APPLICATION for MEMBERSHIP

COMMISSION ON COLLEGES

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

NAME OF INSTIUTION	University of South Florida Polytechnic			
ADDRESS	3433 Winter Lake Rd., Lakeland, FL 33803			
WEBSITE ADDRESS	http://www.poly.usf.edu			
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	Mr. David M. Touchton, Interim Regional Chancellor			
CONTACT PERSON	Dr. Judith A. Ponticell			
CONTACT E-MAIL ADDRESS	jponticell@poly.usf.edu			
CONTACT TELEPHONE	863-667-7732 863-667-7721 Tracey Cayson, Executive Administrative Specialist			
DATE SUBMITTED	December 22, 2010			
	WORKING DRAFT (1) UPDATE 1-12-2012			
SL	JBMIT APPLICATION TO:			
Dr. Belle Wheelan President Commission on Colleges Southern Association of Colleges and Schools 1866 Southern Lane Decatur, Georgia 30033-49097 (404) 679-4500				

For Office Use:		
Number of Institution		
Check Number	_ Amount	

Please Complete and Return with Application

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 1

Information for Applying Institutions For Use in Entering Data

Name of Ins	stitution	University	of South	n Florida Poly	/tech	nic			
Mailing Add	Mailing Address3433 Winter Lake Rd., Lakeland, FL 33803								
Main Switc	hboard To	elephone N	umber	863-667-70	000				
Institution's	s Website	Address	http://w	ww.poly.usf.	edu				
Name of CE	EO Mr.	David M. To	ouchton						
Title of CEC	D Interir	n Regional	Chancell	or and Camp	ous E	xecutive	Officer		
CEO's Mail	ing Addre	ess 3433	Winter L	ake Rd., Lak	eland	d, FL 338	303		
CEO's Tele	phone Nu	u mber 86	3-667-70)13		CEO's	Fax #	863	3-667-7094
CEO's Ema	il Addres	s dtouch	ton@poly	/.usf.edu					
Governanc	e Pul	blic 🗹	Priva	ite (not-for-pi	rofit)		Private	e (foi	r-profit) 🗆
Religious Affiliation (if any)									
Calendar S	ystem	Semester		Quarter		Trimest	er 🗆		Other
Enrollment	·	Credit	1,683	Non-0	Credi	t 360	To	otal	1285
Degrees Offered	A 🗆		в 🗹		ΜĒ		·	ES	
onered	D (three o	or fewer Doct	oral Degr	ees) 🗆	D (fo	our or mo	re Docto	ral de	egrees) 🗆
					-				

**************************************	COC Use Only)************************************
--	---

Institutional ID #	<u> </u>	

Level of Education

Staff Assignment _____

ORGANIZATIONAL INFORMATION For Use by Staff Reviewing Application

1. Name of Institution University of South Florida Polytechnic				
2. Mailing Address 3433 Winter Lake Rd.				
3. City, State, Zip Code Lakeland, FL 33803				
4. Main Switchboard Telephone Number 863-667-7000				
5. Name of Chief Executive Officer Mr. David M. Touchton				
6. Title of Chief Executive Officer Interim Regional Chancellor and Campus Executive Officer				
 Office Address of Chief Executive Officer (including street, city, state, and zip code) 3433 Winter Lake Rd. (LTB 2118, Lakeland, FL 33803 				
8. Telephone number of Chief Executive Officer 863-667-7013				
Fax Number863-667-7094Email Addressdtouchton@poly.usf.edu				
9. Name of the Chair of the Board Mr. John Ramil				
10. Address of the Chair of the Board (including street, city, state, and zip code)				
702 N. Franklin Street, Tampa, FL 33602 11. Date Institution was chartered or authorized Established January 24, 1988 as USF				
Lakeland Center; established December 3, 1993 as USF Lakeland; established July 1, 2008				
as USF Polytechnic				
12. By what agency is the institution legally authorized to provide a degree program?				
Florida Board of Governors				
Name of institution as stated on the authorization/charter				
University of South Florida Polytechnic (Florida Statute 1004.345)				
13. The calendar system at the institution is:				
Semester 🗹 Quarter 🗆 Trimester 🗆 Other 🗆				
14. Date institution enrolled (or will enroll) first students January 6, 1988, as USF				
Lakeland Center; January 3, 1994, as USF Lakeland; August 3, 2008 as USF Polytechnic				
15. Date institution graduated (or will graduate) first class December 13, 2010,				
USF Polytechnic				
16. Dates fiscal year begins and ends July 1 2010 – June 30, 2011				
17. Name of Auditing Firm of Name of Governmental Agency which audits institution's				
finances State of Florida Auditor General				

USF POLYTECHNIC

PART A. INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Adobe Acrobat Reader may be required to view supporting documents.



Part A - Institutional Characteristics History of the Institution

Provide a <u>brief</u> overview of the institution sufficient to assist the reviewer of the application in understanding the nature of the institution and any unique features.

University of South Florida Polytechnic

The University of South Florida was founded in 1956 as the first public university established specifically to address the needs of Florida's rapidly emerging urban regions. Today, the University of South Florida System is comprised of two separately accredited institutions – USF (which includes the main research campus in Tampa and USF Health) and USF St. Petersburg – and two regional campuses – USF Sarasota-Manatee and **USF Polytechnic** in Lakeland.

In 1982 the Florida Legislature authorized funds to begin planning for a USF campus in Lakeland, after demand for a new educational facility in the region had been established. The presidents of Polk Community College (PCC) and USF sent a letter to Florida's Post-Secondary Education Planning Commission recommending a joint PCC-USF facility. A 130-acre orange grove at the southeast corner of US 98 and Winter Lake Rd. was selected for the site, and groundbreaking occurred in 1986.

The USF Lakeland Center opened in 1988, providing a limited range of instructional programs or courses to citizens of Polk, Highlands, Hardee and eastern Hillsborough counties. USF Lakeland began offering classes on January 6, 1988 in the first building, the Curtis Peterson Academic Center (LAC), named in honor of the state senator who was instrumental in obtaining funding for the joint PCC/USF Lakeland campus. The campus was officially dedicated on January 24, 1988.

In 1991 a second joint-use academic building opened. The Lakeland Learning Center (LLC) featured a library, learning labs, general classrooms, computer classrooms and faculty offices. At the December 3, 1993 meeting of the Florida Board of Regents, the **Lakeland Center was officially reclassified as a Branch Campus**. Terry Fulcher, Coordinator of SUS Space Utilization and Analysis, notified Loyce Farr, DOE Office of Educational Facilities, in a **letter dated March 16, 1994 [HIST1]**.

By fall 2000 USF Lakeland was serving 709 home campus students, and in 2003 the Florida Legislature approved funding for a third joint-use academic building, sponsored by State Senator J.D. Alexander. In 2004 ground was broken for the \$32 million joint-use Lakeland Technology Building (LTB). Despite four named hurricanes making landfall in south central Florida in 2004 and affecting availability of construction materials and manpower in their aftermath, the Lakeland Technology Building opened on schedule for classes in spring 2007. The LTB provides USF Polytechnic with 40,000 square feet of space, including a partial auditorium, 9 classrooms with built-in, state-of-the-art instructional technology, 5 special use labs, first-floor student affairs and student services offices, a library and open-use computer lab, faculty and staff offices.

Renovations were also completed on the USF Lakeland allocated classrooms in the two other academic buildings to ensure that state-of-the art classroom technology built into the design of the LTB was also available for classes assigned to the LLC and LAC buildings.

In its **Strategic Plan 2007-2012 [HIST2]**, USF Polytechnic identified a bold new vision and mission to become a "premier destination campus for applied learning, research, and innovative technology" committed to the development of a polytechnic model, characterized by interdisciplinary and applied learning; application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs; and collaborative partnerships that support economic, social and community development.

In 2008 the Florida Legislature passed SB 186 creating **Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic [HIST3]**, renaming USF Lakeland as the University of South Florida Polytechnic, a separate organizational and budget entity of USF intended to operate under separate accreditation from the SACS Commission on Colleges. **Notification of the name change** was sent to Commission on Colleges President, Dr. Belle Wheelan, on August 27, 2008, by Dr. Kathleen Moore, USF Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs, and **acknowledged in a letter from Dr. Wheelan dated October 16, 2008 [HIST4]**.

In academic year 2008-2009 (summer, fall and spring) USF Polytechnic served 1,669 home campus students; 1,440 in academic year 2009-2010; and 1,683 students in academic year 2010-2011 (Source: USF INFOCENTER, Annual Unduplicated Student Headcount). USF Polytechnic offers nine undergraduate and five graduate degree programs. Students may also complete a small number of minors (communication, criminology, information technology, professional and technical writing, and sociology); and two certificates (IT Management and IT Professional).

A Distinctive Mission

The USF Polytechnic **2007-2012 Strategic Plan** expanded the regional campus' vision beyond its local service area, focusing on transition to a destination campus with a polytechnic mission. In a meeting of the **Strategic Planning Committee of the State University System Board of Governors on June 23, 2011** [HIST5], the committee indicated that the Board of Governors would review its options in the coming months "for expanding access in the System." One option identified was expanding one or more branch campuses into "designation campuses"; another was increasing the number of institutions in the System.

In the September 14, 2011, meeting of the State University System of Florida Board of Governors, Academic and Strategic Planning Committee, USF Polytechnic presented information on the polytechnic model, its unique curriculum, and its importance in higher education. In the committee discussion that followed, a motion was made and passed to examine the model further.

On October 3, 2011 Board of Governors Chancellor Brogan requested that USF Polytechnic prepare a 15 year plan for development of USF Polytechnic as an independent institution in the State University System. **The Business Plan: A New Polytechnic University in Florida [HIST6A]** was presented to the Board of Governors on November 9, 2011.

In a 13-3 in favor vote by sixteen of the seventeen members of the Board of Governors, a set of benchmarks was established for USF Polytechnic to achieve, in order to be reviewed for final approval as the 12th university in the State University System [HIST 7 Statement Regarding USF Polytechnic by Chair Ava L. Parker, Florida Board of Governors, State University System, November 9, 2011]. These benchmarks are:

• The USF Polytechnic Campus securing of separation accreditation for the branch campus pursuant to s. 1004.345 Florida Statutes;

• After separate accreditation is achieved, Polytechnic shall implement the programs identified in Phase I of the Business Plan upon approval of the programs by SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools). Highest priority for program development and implementation shall be focused on programs in STEM fields, and appropriate discipline-specific accreditation shall be sought.

• Polytechnic must attain a minimum FTE of 1,244 as calculated in the Business Plan, with a minimum 50 percent of that FTE in STEM and 20 percent in STEM-related programs;

• The following facilities and infrastructure shall be in place – the Science and Technology Building, Phase I of the Wellness Center, the modular resident hall (70 beds), and the residence hall (120 beds);

• Polytechnic shall have a full complement of the following services or functions, provided either directly or where feasible through a shared services model – financial aid, admissions, student support, information technology, and finance and accounting with an internal audit function;

• Students shall be given an option to graduate with a diploma from USF, subject to university criteria;

• The Board of Governors shall monitor the development of the campus and its operations, working in collaboration with the appropriate boards, on a semi-annual basis; and

• The Board shall be consulted on any significant change to the Business Plan prior to any action being taken on such change.

As USF Polytechnic enters into its strategic planning process for development of the 2012-2018 strategic plan, these benchmarks will drive the goals, objectives and action priorities of that plan.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[HIST1] Letter of Notification of USF Lakeland Branch Campus Status, dated March 16, 1994

[HIST2] USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012

[HIST3] Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic

[HIST4] Letter of Acknowledgment of USF Notification of USF Polytechnic Name Change, dated October 16, 2008

[HIST5] Strategic Planning Committee of the State University System Board of Governors on June 23, 2011

[HIST6A] Business Plan: A New Polytechnic University in Florida

[HIST 7] Statement Regarding USF Polytechnic by Chair Ava L. Parker, Florida Board of Governors, State University System, November 9, 2011

Part A - Institutional Characteristics Type of Control

A. Public

State (If checked, which state system?) State University System of Florida

Name of system president/chancellor Frank T. Brogan, Chancellor Address of system president/chancellor Florida Board of Governors State University System of Florida 325 W. Gaines Street, #1614 Tallahassee, FL 32399

□ Other (Specify)

B. Private

- □ Independent, not-for-profit
- Religious Group (if checked, specify affiliation)
- □ Independent, for-profit

1. If this institution is one among other public institutions governed by the same governing board with a central system administration, on a separate sheet, provide the following information:

a. Describe the governing board.

