to its policy.”

Actions Taken In Response to January 2004 Commission Letter

The graduate faculty definition for the university was revised and approved through the shared governance process to make it more clear and understandable (Exhibit 19.1). Each of the university’s four schools clarified the university’s graduate faculty definition as it pertained to its school’s faculty. The university definition and each school’s clarification are provided in the following table.

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| University Definition | All faculty teaching graduate courses must demonstrate competence in teaching and meet the SACS minimum requirement for a terminal degree in their teaching discipline or related field. Faculty designated as graduate faculty must also be engaged in an ongoing program of research, scholarly, creative, or professional activity as defined by each school’s bylaws. Only members designated as graduate faculty are permitted to chair master’s projects or theses or teach capstone courses. |
| School of Business and Public Administration (BPA): Application of Definition | All faculty teaching graduate courses have documented evidence of an earned doctorate or terminal degree in the teaching discipline and/or equivalent competence as specified in Section 4.8.2.3 of the SACS 1998 <i>Criteria for Accreditation</i> . Furthermore, faculty teaching graduate classes are in conformity with the school’s Academic Qualifications policy as specified by AACSB International. This policy was voted on and approved by the school’s faculty. Exhibit 19.3 provides a more detailed explanation of the school’s Academic Qualifications policy. |
| School of Education (SOE): Application of Definition | All faculty teaching graduate courses must meet the SACS minimum requirement for a terminal degree in their teaching discipline or related field. Faculty designated as graduate faculty must also be engaged in an ongoing program of research, scholarly, creative, or professional activity. Only members designated as graduate faculty are permitted to chair master’s projects or theses or teach capstone courses. In order to demonstrate an on-going agenda of research, scholarly, creative, or professional activity, a faculty member must have at least one of the following in the past two academic years: one publication, a professional report, presentation, or product, or an ongoing professional involvement with public school districts or other educational organizations. |
| School of Human Sciences and Humanities (HSH): Application of Definition | All faculty teaching graduate courses must meet the SACS minimum requirement for a terminal degree in their teaching discipline or related field. Faculty designated as graduate faculty must also be engaged in an ongoing program of research, scholarly, creative, or professional activity. Only members designated as graduate faculty are permitted to chair master’s projects or theses or teach capstone courses. In order to demonstrate an on-going agenda of research, scholarly, or creative activity, a faculty member must have at least one of the following in the past two academic years: one publication, a professional report, presentation, an ongoing professional practice, or an artistic performance or exhibition. |
| School of Science and Computer Engineering (SCE): Application of Definition | Graduate faculty members are defined as those faculty who, in addition to holding an earned doctorate in an area of expertise related to their specific program, also meet two or more of the following requirements within his/her discipline over a given five-year period. The requirements may be satisfied either by accomplishing at least two different criteria or by accomplishing the same criterion at least two times. Adjunct faculty members may qualify as Graduate Faculty if they can document that they satisfy at least two of these requirements, including within their primary employment, over a given five year period. Exhibit 19.6 contains a list of requirements for SCE. |

University guidelines are published in the Faculty Handbook (Exhibit 19.2). Exhibits 19.3 through 19.6 show how each of the university's four schools have put the university's graduate faculty definition into operation. Information about where each school publicizes its definition can be found in the table below.

| <u>School</u> | <u>Publication Containing Graduate Faculty Definition</u> |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| School of Business and Public Administration | School Policies and Procedures Manual |
| School of Human Sciences and Humanities | School Bylaws |
| School of Education | School Handbook of Policies and Procedures |
| School of Science and Computer Engineering | School Bylaws |

Monitoring of faculty qualifications that qualify for graduate teaching takes place in all four schools. All faculty teaching graduate courses, including non-tenure-track and part-time, have been reviewed and determined to be eligible under the new requirements. The C&R committee did not make a request concerning the lack of appropriate qualifications for graduate faculty.

Documentation

- 19.1 UHCL Graduate Faculty Definition
- 19.2 Graduate Faculty Definition as published in University's online Faculty Handbook
- 19.3 School of Business and Public Administration Academic Qualifications Policy as published in School Policies and Procedures Manual
- 19.4 School of Education graduate faculty requirements as published in
- 19.5 School of Human Sciences and Humanities graduate faculty requirements
- 19.6 School of Science and Computer Engineering Requirements for Graduate Faculty members