Florida Board of Governors

Article IX, Section 7, subsection (d) of the Constitution of the State of Florida [CTRL1] establishes a statewide Board of Governors to operate, regulate, control and be fully responsible for the management of the State University System. These responsibilities include, but are not limited to, defining the distinctive mission of each constituent university and its articulation with free public schools and community colleges, ensuring the well-planned coordination and operation of the system, and avoiding wasteful duplication of facilities or programs.

The board's management is subject to the powers of the legislature to appropriate for the expenditure of funds, and the board is accountable for such expenditures as provided by law. The governor appoints to the board fourteen citizens dedicated to the purposes of the state university system. The appointed members are confirmed by the senate and serve staggered terms of seven years as provided by law. The commissioner of education, the chair of the advisory council of faculty senates, or the equivalent, and the president of the Florida student association, or the equivalent, are also members of the board.

Article IX, Section 7, subsection (c) establishes that each local constituent university will be administered by a board of trustees consisting of six citizen members appointed by the Governor of the State of Florida and five citizen members appointed by the Board of Governors. The appointed members

are confirmed by the senate and serve staggered terms of five years as provided by law. The chair of the faculty senate, or the equivalent, and the president of the student body of the university are also members.

Florida Statute 1001.74 (1)(a) [CTRL2] provides that the Board of Governors establishes the powers and duties of the university boards of trustees. **Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 [CTRL3]** delegates powers and duties to the university boards of trustees, including responsibility for university administration and oversight, academic programs and student affairs, personnel, financial management, property and purchasing and other miscellaneous duties.

USF Board of Trustees

Established in 2001, the USF Board of Trustees is the public body corporate created by Article IX, Section 7, subsection (c) of the Constitution of the State of Florida and empowered to administer the USF System in Florida Statute 1001.74. The USF Board of Trustees is responsible for cost-effective policy decisions appropriate to the system mission and the implementation and maintenance of high quality education programs within the laws and rules of the State. The USF Board of Trustees' charge is broad, including approval of University rules and regulations, establishing specific degree programs, fiscal oversight, monitoring of DSOs and strategic planning. The USF Board of Trustees appoints and evaluates the performance of the USF System President, who is authorized to implement policies, recommend regulations to the USF Board of Trustees, and is responsible for the operation of the USF System.

The **13 trustees** who serve on the USF Board of Trustees **[CTRL4, Brief Biographies]** include distinguished figures in the law, commerce, medicine, education, philanthropy and public policy leadership, and include the USF System Faculty Advisory Council President and USF Tampa Student Body President. The University of South Florida System President and President of the University of South Florida serves as Corporate Secretary.

The USF System operates within the **USF Board of Trustees Governance Policy 07-001 - Governance Policy for the USF System [CTRL5].** The Regional Chancellors of USF St. Petersburg, USF Sarasota-Manatee and USF Polytechnic are appointed by and report directly to the USF System President who also serves as the President of the University of South Florida. Campus Boards are appointed by the USF Board of Trustees for USF St. Petersburg, USF Sarasota-Manatee and USF Polytechnic (Lakeland). University of South Florida Board of Trustees operating procedures and Florida Statutes Sections 1004.33 The University of South Florida St. Petersburg, 1004.34 The University of South Florida Sarasota/Manatee, and 1004.345 The University of South Florida Polytechnic articulate the powers and duties of the Campus Boards.

USF Polytechnic Campus Board

In 2008 the Florida Legislature passed SB 186 creating **Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic. Section 1(b) [CTRL6]** requires that USF Polytechnic have a Campus Board and a Campus Executive Officer. The Campus Board is comprised of five members: four members are residents of the Polytechnic campus service area and appointed by the USF Board of Trustees from a list of candidates recommended by the USF System President; the fifth member is selected by the USF Board of Trustees from among its membership to serve jointly on the USF Board of Trustees and the Campus Board. The trustee who serves jointly on the Board of Trustees and the Campus Board must be a resident of the Polytechnic campus service area, unless none of the appointed members of the USF

Board of Trustees meet this criteria. The statute further requires that the USF Board of Trustees ensures, to the greatest extent possible, that each county in the Polytechnic campus service area is represented among the Campus Board membership. Campus Board members are appointed to a 4-year term and may be reappointed for one additional 4-year term. The **USF Polytechnic Campus Board [CTRL7, Brief Biographies]** includes distinguished community and regional leaders in law, business, medicine and finance.

The statute establishes powers and duties provided by law, which include the authority of the Campus Board to (a) review and approve an annual legislative budget request to be submitted to the USF Board of Trustees; (b) approve and submit an annual operating plan and budget for review and consultation by the USF Board of Trustees; (c) enter into central support services contracts with the USF Board of Trustees for any services that the Polytechnic campus cannot provide more economically, including payroll processing, accounting, technology, construction administration, and other desired services. All legal services, however, must be provided by a central services contract with the university.

The statute also establishes that the USF Board of Trustees may also lawfully delegate other powers and duties to the Campus Board for the efficient operation and improvement of the campus and for the purpose of vesting in the campus the attributes necessary to meet the requirements for separate accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Article IV(D) of the USF Board of Trustees Operating Procedures [CTRL8] establishes the authority of the Regional Campus Boards to:

1. Review and approve an annual campus legislative budget request, which will be submitted to the Commissioner of Education as a separately identified section to the USF legislative budget request. The Campus Executive Officer shall prepare the legislative budget request in accordance with guidelines established by the Florida Board of Education. This request must include items for campus operations and fixed capital outlay.

2. Approve and submit an annual operating plan and budget for review and consultation by the University Board of Trustees. The campus operating budget must reflect the actual funding available to that campus from separate line-item appropriations contained in each annual General Appropriations Act, which line-item appropriations must initially reflect the funds reported to the Legislature for the Regional Campus for fiscal year 2000-01 and any additional funds provided in the fiscal year 2001-02 legislative appropriation. For USF Polytechnic, such line-item appropriations must initially reflect the funds reported to the Legislature for the University of South Florida Lakeland campus for the 2007-2008 fiscal year and any additional funds provided in the legislative appropriation for the 2008-2009 fiscal year for USF Polytechnic.

3. Enter into central support services contracts with the University Board of Trustees for any services that the Regional Campus cannot provide more economically, including payroll processing, accounting, technology, construction administration, and other desired services. However, all legal services for the campus must be provided by a central services contract with the University. The University Board of Trustees and the Campus Board shall determine in a letter of agreement any allocation or sharing of student fee revenue between the University's main campus and each Regional Campus. In addition, various University units may enter into contracts with the Regional Campus for any services that the University desires the Regional Campus to provide.

4. The Campus Board will consult with the University President and Campus Executive Officer in the development of a Campus Strategic Plan, and periodic updates to the plan, to ensure campus development that is consonant with regional needs and that the campus meets the requirements necessary for separate accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The Campus Strategic Plan and updates will be submitted to the University President for review, approval and inclusion in the University Strategic Plan, which will go to the Board of Trustees for consideration. The Campus Strategic Plan will guide the development of Legislative Budget Requests and Campus Operating Budgets.

5. The Campus Board will regularly review enrollment patterns to ensure that the campus builds the full-time-equivalent student base required for the long-term support of existing and planned programs.

6. The Campus Board will exercise other such powers as are lawfully delegated by the University Board of Trustees to provide for the efficient operation and improvement of the campus.

Article IV(D) further provides that upon enactment of the state budget, the Board of Trustees Executive Committee will consult with the Campus Boards to develop for each regional campus an operating budget that advances the strategic goals for the campus, consistent with state law. At the next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Committee will present the operating budget for each Regional Campus that was developed through the consultative process. Upon approval by the Board of Trustees, the regional campus operating budgets will be reflected in the University of South Florida operating budget.

Finally, Article IV(D) establishes that the Board of Trustees appointed member will chair their respective Campus Board unless otherwise approved by the Chair of the Board of Trustees.

b. Describe the reporting structure for the chief executive officers of each of the institutions.

The Regional Chancellor is appointed by and reports directly to the USF System President, who reports to the USF Board of Trustees as established by Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic and affirmed by the **USF Board of Trustees Resolution [CTRL9]** passed and adopted on December 16, 2010.

c. Describe the procedure for the development and approval of academic policy and practice.

USF System Regulation 0-001 [CTRL10] provides for the **issuance of policies and procedures in the USF System.** The University of South Florida is a system of higher education composed of multiple campuses and separately accredited institutions located in Tampa, St. Petersburg, Sarasota-Manatee and Lakeland. USF System policies and procedures apply to all regional campuses and separately accredited institutions.

The President of USF System has the authority and responsibility for establishing and implementing policies and procedures in accordance with the previously referenced Board of Trustees Governance Policy (07-001) and as provided by the Board of Governors.

The proposed new, revised or repealed policy and explanation is forwarded to the Office of the General Counsel by the appropriate Vice President, USF System official or designee. The policy then begins a six

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 11

week review and comment period by the following USF System groups: President's staff, President's Executive Management Council, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Student Government, Council of Deans, Academic Chairs, Administration Council, Staff Senate, Regional Chancellors and Regional Campus Executive Officers, and Collective Bargaining representatives as required by any collective bargaining agreement. Comments received after the six week review period are forwarded to the President and appropriate Vice President for consideration. If necessary, appropriate changes are made to the proposed policy. Final form policy is distributed system-wide and posted to the Office of the General Counsel webpage.

The USF System Executive Vice President and Provost will normally propose policies and procedures with USF or USF System-wide application regarding academic and other matters related to the University's mission of teaching, research and service. USF System Academic Affairs Policies and Regulations are posted through the Office of the General Counsel [CTRL11].

Regional campuses may make necessary adjustments in order to implement a policy consistent with their local facilities or organizational structures. Separately accredited institutions within the USF System may issue separate policies when appropriate, provided that such policies are not inconsistent with system policies, regulations or other legal requirements.

Academic policies, guidelines and procedures at USF Polytechnic are developed and approved by the faculty and academic administration through the USF Polytechnic Faculty Senate, the Academic and Student Affairs Council and where appropriate, the Executive Council and/or Campus Board. Matters that may have USF System-wide implications are presented by the USFP Regional Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, to the USF System Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council.

USFP Faculty Senate

Members of the USF Polytechnic Faculty Senate must be full-time faculty (including visiting) at USFP with the rank of Lecturer, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Full Professor, Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian. Faculty on administrative appointment with 50% or more assignment to teaching and research duties are eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate.

The Preamble of the **USFP Faculty Senate Constitution [CTRL12]** indicates that Senate forms a vital link between the faculty, the administration, institutional and system-wide governing boards, and the faculty union. It is an integral component of the philosophical commitment to, and the practical application of, shared governance. It is the intent of the Senate that faculty members, primarily through their representative governance body (USF Polytechnic Faculty Senate), shall be included in an advisory role at all stages of processes relevant to the academic functioning of the institution. Specifically, the Faculty Senate views its responsibilities as:

- A. Initiating actions, carrying out reviews and making recommendations for determining the educational policies of the institution, including but not limited to:
 - 1. Academic guidelines, including initial approval of all courses, curricula, certificates, degrees and other academic programs offered;
 - 2. Scholastic guidelines, including standards for admission, continuation, graduation and honors;
 - 3. Academic ethics, including the development of guidelines and procedures; and

- 4. Academic research.
- B. Making recommendation to the Administration regarding:
 - 1. The institution's internal structure in terms of colleges, schools, centers, divisions, departments, and other administrative configurations;
 - 2. Criteria for hiring, retention, tenure, promotion and reward for faculty members and to make specific recommendations in each instance;
 - 3. Rules for ethical and professional behavior of faculty members;
 - 4. Selection and periodic review of academic administrators;
 - 5. Institutional strategic planning, decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources, and budgetary review; and
 - 6. Expectations of student conduct and student activities related to the educational process.

The Senate meets monthly during the academic year and holds general faculty meetings twice yearly. The Senate's Executive Committee consists of the current President, Vice-President, and the immediate past President. The committee prepares the agenda for Senate meetings and recommends faculty members for institutional or system committees. The Senate is provided clerical support through the Office of the USFP Regional Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

USFP Academic and Student Affairs Council

The Academic and Student Affairs Council (ASAC) provides academic and student affairs units with a venue for discussion, review and recommendation for campus-wide academic and student affairs issues and to ensure, through consensus, consistency in academic and student affairs procedures and practices across units. The Council also provides advice and recommendation to the chief academic officer of USF Polytechnic with respect to academic and student affairs matters. The ASAC may appoint ad hoc or subcommittees to address specific issues and report outcomes as appropriate.

Members

- 1. James Payne, Regional Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Co-Chair
- 2. Jan Lloyd, Dean of Students, Co-Chair
- 3. Paul Cromwell, Director, Social Sciences
- 4. TBD Director, Innovation Management and President, Faculty Senate
- 5. TBD Director, Education
- 6. W. Dave Armitage, Director, Information Technology
- 7. JoAnne Larsen, Program Coordinator, Engineering
- 8. Monica Roberts, Interim Director, Academic Advising
- 9. Willette Roach, Director, Admissions & Financial Aid
- 10. Joel Rodney, Director, Extended University
- 11. Kevin Calkins, Director, Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning
- 12. Catherine Lavallée-Welch, Associate Librarian and Director, USFP Library
- 13. E. Nathan Thomas, Program Director, Multicultural Education and Engagement
- 14. Rosemarie Lamm, Program Director, Rath Senior ConNEXTions Center
- 15. Travis Brown, Director, Blue Sky Incubators

Areas within the scope of the ASAC include, but are not limited to:

- Academic policy issues—undergraduate and graduate
- Degree program planning and development—undergraduate and graduate
- Enrollment planning and management
- Faculty well-being and development
- Student affairs programs and services
- Strategic planning
- Assessment and accountability reporting
- Coordination of implementation of campus-wide or system-wide policies and procedures

The Academic and Student Affairs Council meets monthly, with additional special topics meetings called as needed. **Examples of ASAC meeting notes [CTRL13a, December 10, 2009, and CTRL13b, April 8, 2010]** provide illustration of matters addressed by the ASAC.

USFP Executive Council

The USFP Executive Council advises and supports the Regional Chancellor and Campus Executive Officer in the implementation of the campus vision, mission and strategic plan and in review, implementation and/or recommendation regarding policies, procedures and practices in the USF System. The USFP Executive Council meets weekly. Members of the Executive Council are:

- David Touchton, Interim Regional Chancellor and Campus Executive Officer, Chair
- James Payne, Regional Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
- Judith Ponticell, Regional Vice Chancellor, Assessment & Accountability
- Alice Murray, Regional Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning and Facilities Operations
- Joel Rodney, Director, Extended University
- Didier Rousseliere, Director, Global Partnerships
- Jan Lloyd, Dean of Students
- Joshua Bresler, Executive Director, Finance and Administration
- Kevin Calkins, Director, Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning
- Samantha Lane, Associate Director, Marketing and Communications
- David Bobbitt, Director, Strategy and Innovation
- Karen White, Sr. Advisor to the Regional Chancellor

USF System Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council (ACEAC)

The USF System Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council, established September 2010, has cross-institutional membership (as needed) and serves as a forum for communications and review body for relevant items going to the Board of Trustees, and makes recommendations to the President on policy and other matters. The ACEAC also supports the Board of Trustees Academic and Campus Environment (ACE) Workgroup. The ACEAC may, at its discretion, form smaller subgroups for particular areas, issues, or initiatives. Whenever possible, the Advisory Council seeks consensus on issues. The Advisory Council meets six (6) times a year, with its meetings aligned with preparation for the meetings of the Board of Trustees ACE Workgroup.

The Advisory Council chair and vice chair are appointed from the Council membership by the USF System President annually. ACEAC members are:

- Dwayne Smith, USF System Provost designee and Council Chair
- Paul Dosal, USF Tampa Academic Affairs designee
- Norine Noonan, USF St. Petersburg; Bonnie Jones, USF Sarasota-Manatee; and James Payne, USF Polytechnic, Chief Academic Officers
- John Curran Academic Officer from USF Health as designated by the USF Health Sr. Vice President
- Tracey Tyree, USF Tampa and Council Vice Chair; Kent Kelso, USF St. Petersburg; Pam Doerr, USF Sarasota-Manatee; Jan Lloyd, USF Polytechnic; Deanna Wathington, USF Health – Chief Student Affairs Officers and a Student Affairs representative from USF Health as designated by USF System President and Regional Chancellors, and the USF Health Sr. Vice President
- Ted Williams Equal Opportunity Director
- Sandy Lovins, USF Tampa; Facility Officer from a Regional Campus TBD Facility Officer from USF and one from a Regional Campus as designated by the USF System President and by agreement of the Regional Chancellors
- Roger Brindley International Affairs Officer as designated by the Senior International Officer
- Elizabeth Larkin, President and USF Sarasota-Manatee; Elizabeth Byrd, Vice President and USF Tampa; Richard Plank, USF Polytechnic; USF St. Petersburg TBD – USF System Faculty Advisory Committee President and Vice President and two members of the Faculty Advisory Council as designated by the Faculty Advisory Committee President from campuses that are not represented by the sitting President or Vice President of the Council
- Bill McGillis Executive Associate Director of Athletics
- Michael Pearce Chief Information Officer

Roles and Responsibilities of the ACEAC:

- 1. Advise the USF System President and the USF System Provost on what items should be reviewed and/or acted upon by the Board of Trustees Academics and Campus Environment Workgroup.
- 2. Review and advise the USF System President and USF System Provost on the substance of all items placed on the Board of Trustees Academics and Campus Environment Workgroup agenda.
- 3. Develop and/or review USF System initiatives and review and/or advise on USF System institutional activities related to academic issues, including:
 - Academic Programs (Undergraduate, Graduate, Professional): Academic program planning; new program approval, program elimination, program review; collaborative degree programs; interdisciplinary programs; assessment in academic programs.
 - *Faculty Matters*: Recruitment and retention; faculty development; promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review; faculty policies and procedures.
 - *Enrollment Management*: Enrollment planning; enrollment management integration System-wide; admissions and transfer standards.
 - Academic Support Functions: Library; Instructional Technology; Advising.
- 4. Develop and/or review USF System initiatives and/or review and/or advise on USF System institutional activities related to student issues and policies, including:

- *Student Housing*: Residential life; integration of residential and academic; off-campus housing; commuter student experience.
- Judicial: Policies; procedures; communications; legal issues.
- *Student Life*: Activities; cultural and intellectual opportunities; volunteer opportunities.
- *Student Health*: Health Center policies and procedures; education and prevention programs; health intervention.
- *Student Security*: Safety; emergency procedures and communications; University police.
- 5. Develop and/or review USF System initiatives and/or review and/or advise on USF System institutional activities related to strategic planning and accountability, including:
 - *Strategic Planning:* Integration of USF System Strategic Plan and institutional strategic plans; monitoring implementation progress of strategic plans; academic master planning integration. Integration of USF System strategic planning and Board of Governors' plan.
 - *Student Success*: Student quality; freshman to sophomore retention rates; four and six year graduation rates; employment and graduate/professional school acceptances.
 - Accreditations: Regional accreditation; national disciplinary accreditations.
 - Diversity and Equal Opportunity: Annual equity report; plans and results; Title IX compliance.
- 6. Develop and/or review USF System initiatives and/or review and/or advise on USF System institutional activities related to facilities, including:
 - *Campus Master Plans:* Integration of common themes (e.g., green space, sustainability, pedestrian).
 - *Real Estate and Facilities Priorities:* Buildings; land acquisition; utilization.
 - *Deferred Maintenance of Facilities*: Analysis of deferred maintenance backlog; plans to reduce backlog; development of preventive maintenance programs; collaborative projects.
- 7. Develop and/or review USF System initiatives and/or review and/or advise on USF System institutional activities (if any) related to intercollegiate athletics, including:
 - *Student Athletes*: Student support; student success.
 - *Marketing and Attendance*: USF System participation; USF System communities' participation.
- 8. Develop and/or review USF System initiatives and/or review and/or advise on USF System institutional activities related to international affairs, including:
 - *Study Abroad*: Policies and procedures; locations; quality controls; emergency/liability management; collaborative possibilities.
 - *Curricular:* Collaborative opportunities; policies and procedures; incentives.
- 9. Review fee and tuition recommendations submitted to the Finance and Audit Advisory Group: discuss impact on student progress and success; discuss the programmatic impact of fee increases. Advise Finance and Audit Advisory Group as appropriate.

- 10. Serve as a communication forum for Academics and Campus Environment issues, both at the USF System level and among the institutions by sharing appropriate and timely information. Ensure the work of the Advisory Council is communicated to all interested parties.
- 11. Serve as a "brainstorming" forum to find "game changing" ideas for the USF System in Academics and Campus Environment.

d. Describe the system's academic program review process.

Academic program review occurs both at the initial authorization of new academic programs and in cyclical academic program review. Florida Statute 1004.03 Program Approval [CTRL14] gives authority to establish criteria for approval of new degree programs to the Board of Governors. Florida Board of Governors Regulation 8.011 New Academic Program Authorization [CTRL15] requires that proposals for new degree programs be reviewed for: 1) consistency with institutional mission and the BOG State University System Strategic Plan; 2) demonstrated need for program graduates, research or service; 3) sufficient financial planning and resources; 4) projected benefit to the university, local community, and state; 5) maintenance of access and articulation; 6) ability to implement a high quality program; 7) curriculum appropriate for the discipline and program level; 8) sufficient qualified faculty; and 9) sufficient institutional resources.

USF System Policy 10-036 Authorization of New Degree Programs [CTRL16] requires that new degree program proposals meet the criteria listed in BOG Regulation 8.011 and be prepared in accordance with the common state university new degree proposal format. Proposals are reviewed and approved by appropriate institutional/campus committees (e.g., USF Polytechnic Academic and Student Affairs Council, USFP Executive Council); by the campus Senate (e.g., USFP Faculty Senate Undergraduate or Graduate Council); by the USFP Campus Board; and by appropriate USF System Councils (e.g., Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council), prior to submission to the Board of Trustees Academic and Campus Environment (ACE) Work Group which reviews and recommends for approval, if appropriate, to the USF Board of Trustees.

USF System Procedures for Authorization of New Degree Programs [CTRL17] provide for coordination and consistency of implementation of new degree authorization requirements and approval procedures.

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 8.015 Academic Program Review 2007-2014 [CTRL18] requires the cyclic review of all academic degree programs in State universities at least every seven years. Program reviews must document how individual academic programs are achieving stated student learning and program objectives within the context of the university's mission, as illustrated in the academic learning compacts. The results of the program reviews are expected to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level and, when appropriate, at the state level.

The Office of the USF Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs, coordinates all activities for USF System program reviews in accordance with BOG Regulation 8.015. The **USF Program Review Process and Guidelines [CTRL19]** includes specific instructions for each component of the review process and a recommended timeline. The current program review process includes the following elements:

- A program **Self-study** prepared by the chair and faculty of the program under review.
- A **Dean's Report** prepared by the Dean of the College that house(s) the program under review.
- A written report from one or more external reviewers selected by the Office of Academic Affairs in consultation with the program under review and the Dean's Office. As the program review process is web-based, external reviewer(s) will participate in the process via the web unless the Office of Academic Affairs in consultation with the Dean determines that a site visit is necessary. For programs with specialized professional accreditation, external reviews conducted for professional accreditation may be used for the purposes of program review.
- Selection of External Reviewers
- External Reviewers Report
- A summary report of the program review prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs and sent by the USF Executive Vice President and Provost (or designee) to the BOG.

A general timeline template is provided in the guidelines for program review:

January-March

The USF Office of Academic Affairs sends the USF Program Review Plan and other relevant guidelines (e.g., the BOG Program Review Policies) to the Dean, Associate Dean and the Department Chair along with a reminder indicating which program(s) are to be reviewed during the coming academic year. Directions are provided on where to access the documents in the Program Review Website.

March-October

The academic unit prepares the self-study which is submitted to the Dean (or Associate Dean). The Self-Study Report is submitted electronically via the website on or about October 1. The Dean (or Associate Dean) is given access to the website and prepares the Deans' Report. The Dean's report is submitted electronically via the website on or about December 1.

By May 1, the academic unit sends a list of three to five potential external reviewers to the Dean (or Associate Dean), who will review the list, amend it if appropriate, and forward it to the USF Office of Academic Affairs which will correspond with potential external reviewer(s) to determine their willingness and availability to review the program(s). Once an external reviewer has been selected, s/he will be provided with exact dates for review of program reports, and a website log-on ID and password.

November-February

The self-study will be reviewed online by the external reviewer(s). If the unit wishes to have the consultant review other non-electronic supplementary materials (e.g., brochures, flyers, etc.) as part of the self study report, they will be sent to the USF Office of Academic Affairs at least a month before the scheduled date of the beginning of the review. The USF Office of Academic Affairs will mail them to the consultant.

If no site visit is conducted, a meeting will be organized via a webinar/video conferencing or phone conference. This meeting will include the consultant, who will deliver an oral report, representatives from the Provost's Office, the College Dean and Associate Dean, and the Dean of the Graduate School and/or the Dean of Undergraduate Studies (or Associate Dean),

The external reviewer(s) will be requested to submit a complete electronic report no later than four weeks following the exit meeting. The report will be submitted to the USF Office of Academic Affairs, which will distribute a copy to the Dean of the College for further dissemination and discussion.

May-June

The USF Office of Academic Affairs prepares a summary report for submission to the BOG Office.

The program review process within the USF System encompasses a systematic, ongoing, and intentional gathering of information on academic program performance and effectiveness. The results of the self-study, report of the external reviewer(s), and summary report submitted to the BOG Office are used to enhance student learning and improve academic programs in the context of the USF Board of Trustees, campus and BOG strategic priorities.

e. Outline the budget process.

Effective July 1, 2008 Florida Statute 1004.345 The University of South Florida Polytechnic [CTRL6] established the Lakeland campus of the University of South Florida as the University of South Florida Polytechnic, to be operated and maintained as a separate organizational and budget entity of the University of South Florida with all legislative appropriations for the University of South Florida Polytechnic to be set as separate line items in the annual General Appropriations Act (1)(a).

The Statute further requires that USF Polytechnic to have a Campus Board (1)(c) and a Campus Executive Officer (1)(b). The Campus Board has authority to (a) review and approve an annual legislative budget request to be submitted to the USF Board of Trustees; (b) approve and submit an annual operating plan and budget for review and consultation by the USF Board of Trustees; (c) enter into central support services contracts with the USF Board of Trustees for any services that the Polytechnic campus cannot provide more economically, including payroll processing, accounting, technology, construction administration, and other desired services. All legal services, however, must be provided by a central services contract with the university. The Campus Executive Officer has authority to recommend to the Campus Board an annual legislative budget request that includes funding for campus operations and fixed capital outlay and an annual campus operating budget.

Board of Governors Regulation 9.007 State University Operating Budgets [CTRL20] establishes that each university president prepares an operating budget for approval by the University Board of Trustees, in accordance with instructions, guidelines, and standard formulas provided by the Board of Governors. Furthermore, each university Board of Trustees adopts an operating budget for the general operation of the university as prescribed by the regulations of the Board of Governors.

USF System Policy 0-513 USF System Budgets [CTRL21] establishes that the President of the USF System has delegated primary responsibility for detailed planning and budgeting to each of the vice presidents and central administrative offices who have line authority for the major organizational units of the USF System. The USF Vice President for Business and Finance has been delegated responsibility for USF System-wide coordination and administration of the budgeting process, including implementation, oversight and accountability for budget management. The USF System's annual budget is prepared by Budget & Policy Analysis under the direction of the USF Vice President for Business and Finance.

The USFP Regional Chancellor and Campus Executive Officer has delegated primary responsibility for detailed planning and budgeting to the regional vice chancellors and central administrative offices with

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 19

line authority for the major organizational units of USF Polytechnic. The **Executive Director, Finance and Administration [CTRL22]** has been delegated responsibility for 1) coordination with the USF System Vice President for Business and Finance in the USF System budgeting process; and 2) coordination with USF Polytechnic organizational units, administration, implementation, oversight and accountability for budget management at USF Polytechnic.

A general timeline for budget planning, review, approval and submission follows:

January – March

The USFP Executive Director, Finance and Administration, meets with organizational unit leadership to review budget allocations and expenditures for the previous fiscal year, Quarters 1 and 2 of the current fiscal year and projected expenditures for Quarters 3 and 4 of the current fiscal year. Organizational unit leaders develop preliminary operating budget requests, other capital outlay (OCO) projects requests, Foundation funding requests and faculty and/or staff recruitment plans for the new fiscal year. Unit directors must align their budget requests with the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan and the unit's annual action plan, derived from assessment data and annual progress report.

April – June

Organizational unit leaders finalize campus operating budget requests, other capital outlay (OCO) projects requests, Foundation funding requests and faculty and/or staff recruitment plans for the new fiscal year and submit required forms to the USFP Executive Director, Finance and Administration [CTRL23]. The Executive Director prepares the draft Campus Operating Budget, Campus OCO Project Requests, Campus Foundation funding requests and campus faculty and/or staff hiring plans for review by the campus Executive Council.

The Florida Legislative Session ends early May, and the state operating budget is forwarded to the Governor for approval and signature. The USF Board of Trustees sets the tuition rate for new academic year.

A USF System Budget Planning Cover Memo and Process Guidelines [CTRL24], together with Budget Planning Forms [CTRL25a,CTRL25b, CTRL25c and CTRL25d] are distributed by the University Budget Director. The USFP Executive Director, Finance and Administration, completes the USF System budget worksheets and submits them to the University Budget Director for review by the USF System Vice President for Business and Finance and the USF System Finance & Budget Management Council.

The USFP Executive Director for Finance and Administration prepares the final Campus Operating Budget, Campus OCO Project Requests, Campus Foundation funding requests and campus faculty and/or staff hiring plans for review and approval by the Campus Executive Council, Regional Vice Chancellor, and Campus Board; approval by the USF System Executive Management Council; approval by the USF Board of Trustees Finance & Audit Work Group; and approval by the USF Board of Trustees. The final USF System operating budget is submitted to the Board of Governors.

June – July

The Board of Governors prepares the legislative budget request for the State University System and submits it to the Legislature.

July – August

USF Polytechnic receives legislative allocation.

f. Describe the relationship between the system office and the applying institution.

The relationship between the University of South Florida System offices and USF Polytechnic is articulated in the USF Board of Trustees Governance Policy 07-001 Governance Policy for the USF System [see CTRL5].

The preamble to the policy states:

The University of South Florida (USF) Board of Trustees is committed to building, strengthening and sustaining a premier university system that adds value regionally, state-wide, nationally, and globally through enhancing access to higher education; advancing research which benefits society; contributing to regional unification; leveraging distinctive regional advantages; promoting partnership opportunities; assuring academic program quality; providing consistently high quality support programs and services; strengthening institutional control, legal compliance and ethics, and risk management; and maximizing the economies of scale. The USF System embraces a unified vision of cooperative excellence with institutions, regional campuses and direct service organizations (DSOs) developing distinct and complementary missions that are consistent with the overall USF mission. The USF System deeply values existing collegial groups, including the Faculty Senate, Student Government, A&P Council, and Staff Senate that constructively contribute to the USF System strategic plan. The USF System is committed to working collaboratively with such groups to identify, develop and refine best practices on matters of shared interest. All USF institutions, regional campuses, DSOs and their employees benefit from a focused collegial enterprise and share accountability to the USF Board of Trustees, the Florida Board of Governors, the public and the students we serve.

The policy establishes the following:

- 1. The USF System is comprised of three separately accredited institutions: USF, USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee. USF includes the main campus in Tampa, its College of Marine Science in St. Petersburg, USF Health and USF Polytechnic (Lakeland). The USF Board of Trustees is the public body corporate created by Article IX, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of Florida and empowered (Section 1001.74 F.S.) to administer the USF System. The USF Board of Trustees is responsible for cost-effective policy decisions appropriate to the system mission and the implementation and maintenance of high quality education programs within the laws and rules of the State. The USF Board of Trustees' charge is broad, including approval of University rules and regulations, establishing specific degree programs, fiscal oversight, monitoring of DSOs and strategic planning. The USF Board of Trustees appoints and evaluates the performance of the USF System President, who is authorized to implement policies, recommend regulations to the USF Board of Trustees, and is responsible for the operation of the USF System.
- 2. The USF System operates within the USF Board of Trustees governance structure. The Regional Chancellors of USF St. Petersburg, USF Sarasota-Manatee and USF Polytechnic are appointed by and report directly to the USF System President who also serves as the President of the University of South Florida. Campus Boards are appointed by the USF Board of Trustees for USF St. Petersburg, USF Sarasota-Manatee and USF Polytechnic. University of South Florida Board of Trustees operating procedures and Sections 1004.33, 1004.34, and 1004.345 F.S. articulate the powers and duties of the Campus Boards.

- 3. The President is the Chief Executive Officer of the USF System and of the University of South Florida. The Provost and Executive Vice President, all Senior Vice Presidents, the Vice President for Communications, the Associate Vice President for System Initiatives, and the Regional Chancellors report directly to the System President. The System President delegates Systemwide authority to the Provost and Executive Vice President, Senior Vice Presidents and Vice Presidents as appropriate. System Advisory Councils consisting of representatives from all USF institutions and regional campuses advise the System President and other System Officers. These include the Academics and Campus Environment Advisory Council, the Finance and Audit Advisory Council, and the Health Sciences and Research Advisory Council. The USF System Faculty Advisory Council is chaired by a faculty governance leader and facilitates communication on System-wide faculty and academic issues. Each Advisory Council's role and responsibilities, scope of activities, membership and operating procedures are established and approved by the System President. Each Advisory Council will post members, meeting dates, agendas, and summary notes on its website.
- 4. As part of the USF System, direct support organizations (DSOs) are separately incorporated by statute (Section 1004.28 F.S.), and operate exclusively for the benefit of USF consistent with the USF System strategic plan approved by the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees is the ultimate governing entity authorized to establish and decertify DSOs and annually reviews and approves DSO budgets, audits and financial reports.
- 5. The USF System was formed to bring its member institutions together, so that collectively and collaboratively they could serve the region and beyond in optimal ways, resulting in a stronger presence and a distinctiveness that provides an unstoppable competitive differentiation. In addition to having a strong and unified voice for higher education, the USF System seeks to find and capitalize on synergies and economies of scale among its institutions that are of benefit to students, faculty, staff, alumni, and communities.
- 6. The USF System will develop, approve, promote and hold all institutions, regional campuses and DSOs accountable to a single, unified and transparent legislative agenda consistent with the University's strategic priorities approved by the USF Board of Trustees. All interaction with state, regional, national and international governing bodies will be conducted by the USF Board of Trustees, the system President, and their designees.
- 7. In order to achieve the desired synergies and economies of scale and ensure effective operations at all USF institutions and campuses, the USF System has defined a set of System-wide services. These are described in Attachment A, USF System-wide Services Paradigm.
- 8. In order to improve student retention and graduation rates, the USF System will manage access, transfer, and success through a unified student information system and clearly articulated admission, retention and graduation requirements, with formal System-level articulation agreements, where appropriate, to ensure coordination of enrollment planning and management.
- 9. The Dean of the Graduate School and Associate Vice President for Research and Innovation will coordinate graduate policies and programs for all USF institutions and campuses. As established by the Florida Board of Governors, USF (which includes the main campus in Tampa, its College of Marine Science and USF Health), is the only doctoral degree granting institution within the USF

System. The University of South Florida may deliver "hosted" programs collaboratively within the system as well as with other research institutions when deemed appropriate.

- 10. USF System institutions and campuses will articulate differentiated, yet complementary, missions through the development of strategic plans, compact plans, and work plans. These plans will be consistent with the USF System strategic plan and will be approved by the Board of Trustees. Enrollment profiles may reflect these differentiated missions. Each institution and regional campus will have its own Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS) number and report separately to the National Center for Education Statistics. The System-wide reporting is coordinated through the Office of Decision Support. Each institution and regional campus will participate as a separate reporting entity in the Voluntary System of Accountability. Each institution and regional campus is classified separately by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- 11. As legislatively mandated, each regional campus will maintain SACS accreditation. The Office of the System Provost and Executive Vice President will facilitate fully informed choices by faculty in the event of a change of accreditation status for any USF institution or campus. Faculty may be granted courtesy appointments in a program/department/college on a campus different from the faculty member's primary place of employment. Upon separate accreditation of all campuses, the USF System will establish consistent terminology for persons in like positions who are accorded like authority, and fulfill like responsibilities.

The USF System Governance Policy was approved by the USF Board of Trustees and adopted May 31, 2007. It was subsequently revised July 1, 2008; February 17, 2011; and June 8, 2011.

2. If this institution is one among several institutions owned by the same corporate board, on a separate sheet, provide the following information:

- a. Provide the name and location of the corporate headquarters.
- Provide the name of each postsecondary institution owned by the corporation, its address, telephone number, and the name and title of each institution's chief executive administrator.
 Also, indicate whether each institution is accredited and the name of the accrediting agency.
- c. Describe the duties and responsibilities of the corporate officers.
- d. If the applying institution shares a single governing board with other institutions owned by the corporation, describe the governing board, its responsibilities and authority
- e. If each institution has a separate governing board:

(1) Describe the relationship between the corporate board and the governing boards of each of the institutions.

(2) Define the duties and responsibilities, appointment procedures, rotation policies, removal policies, organizational structure, committee structure, and frequency of meetings for the separate governing boards and for the corporate governing board.

(3) Describe the reporting structure for the chief executive officers of each of the institutions.

(4) Describe how the legal posers of the corporate board and the individual boards differ.

(5) Indicate whether degrees are conferred by the corporate board or the individual boards.

(6) Explain whether the corporate board or the individual boards make decisions affecting administrative services, staff support services, and academic programs and services.

(7) Explain whether or not members of the corporate board are also members of individual governing boards.

Not applicable.

3. Describe any change in sponsorship or control that occurred in the past year.

Not applicable.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CTRL1] Article IX, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of Florida

[CTRL2] Florida Statute 1001.74 Powers and duties of university boards of trustees

[CTRL3] Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 University Board of Trustees Powers and Duties

[CTRL4] Brief biographies of the members of the USF Board of Trustees

[CTRL5] USF Board of Trustees Governance Policy 07-001 Governance Policy for the USF System

[CTRL6] Florida Statute 1004.345 The University of South Florida Polytechnic

[CTRL7] Brief biographies of members of the USF Polytechnic Campus Board

[CTRL8] USF Board of Trustees Operating Procedures

[CTRL9] USF Board of Trustees Resolution, December 16, 2010

[CTRL10] USF System Regulation 0-001 Issuance of Policies and Procedures in the USF System

[CTRL11] USF System Academic Affairs Policies and Regulations posted through the Office of the General Counsel

[CTRL12] Faculty Senate Constitution and By-laws

[CTRL13 a&b] Examples of ASAC Meeting Notes for December 10, 2009 (CTRL13a) and April 8, 2010 (CTRL13b)

[CTRL14] Florida Statute 1004.03 Program Approval

[CTRL15] Florida Board of Governors Regulation 8.011 New Academic Program Authorization

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 24

[CTRL16] USF System Policy 10-036 Authorization of New Degree Programs

[CTRL17] USF Procedures for Authorization of New Degree Programs

[CTRL18] Florida Board of Governors Regulation 8.015 Academic Program Review 2007-2014

[CTRL19] USF Program Review Process and Guidelines

[CTRL20] Board of Governors Regulation 9.007 State University Operating Budgets

[CTRL21] USF System Policy 0-513 USF System Budgets

[CTRL22] Executive Director, Finance and Administration, and Campus Budget Officer

[CTRL23] Example of USFP budget planning memo and required forms for campus operating budget requests, other capital outlay (OCO) projects requests, Foundation funding requests and faculty and/or staff recruitment plans

[CTRL24] USF System Budget Planning Cover Memo and Process Guidelines

[CTRL25a-d] USF System Budget Planning Forms [CTRL25a] Budget Summary [CTRL25b] Revenue Worksheet [CTRL25c] Budget Planning Worksheet - Revenue [CTRL25d] Budget Planning Worksheet - Expense

Part A - Institutional Characteristics Organizational Chart for the Institution

Provide an organizational chart for the institution making it clear at a minimum the following information:

(1) The relationship between the CEO of the institution and the governing board.

(2) The administrative units of the institution with names for the administrative personnel heading each unit.

(3) Additional detail concerning academic divisions and support units at the institution.

A set of **USF Polytechnic organizational charts** is provided including the following organizational units:

- Campus Administration [OC1]
- Office of the Regional Chancellor & Campus Executive Officer [OC2]
- Academic Affairs [OC3]
- Student Affairs [OC4]
- Extended University [OC5]
- Campus Planning and Facilities Operations [OC6]
- Assessment and Accountability [OC7]
- Finance and Administration [OC8]
- Marketing and Communications [OC9]
- Strategy and Innovation [OC10]
- Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning [OC11]
- College of Technology and Innovation [OC12]
- College of Human and Social Sciences [OC13]
- Experiential and Applied Learning [OC14]

Part A - Institutional Characteristics Educational Programs

1. Level of offering (Check all that apply)

- Diploma or <u>certificate program(s)</u> requiring less than one year beyond grade 12.
- Diploma or <u>certificate program(s)</u> of at least two but fewer than four years of work beyond grade 12.
- Associate degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 60 semester hours or the equivalent designed for transfer to a baccalaureate institution.
- Associate degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 60 semester hours or the equivalent not designed for transfer.
- Four or five-year baccalaureate degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 120 semester hours or the equivalent.
- Professional degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent.
- Master's degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent.
- □ Work beyond the master's level but not at the doctoral level (such as Specialist in Education).
- Doctoral degree program(s) requiring a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent.
- □ Other (Specify)

2. List all Diploma Programs and Certificate Programs Offered.

Post-baccalaureate Certificates (2): Information Technology Management

Information Technology Professional

3. List all Associate degree programs offered (AAT, AAS, AS, and AA).

Not applicable.

4. List all Baccalaureate degree programs offered (BA, BS, BFA, BAS, BBA, or other as specified)

Baccalaureate Degree Programs (9):

Applied Science, B.S. with concentrations in Criminal Justice, Early Childhood Development, Industrial Operations, Information Technology and Leadership Studies

Criminology, B.A.

Elementary Education, B.S.

General Business Administration, B.S./B.A. with concentrations in Accounting, Finance, Management and Marketing

General Studies, B.G.S.

Industrial Engineering, B.S.

Information Technology, B.S.

Interdisciplinary Social Science, B.A. Psychology, B.A.

5. List all Master's degree programs offered (MA, MS, MBA, MFA, or other as specified).

Master's Degree Programs (5): Business Administration, M.B.A. Counselor Education, M.A. Educational Leadership, M.Ed. Reading Education, M.A. Information Technology, M.S.

6. List all Doctoral degree programs offered (Ph.D., Ed.D., DBA, or other as specified).

Not applicable.

7. Indicate what constitutes a normal credit hour load:

a. Undergraduate credit hours	Fall/spring semester: 12 hours minimum = FT Summer sessions A & B (6 weeks): 6 hours minimum = FT Summer session C (10 weeks): 9 hours minimum = FT		
In Graduate credit nours	Fall/spring semester: 9 hours minimum =FT Summer semester A,B or C: 6 hours minimum = FT		
c. Semester credit hours	Not applicable		
d. Other	Not applicable		

8. List all agencies which currently accredit the institution or any of its programs, the agency name, and the dates of the last review.

SACS, as part of the University of South Florida (2005-2015) AACSB, as part of the University of South Florida (2005-2013) CACREP, as part of the University of South Florida (2005-2013) NCATE, as part of the University of South Florida (2005-2013)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[EP1] USF System Degree Programs by Location August 2011

Part A - Institutional Characteristics Methods of Delivery

(Check all that apply and provide information for each)

- **On-Campus Face to Face Delivery**
- **Off-Campus Physical Site(s) using Face to Face Delivery**

For each site provide the following information:

- (1) the location (complete address), indicating distance from main campus
 - Site 1: South Florida Community College 600 West College Drive Avon Park, FL 33825 Distance from USF Polytechnic Campus: 48 miles
 - Site 2: Citrus High School 600 W. Highland Blvd. Inverness, FL 34452 Distance from USF Polytechnic Campus: 101 miles

(2) the programs (or courses if complete programs are not offered) offered

- Site 1: South Florida Community College
 - M.Ed. Educational Leadership
 - **B.S. Elementary Education**
- Site 2: Citrus High School M.Ed. Educational Leadership
- (3) the number of students enrolled Fall 2011 Source: OASIS Schedule of Classes Off-Campus Fall 2011 [MD1]

South Florida Community College (SFCC, Avon Park)

B.S. Elementary Education				
EDF 3122	FT	13		
EDF 4430	FT	16		
EDE 4223	FT	15		
EDE 4301	PT	13		
EDE 4940 Internship	PT Clinical Supervisor	1		
EDE 4941 Internship	PT Clinical Supervisor	13		
EDE 4942 Internship	PT Clinical Supervisor	16		
LAE 4414	PT	13		
RED 4310	FT	13		
EEX 4070	FT	15		
TSL 4251	PT	15		
M.Ed. Educational Leadership				
EDA 6192	FT	6		

EDG 6627	PT	5		
Citrus County				
M.Ed. Educational Leadership				
EDA 6232	FT	11		
EDF 6492	FT	4		
EDG 6285	FT	10		

(4) the name and position of the person administratively responsible for the site

- Site 1: South Florida Community College Merri Warren, Adjunct Faculty, Site Liaison
- Site 2: Citrus High School

Dr. Jennifer Reeves, Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership, Site Liaison

(5) how students access library/learning resources

Students access library resources through the USF Polytechnic website "Student Tools" webpage, the USF Polytechnic "Library" webpage, and/or through the "USF Libraries" link on the "myUSF/Blackboard" portal.

Students access additional learning resources through the "TLI" Teaching Learning Innovation and "Writing Center" links on the **USF Polytechnic Student Tools webpage [MD2]** as well as through the "myUSF/Blackboard" portal.

Students can also access Tutoring and Learning Services (TLS) through the USF Tampa Library Learning Commons [MD3, Tutoring & Learning Services]. TLS provides: a) course tutoring in mathematics, natural science, engineering and business; b) writing consultations and resources in the Writing Center; c) learning support courses in strategic learning, advanced learning systems, critical reading and writing, advanced reading, reading lab; d) study skills workshops in memory skills, reading textbooks, note taking, test taking, test anxiety, time management, writing papers, effective presentations; e) test preparation tutoring for the MCAT, GRE, GKT, CPT and LSAT; and f) software tutorials, online tutoring and web-based writing support through the Learning Commons Online.

(6) how students access student support services

Students access degree program information through e-mail or phone contact with the academic advisor, and course schedule and location information through the site coordinator/ liaison. Registration and financial aid support services are accessed through the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid. Support for online technical and instructional resources is accessed through the "myUSF/Blackboard" portal, through the USF Polytechnic Office of Teaching & Learning Innovation, a unit of Extended University, and through the USF System Office of Information Technology phone and e-mail contacts for IT services.

Site 1: South Florida Community College

Merri Warren, Site Liaison; Dale Gosnell, Education Advisor

Site 2: Citrus High School

Dr. Jennifer Reeves, Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership, Site Liaison; Dale

Gosnell, Education Advisor

(7) the number of full time faculty and the number of adjunct faculty teaching at each site in Fall 2011

Site 1 South Florida Community College: 6 full-time faculty; 4 part-time faculty **Site 2 Citrus High School:** 2 full-time faculty

- □ Distance Learning by Correspondence
 - (1) Indicate who is administratively responsible for learning by correspondence
 - (2) Indicate the programs (or courses if complete programs are not offered) offered by correspondence and the number of students enrolled
 - (3) Indicate how correspondence students access library/learning resources
 - (4) Indicate how correspondence students access student support services

Distance Learning by Electronic Means

(1) Indicate the type(s) of electronic delivery available to students

Courses can be delivered through the myUSF/Blackboard online learning system; webcast; instructional TV; encoded video; videoconferencing; and asynchronous and synchronous online programs.

(2) Indicate who (or what unit) at the institution is administratively responsible for distance learning by electronic means

Nicholle Stone, Assistant Director, Teaching & Learning Innovation

(3) Describe the information technology used to provide instruction by electronic means

Blackboard online learning system, Elluminate online synchronous program, videoconferencing, and instructional television.

(4) Indicate the programs (or courses if complete programs are not offered) offered by electronic means

The **OASIS Schedule of Off-Campus Classes Fall 2011 [MD1]** indicates courses taught via the World Wide Web as "W" courses. All courses in the Bachelor of Science in Information Technology degree can be completed online.

(5) Indicate the number of students enrolled in programs or courses offered by electronic means in Fall 2010

1,681 students were enrolled in courses delivered via the World Wide Web. No courses were offered by Instructional Television or videoconferencing in fall 2011.

(6) Indicate who is responsible for development of courses offered by electronic means

Individual faculty members are responsible for developing online course content and instructional delivery methods with assistance from support staff in Teaching and Learning

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 31

Innovation. Extended University has made funds available for the development of online courses. Faculty are eligible for a \$4,000 stipend if they meet several conditions including a) approval of course development by the academic division director, b) attendance at training and support sessions for online course development, c) utilization of course-appropriate software for online content and instructional delivery, d) adherence to campus online course development standards and module structures, e) review of the course by the Standards Review Committee, f) posting of content for program usage in an open access online space that will then be available to other faculty/adjuncts teaching the course, and g) service as a mentor to other faculty or adjuncts that utilize the developed online content to teach the online course. Faculty who receive a stipend for online course development agree that content developed belongs to the university, academic division and program to disseminate and utilize in ways that support strategic development of degree programs and online courses at USF Polytechnic.

(7) Indicate how students enrolled in these courses or programs access library/learning resources

Students access library resources through the USF Polytechnic website "Student Tools" webpage, the USF Polytechnic "Library" webpage, and/or through the "USF Libraries" link on the "myUSF/Blackboard" portal. Students also have online access to the State University Library System and the Florida Community College Libraries. Electronic reserves are available through "myUSF/Blackboard" on individual course class pages. Students can request books and journal articles using ILLIad, the interlibrary loan management system.

Students access additional learning resources through the "TLI" Teaching Learning Innovation and "Writing Center" links on the **USF Polytechnic Student Tools webpage [MD2, see link below]** as well as Blackboard technical support through the "myUSF/Blackboard" portal. Additional support is also available through the USF System Office of Information Technology phone and e-mail contacts for IT services.

Software tutorials, online tutoring and web-based writing support are available through the Learning Commons Online, as service of the USF Tutoring and Learning Services [MD3, see link below].

(8) Indicate how students enrolled in these courses or programs access student support services

Students access degree program information through e-mail or phone contact with the academic advisor. Registration and financial aid support services are accessed through the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid. Support for online technical and instructional resources is accessed through the "myUSF/Blackboard" portal, and through the USF Polytechnic Office of Teaching & Learning Innovation, a unit of Extended University.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

- [MD1] OASIS Schedule of Classes Off-Campus Fall 2011
- [MD2] USF Polytechnic "Student Tools" web page: http://www.poly.usf.edu/StudentTools.html
- [MD3] USF Tutoring & Learning Services web page: http://guides.lib.usf.edu/learningcommons

Part A - Institutional Characteristics Enrollment Data (Fall 2011)

Please report enrollment for the *most recent fall term* in the following categories. Include all degree and non-degree students, wherever or however instruction takes place. Use the following Commission definitions in your computation:

A full-time undergraduate student is one who is enrolled for 12 or more credit hours. A full-time post-baccalaureate/graduate student is one who is enrolled for 9 or more credit hours.

<u>For-</u>	For-Credit, Full-Time Undergraduate and Post-Baccalaureate Students				
1.	Total <u>number</u> of full-time undergraduate students (those taking 12 or more credit hours):	466			
2.	Total <u>number</u> of full-time post-baccalaureate (master's or doctoral programs or other for-credit programs) students (those taking 9 or more credit hours):	27			
<u>For-</u>	Credit, Part-Time Undergraduate and Post-Baccalaureate Students				
3a.	Total <u>hours</u> of all undergraduate students carrying fewer than 12 credit hours (definition of part-time student):	4,038			
3b.	Divide the total hours in 3a by 12, rounding to the nearest whole number:	337			
4a.	Total <u>hours</u> of all post-baccalaureate students (master's or doctoral programs or other for-credit programs) carrying fewer than 9 credit hours (definition of part-time student):	852			
4b.	Divide total hours in 4a by 9, rounding to the nearest whole number:	95			
5.	Total of lines 1, 2, 3b, and 4b:	925			
<u>Non</u>	Non-Credit				
6a.	For <u>each</u> non-credit course offered in the <i>most recent fall term</i> , multiply the total number of contact hours for the course (as determined by your institution) by the total number of students enrolled in the course. Add resulting figures for all non-credit courses (See example below).	60,543			
6b.	Divide combined total in 6a by 168 if your institution is on a semester or trimester system (12 hours/week X 14 weeks), or by 120 if your institution is on a quarter system (12 hours/week X 10 weeks). Round the quotient to the nearest whole number:	360			
Tota	Total of items 5 and 6b:	1,285			

Data Source: USF INFOCENTER

Part A – Faculty Qualifications

List the qualifications of all faculty employed during the most recent spring term and the most recent fall term. Qualifications should relate directly to the content of courses assigned.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[FQ1] Faculty Roster Spring 2010[FQ2] Faculty Roster Fall 2010[FQ3] Faculty Roster Spring 2011[FQ4] Faculty Roster Fall 2011

Part A - Institutional Characteristics Library/Learning Resources

LIBRARY/LEARNING RESOURCES

1. SPACE USAGE

Describe the Library/Learning Resources physical facilities and, of the total, indicate the amount of space devoted to each of the following:

The library/learning resources facilities on the USF Polytechnic campus are located on the first floor of the Lakeland Technology Building (LTB) in a shared space which houses the **USF Polytechnic Library [LLR1, see link below]** and the Open Use Computer Lab supported by the staff of the USFP Information Technology Services (ITS). Students have access to the library and open use lab, and faculty, students and staff have access to the library's collections and learning resources. The shared space houses the Library's offices, stacks, collections and study spaces as well as the Open Use Computer Lab managed by the ITS staff. The front desk is shared by both the Library and ITS to provide services and support to students. Each unit maintains one employee at the front desk. The square footage below includes the space allocation for the entire shared room:

a. Stack areas for shelving volumes only	326 sq. ft. (1,281 linear ft.)
Total Stac	ks = 475 sq. ft. (1,383 linear ft.)
b. Seating capacity	897 sq. ft.
c. Staff offices and work areas	992 sq. ft
d. Other areas (e.g. media productions, learning labs, and listening rooms)	952 sq. ft
e. Total square feet allocated to library functions	3,729 sq. ft.

A larger space, based on the Learning Commons model, is envisioned for the new USF Polytechnic campus site on Interstate 4. The Learning Commons will be a dynamic, user-driven and collaborative space where the users – students, faculty and staff – will find the assistance and technology needed for the production of the desired product (e.g., paper, presentation, study time). Users will easily find assistance from different units (e.g., library, information technology services, writing center, tutoring center) for accessing, gathering, evaluating, organizing and using information to produce a knowledge-based or research-based object. The Learning Commons will be developed in two stages, a temporary building with a projected square footage of approximately 12,000 sq. ft. and a final permanent building, the specific size of which is as yet unspecified.

2. LIBRARY STAFF

Library Staff	Full- time	Part- time	Qualifications
1. Librarians	3	0	MLIS degrees from ALA-accredited programs
2. Other professional staff on the library budget (media specialists, subject bibliographers, etc.)	0	0	
3. Para-professional staff (Undergraduate degree in library science)	1	0	
4. Support staff (technical, clerical) - student assistance	0	3	

Three full-time librarians provide library instruction and research assistance to students, faculty and staff at USF Polytechnic. The librarians also perform library collection development activities for the campus. The Director of the USFP Library reports directly to the Dean of the USF Libraries with a dotted-line report to the Regional Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, at USF Polytechnic.

The USFP librarians hold master's degrees in library and information science from programs accredited by the American Library Association (ALA). The USFP librarians participate with other USF Libraries' librarians in professional development workshops and training sessions, as well as overall discussions regarding development of the USF Libraries collections.

1. Number of hours of student assistance by students employed on an hourly basis charged to the library budget

Two (2) student assistants work approximately 20 hours/week each, or approximately 2080 hours over three semesters.

2. Number of hours of student assistance by students employed on an hourly basis charged to budgets other than the library

One (1) Federal Work Study student works approximately 10 hours/week, or approximately 360 hours over two semesters.

3. LIBRARY MATERIALS

<u>Directions:</u> For each of the library material descriptions listed below, please provide the following information:

- a. Number held 2 years ago
- b. Number held at the end of previous year
- c. Number added this fiscal year
- d. Number withdrawn this fiscal year
- e. Number held at the end of this fiscal year
- A. Bound volumes (exclude bound periodicals and microfilms)
- B. Paid current periodical subscriptions
- C. Free current periodical subscriptions
- D. Current newspaper subscriptions
- E. Current serial subscriptions (include annual proceedings, etc.)
- F. Separate government documents
- G. Other

The figures that follow refer to print holdings for the USF Polytechnic Library. These figures were derived from reports provided by library online catalog systems maintained by the Florida Consortium for Library Automation (FCLA). The figures for the electronic resources were provided by the Academic Resources unit of the USF Tampa Library.

	2007-2008	2008-2009	Added	Withdrawn	Held at end of FY09-10
A) Bound volumes	5,339	5,766	563	31	6,298
 B) Paid current periodicals 	98	98	2	5	95
C) Free current periodicals	7	6	0	0	
D) Current newspapers subscriptions	2	2	0	0	2
E) Current serials subscriptions	23	26	1	0	27
F) Separate government documents			Included in A-E		
G) Other electronic documents					
Number of e- journals purchased	25,156	51,396	827	0	52,223
Cost of e-journals	\$2,618,959	\$2,701,383	n/a	n/a	\$2,929,369
Number of electronic reference resources (including databases)	736	787	20	0	807
Cost of electronic reference resources	\$1,713,007	\$1,206,236	n/a	n/a	\$1,225,509
Number of e-books	256,306	281,927	161,262	0	443,189
Cost of e-books	\$285,315	\$328,731	n/a	n/a	\$582,712
Number of business datasets	20	21	1	0	22
Cost of business datasets	\$171,903	\$143,663	n/a	n/a	\$169,645

4. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

Describe all learning resources provided by electronic means.

The **USF Libraries [LLR2, see link below]** provide an extensive collection of online resources to which all USF Polytechnic students, faculty and staff have access. All USF libraries contribute financially to the funding of these resources based on a formula that allocates cost by academic programs delivered by each campus and student FTE. The resources include 51,396 journals acquired through subscriptions and database aggregators; over 780 databases that include significant reference resources; and over 281,000 e-books from the latest imprint to historical texts. Beginning in 2009, faculty and students gained online access to the entire publication output of Springer e-books with a substantial collection in Computer Science and Information Technology. The USF Libraries have recently acquired over twenty business datasets (e.g., COMPUTSTAT, CRSP, Audit Analytics) that are accessed through Wharton Research Data Services (WRDS) to facilitate research in business and the social sciences. Additional electronic collections include access to USF theses and dissertations, image and digitized collections, oral histories and multi-media resources. The USF Libraries is one of 19 libraries nationally that provide access to the University of Southern California Shoah Foundation Institute's Visual History Archive containing over 52,000 Holocaust testimonies.

The USF Libraries also hold membership in the Center for Research Libraries (CRL), providing students and faculty access to over four million rarely-held books, journals and other primary-source materials from all over the world. These resources are listed in the USF online catalog. USF Polytechnic students and faculty can search either the USF Libraries catalog or the CRL catalog and request materials through interlibrary loan.

To assist learners further, the USF Polytechnic Library uses social media tools (blog, Facebook, Twitter, FriendFeed, Flickr, Foursquare) for outreach and to communicate information. It also provides videocasts to demonstrate research techniques. Users also have access to the blogs, videocasts, podcasts and other online tools as prepared by the other USF libraries. Online research assistance is available via forms, e-mail or, with the collaboration of the USF libraries, online chat and text messaging.

Describe the computer resources dedicated to library/learning resources.

The application of innovative technology is foundational to USF Polytechnic's mission. Three units at USFP share responsibility for computer services that support library/learning resources:

- USFP Information Technology Services (ITS) [LLR3, see link below] provides and maintains the software and hardware for academic, administrative and office computing as well as the campus' computer networks and network security. ITS also provides the staff supporting the Open Use Computer Lab in the Library shared space and the campus IT Help Desk.
- **Classroom Technology and Media Services [LLR4, see link below]** provides AV-media technology, Instructional TV, webcasting and videoconferencing services. The unit also provides smart podium training and troubleshooting for the use of all campus classroom technology.
- **Teaching and Learning Innovation (TLI) [LLR5, see link below]** provides faculty training and support for the use of innovative instructional technologies and teaching pedagogies. Assistance is also provided for students and faculty with technology issues involving Blackboard,

Chalk & Wire and Elluminate, as well as most Windows-based application programs used for course activities or assessments.

At the USF Polytechnic Library, students have access to six (6) computer workstations. One workstation is also accessible to alumni and community users. One workstation serves as a microfilm/fiche reader/scanner station and also as a backup to the open access workstation. (23 other seats are available in the shared space; they are not computer workstations.) Inside the same room in the Open Use Lab, students have access to forty-one (41) workstations. One of these is a multimedia workstation with a color scanner and specialized image and video editing software. Some workstations also provide assistive software and hardware for students with disabilities. An instructor podium, equipped with a projector and similar to the smart podium found in campus classrooms, permits students to practice presentations. Students have access to two printers and a photocopier/scanner. A high-speed wireless network is available throughout the room to use with laptops and other handheld devices.

5. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

List cooperative agreements with other libraries and agencies.

For each agreement, provide a signed copy of the cooperative agreement which includes, but is not limited to, provision for student access, provision for review, provision for assistance to students, and provision for enhancing the collections.

For each cooperative agreement, describe how the resources of the other library or agency support specifically the programs offered by the institution.

Memorandum of Understanding with the USF Libraries

The USF System manages its libraries centrally through USF Tampa. A **USF Libraries and USF Polytechnic Library Memorandum of Understanding [LLR6]** details the relationship between the USF Libraries and the USF Polytechnic Library.

The services provided by the Tampa Library to USF Polytechnic include the following categories/subcategories:

- A. Recruitment and development of employees
- B. Information services
 - 1. Website administration (including the USF Libraries Intranet)
 - 2. Online reference assistance
- C. Collection services
 - a. Cataloging
 - b. Acquisitions
 - c. Serials management
 - d. Electronic collections management
 - e. Fiscal processes
 - f. Budget-tracking and reporting
 - g. Miscellaneous services

USF Polytechnic students, faculty, and staff are eligible to access the electronic collections shared among the members of the USF Library System and maintained by Tampa Library personnel. Costs associated with access to these collections are calculated annually using a formula accepted by all parties.

USF Polytechnic is responsible for adequately funding the terms of the agreement and all library collections and services needed to support their academic programs and to meet accreditation goals, including all services outsourced to the Tampa Library.

Other agreements and cooperative arrangements

USF Polytechnic students and faculty benefit from agreements, memberships in cooperative consortia and cooperative agreements established by the USF Libraries to extend access to important research collections beyond the USF Libraries. For example, through the USF Libraries, faculty and students of USF Polytechnic obtain access to state-funded resources accessed by an online catalog created by the Florida Library Center for Automation (FCLA).

As a member of the State University System of Florida, the USF Libraries are signatories to and active participants in the **State University System of Florida and the Community College System of Florida Library Borrowing Privileges Agreement (1998)** [LLR7], which guarantees that current USF Polytechnic students, faculty and staff have borrowing privileges at other state university and community college libraries. The relationship with FCLA ensures that USF Polytechnic students and faculty have access to state-provided resources, such as online databases, e-journals and e-books. In addition, USF Polytechnic students and faculty have access to library holdings worldwide through a comprehensive interlibrary loan network. USF Polytechnic has an active, individual membership in the OCLC Bibliographic Network [LLR8, see link below] for interlibrary loan purposes [LLR9, OCLC Resource Sharing Terms]. Other collaborative bibliographic networks in which USF Polytechnic maintains membership for interlibrary loan purposes include the Tampa Bay Library Cooperative (TBLC), the Florida Library Information Network (FLIN), SOLINET and Libraries Very Interested in Sharing (LVIS).

6. ANALYSIS OF LIBRARY RESOURCES

<u>Directions:</u> The two columns "percent of total collection" and "percent of total acquisitions" refer to the number of bound volumes - excluding bound periodicals and microfilms.

Area	L.C. Classification	% of Total Collection	% of Total Acquisitions FY09-10
Humanities & General Works	A, B, M, N, P, Z	26.08%	18.82%
Social Sciences	C, D, E, F, G, H, J, K, L	57.09%	52.04%
Physical Sciences, including Mathematics	Q - QE	6.55%	12.25%
Biomedical Sciences	QH - QR, R, S	4.03%	6.21%
Technology (Engineering)	T, U, V	6.22%	10.65%
Unclassified materials		0%	0%

USF Polytechnic Library Resources as of June 30, 2010

Assessment of Student Satisfaction with Learning Resources and Services

The **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** Graduating Student Survey indicates that students are for the most part satisfied to highly satisfied with learning resources and services provided by the Library and computer services that support library functions. Survey data are provided in the following table.

	Highly Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Highly Satisfied		Not Applicable	
	2009-	2010-	2009-	2010-	2009-	2010-	2009-	2010-	2009-	2010-
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Library	1%	2%	3%	6%	41%	35%	39%	45%	16%	9%
Library Electronic	1%	0	6%	6%	37%	43%	41%	44%	16%	5%
Resources										
Open Use	1%	2%	4%	1%	34%	36%	36%	44%	24%	13%
Computer Lab										
Classroom	2%	2%	3%	6%	49%	51%	41%	35%	7%	5%
Technology										

2009-2010 and 2010-2011 Graduating Student Survey

The **2009-2010 Client Survey** indicates that faculty and staff are also for the most part satisfied to highly satisfied with learning resources and services provided by the Library and computer services that support library functions. Survey data are provided in the following table.

	Highly	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly	Not
	Dissatisfied			Satisfied	Applicable
Print Collections	0%	8%	32%	26%	34%
Electronic Collections	0%	6%	20%	48%	26%
Library instruction & information	0%	2%	29%	45%	24%
literacy					
Reference & research assistance	0%	2%	29%	45%	24%
Circulation/reserves services	0%	2%	26%	43%	29%
Inter-library loan	0%	4%	24%	40%	32%
Facilities, physical space	0%	12%	44%	24%	20%

2009-2010 Client/Faculty & Staff Survey

The 2010-2011 Client/Faculty & Staff Survey analysis and dissemination of report are in process by the USF Polytechnic Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[LLR1] USF Polytechnic Library website: http://poly.usf.edu/Offices/Library.html

[LLR2] USF Libraries website: http://www.lib.usf.edu/

[LLR3] USFP Information Technology Services (ITS) website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/x898.xml

[LLR4] USFP Classroom Technology and Media Services website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/x904.xml

[LLR5] Teaching and Learning Innovation (TLI) website http://www.poly.usf.edu/x910.xml
[LLR6] USF Libraries and USF Polytechnic Library Memorandum of Understanding
[LLR7] Florida Library Center for Automation - Reciprocal Borrowing Agreement
[LLR8] OCLC Bibliographic Network website http://www.oclc.org/us/en/default.htm

[LLR9] OCLC Resource Sharing Terms

Part A - Institutional Characteristics Financial Resources

Date Fiscal Year Ends: June 30, 2010

Please refer to <u>College and University Business Administration</u>, current edition* for definitions of the categories used in this section. <u>Audits of Colleges and Universities</u> and <u>Audits of Not-For-Profit</u> <u>Organizations</u>, published by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, may also be referred to as a supplemental source of definitions.

*Available from:	National Association of College and University Business Officers
	One Dupont Circle, N.W.
	Washington, DC 20036

The following financial audits are provided as the data source for the information required for the supplementary schedules:

[FR1] University of South Florida Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008 [FR2] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009 [FR4] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010

The USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011 is in the process of being completed by the State Auditors, USF System Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance, and the USF Polytechnic Executive Director for Administration and Finance. Completion is expected end of January 2012.

1. Provide, with appropriate detail for the past three years, the following applicable supplementary schedules:

A. Summary of investments, with breakdown of unrestricted, temporarily restricted, and permanently restricted;

On p. 19 of the USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010 [FR4], Item 3 INVESTMENTS indicates that

Section 1011.42(5), Florida Statutes, authorizes universities to invest funds with the State Treasury and State Board of Administration, and requires that universities comply with the statutory requirements governing investment of public funds by local governments. Accordingly, universities are subject to the requirements of Chapter 218, Part IV, Florida Statutes. The University's Board of Trustees has adopted a written investment policy providing that surplus funds of the University shall be invested in those institutions and instruments permitted under the provisions of Florida Statutes. Pursuant to Section 218.415(16), Florida Statutes, the Regional Campus is authorized to invest in the Local Government Surplus Funds Trust Fund investment pool administered by the State Board of Administration; interest-

bearing time deposits and savings accounts in qualified public depositories, as defined in Section 280.02, Florida Statutes; direct obligations of the United States Treasury; obligations of Federal agencies and instrumentalities; securities of, or interests in, certain open-end or closed-end management type investment companies; Securities and Exchange Commission registered money market funds with the highest credit quality rating from a nationally recognized rating agency; and other investments approved by the University's Board of Trustees as authorized by law. During fiscal year 2009-2010, The University Board of Trustees Investment Committee authorized the University to invest in Hedge Funds, a new class of assets. Investments set aside purchase or construct capital assets are classified as restricted.

The Regional Campus's investments at June 30, 2010, are reported at fair value, as follows:

Investment Type	Amount
Bond Index Mutual Fund	\$ 10,534,336
Hedge Funds	720,398
Equity Mutual Fund	160,113
Money Market Mutual Funds	671,332
Total Regional Campus Investments	\$ 12,086,179

The Regional Campus's investments consisted of various bond, foreign equity, and money market mutual funds, and hedge funds. The investment policy allows investments in pooled funds that are professionally managed and registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission, fixed-income investments, and hedge funds. The USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010 (p. 31) reports investment income of \$246,789.

The USF System Board of Trustees has adopted a **USF Investment Policy 06-001 [FR3]** which states the responsibilities of the parties involved in carrying out the investment program to structure and manage investment portfolios, to evaluate returns and risk, and to report investment performance, all as appropriate to their funds.

The USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010 identifies on pp. 20-21 the following **types of risks** that apply to the Regional Campus's investments:

Interest Rate: Interest rate risk is the risk that changes in interest rates will adversely affect the fair value of an investment. The investment policy limits the fixed-income portfolio (United States Treasury securities, United States government agency obligations, mortgage-based securities, corporate debt, State, and municipal securities investments) to a weighted-average duration of less than five years. The investment policy provides for interest risk. The risk varies depending on the type of investment.

Credit Risk: Credit risk is the risk that an insurer or other counterparty to an investment will not fulfill its obligations. The investment policy provides for credit rate risk. The risk varies depending on the type of investment.

The following interest rate and credit risks apply to the Regional Campus's investments in bond and money market mutual funds, and hedge funds, at June 30, 2010:

Investme	nt Type	Weighted or Effective Average Maturities	Credit Quality Rating	Fair Value
Hedge Fu	ex Mutual Funds nds larket Mutual Fund	2.737 Years (1) (2) 54 Days (3)	Not Rated Not Rated Not Rated	\$ 10,534,336 720,398 671,332 \$ 11,926,066
Notes:	(1) Weighted-av (2) Information (3) Effective ave	not available		

Concentration of Credit Risk: Concentration of credit risk is the risk of loss attributed to the magnitude of the Regional Campus's investment in a single issuer. The investment policy provides that the maximum amount that may be invested in the securities of an individual issuer not backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government shall not exceed five percent (5%) of the market value of the assets of the investment portfolio, and no single corporate bond issuer shall exceed five percent (5%) of the market value of the investment portfolio. Direct investments in securities of the United States Government agencies and State of Florida Investment Pools, or Pooled Funds comprised solely of United States Government Securities are not subject to these restrictions.

B. Summary of property, plant, and equipment;

The USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010 identifies on p. 19 the following information on capital assets as of June 30, 2010:

Regional Campus capital assets consist of land; construction in progress; buildings; infrastructure and other improvements; furniture and equipment; library resources; and other capital assets. These assets are capitalized and recorded at cost at the date of acquisition or at estimated fair value at the date received in the case of gifts and purchases of State surplus property. Additions, improvements, and other outlays that significantly extend the useful life of an asset are capitalized. Other costs incurred for repairs and maintenance are expensed as incurred. The Regional Campus has a capitalization threshold of \$1,000 for tangible personal property and \$100,000 for buildings and other improvements. Depreciation is computed on the straight-line basis over the following estimated useful lives:

- □ Buildings 25 to 40 years, depending on construction
- □ Infrastructure and Other Improvements 20 years
- □ Furniture and Equipment 5 to 15 years
- □ Library Resources 10 years
- □ Other Capital Assets 5 to 20 years

Capital assets activity (p. 22) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010, is shown below:

Description	Beginning Balance	Additions	F	eductions	En	ding Balance
Nondepreciable Capital Assets:						
Land	\$ 17,910,000				\$	17,910,000
Construction in Progress	 3, 847,865	1,942,718		56,876		5,733,707
Total Nondepreciable Capital Assets	\$ 21,757,865	\$ 1,942,718	\$	56,876	\$	23,643,707
Depreciable Capital Assets:						
Buildings	\$ 11,886,075	56,876				11,942,951
Infrastructure and Other Improvements	34,920					34,920
Furniture and Equipment	3,470,635	350,978		99,909		3,721,704
Library Resources	62,885	7,824		35,385		35,324
Other Capital Assets	380,195	65,989		12,367		433,817
Total Depreciable Capital Assets	\$ 15,834,710	\$ 481,667	\$	147,661	\$	16,168,716
Less, Accumulated Depreciation:						
Buildings	984,100	305,739				1,289,839
Infrastructure and Other Improvements	4,074	1,746				5,820
Furniture and Equipment	2,024,032	368,828		57,394		2,335,466
Library Resources	18,952	3,353		14,079		8,226
Other Capital Assets	240,798	39,216		5,655		274,359
Total Accumulated Depreciation	\$ 3,271,956	\$ 718,882	\$	77,128	\$	3,913,710
Total Depreciable Capital Assets, Net	\$ 12,562,754	\$ (237,215)	\$	70,533	\$	12,255,006

C. Schedule of long-term debt, including terms and interest rates;

The USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010 indicates on p. 23 that longterm liabilities of the Regional Campus at June 30, 2010, include Federal advance payable, compensated absences payable, and postemployment benefits payable. Long-term liabilities activity for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010 are shown below:

Description	Beginning Balance	A	dditions	R	eductions	Ending Balance	Current Portion
Bonds Payable (1)	\$ 487,457				\$ 487,457		
Federal Advance Payable	124,384				28,191	96,193	
Compensate Absences Payable	648,830		131,741		1,286	779,285	63,943
Other Postemployment Benefits Payable	143,319		224,031		58,600	308,750	
Total Long-term Liabilities	\$ 1,403,990	\$	355,772	\$	575,534	\$ 1,184,228	\$ 63,943

Note: (1) The University recorded an adjustment to beginning net assets to correct an error in reporting bonds and revenue certificates payable for State University System Capital Improvement Trust Fund Revenue Bonds.

Federal Advance Payable represents the Regional Campus's liability for the Federal Capital Contribution (advance) provided to fund the University's Federal Perkins Loan program. This amount will ultimately be returned to the Federal government should the Regional Campus cease making Federal Perkins Loans or have excess cash in the loan program.

Compensated Absences Payable. Employees earn the right to be compensated during absences for annual leave (vacation) and sick leave earned pursuant to Board of Governors regulations, University regulations, and bargaining agreements. Leave earned is accrued to the credit of the employee and records are kept on each employee's unpaid (unused) leave balance. The Regional Campus reports a liability for the accrued leave; however, State appropriations fund only the portion of accrued leave that is used or paid in the current fiscal year. Although the Regional Campus expects the liability to be funded primarily from future appropriations, generally accepted accounting principles do not permit the recording of a receivable in anticipation of future appropriations. At June 30, 2010, the estimated liability for compensated absences, which includes the Regional Campus's share of the Florida Retirement System and FICA contributions, totaled \$779,285. The current portion of the current liability reported by the University.

Other Postemployment Benefits Payable. The University follows Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement No. 45, *Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions*, for certain postemployment healthcare benefits provided by the State Group Health Insurance Program.

Plan Description: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 112.0801, Florida Statutes, all employees who retire from the Regional Campus, are eligible to participate in the State Group Health Insurance Program, an agent multiple-employer defined-benefit plan (Plan). The Regional Campus subsidizes the premium rates paid by retirees by allowing them to participate in the Plan at reduced or blended group (implicitly subsidized) premium rates for both active and retired employees. These rates provide an implicit subsidy for retirees because, on an actuarial basis, their current and future claims are expected to result in higher costs to the plan on average than those of active employees. Retirees are required to enroll in the Federal Medicare program for their primary coverage as soon as they are eligible. A standalone report is not issued and the Plan information is not included in the report of a public employee retirement system or another entity.

- D. Schedule of short-term debt, including terms and interest rates; <u>Not Applicable</u>
- E. Schedule of disbursements and/or dividends to stockholders or owners; <u>Not Applicable</u>
- F. A list of the names of the principal stockholders. <u>Not Applicable</u>

REVENUES BY SOURCE FOR PAST THREE YEARS

Source of Funds	Line	2007-2008 Amount [%]*	2008-2009 Amount [%]*	2009-2010 Amount [%]*
Tuition and Fees	1	\$2,738,903 [20.4%]	\$3,894,542 [25.9%]	\$4,421,562 [22.1%]
Government Appropriati	ons**			
Federal (Financial Aid)	2	\$	\$1,589,284 [10.5%]	\$1,979,830 [9.9%]
State	3	\$10,276,671 [76.7%]	\$8,620,957 [57.2%]	\$12,995,407 [65.0%]
Local	4	\$	\$	\$
Government Grants & Co	ontracts**			
Federal unrestricted	5	\$	\$	\$
Federal restricted	6	\$	\$538,589 [3.6%]	\$323,952 [1.6%]
State unrestricted	7	\$	\$41,333 [0.3%]	\$13,931 [0.1%]
State restricted	8	\$	\$	\$
Local unrestricted	9	\$	\$	\$
Local restricted	10	\$	\$	\$
Private Gifts, Grants and	Contracts**			
Unrestricted	11	\$	\$	\$
Restricted	12	\$	\$221,320 [1.5%]	\$18,152 [0.1%]
Endowment Income**				
Unrestricted	13	\$	\$	\$
Restricted	14	\$	\$	\$
Sales and Services**				
Educational Activities	15	\$	\$	\$
Auxiliary Enterprises	16	\$386,768 [2.9%]	\$37,688 [0.3%]	\$23,753 [0.1%]
Hospitals***	17	\$	\$	\$
Borrowed Funds	18	\$	\$	\$
Other Sources**	19	\$	\$121,192 [0.8%]	\$204,999 [1.0%]
Independent Operations	20	\$	\$	\$
TOTAL (sum of lines 1-2	0)	\$13,402,342 [100%]	\$15,064,905 [100%]	\$19,981,586 [100%]

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 48

EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS FOR PAST THREE YEARS

Function of Expenditures	Line	2007-2008(1) Amount [%]*	2008-2009 Amount [%]*	2009-2010 Amount [%]*
Education & General				
Instruction	1	\$5,302,221 [39.6%]	\$4,896,364 [32.5%]	\$6,679,743 [33.4%]
Research	2	\$	\$551,913 [3.7%]	\$346,077 [1.7%]
Public Service	3	\$	\$	\$
Academic Support	4	\$1,892,956 [14.1%]	\$1,815,798 [12.1%]	\$1,885,622 [9.4%]
Libraries	5	\$	\$	\$
Student Services	6	\$1,141,341 [8.5%]	\$1,213,295 [8.1%]	\$1,232,881 [6.2%]
Institutional Support	7	\$3,680,876 [27.5%]	\$3,360,136 [22.3%]	\$3,334,108 [16.7%]
Operation & Maintenance	8	\$210,359 [1.6%]	\$201,254 [1.3%]	\$243,770 [1.2%]
Scholarships & Fellowships				
From unrestricted funds	9	\$	\$1,338,218 [8.9%]	\$1,495,588 [7.5%]
From restricted funds	10	\$	\$	\$
Mandatory Transfers	11	\$	\$	\$
Non-mandatory Transfers	12	\$	\$	\$
Total Education & General Expenditures & Transfers (sum of lines 1 - 12)	13	\$12,227,753 [91.2%]	\$13,376,978 [88.8%]	\$15,217,789 [76.2%]
Auxiliary Enterprises				
Mandatory transfers	14	\$2,240 [0.0%]	\$6,939 [0.0%]	\$8,916 [0.0%]
Non-mandatory transfers	15	\$	\$	\$
Hospitals				
Mandatory transfers	16	\$	\$	\$
Non-mandatory transfers	17	\$	\$	\$
Independent Operations				
Mandatory transfers	18	\$	\$	\$
Non-mandatory transfers	19	\$	\$	\$
Other (specify) (2)	20	\$	\$12,269 [0.1%]	\$21,169 [0.1%]
TOTAL Expenditures & Trans (sum of lines 13-20)		\$12,229,993 [91.3%]	\$13,396,186 [88.9%]	\$15,247,874 [76.3%]

(1)FY2007-2008 USF Polytechnic is included in the USF System Financial Audit. Reported amounts are based on FAST financial system queries, excluding contracts and grants, interests and financial aid.

*Percentage of total current funds revenues within same FY reporting period.

**Excludes appropriations, gifts, endowment, sales and services for hospitals (not medical schools)

***Amounts relating to hospitals only. Medical school revenues should be reported on lines 2 through14, as appropriate (2)FY2008-2009 Expenditure-Loan Operations, USF Polytechnic Financial Audit, p. 28 Functional Classification Schedule

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

- [FR1] University of South Florida Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008
- [FR2] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009
- [FR3] USF Board of Trustees USF System Investment Policy
- [FR4] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010

Part A - Institutional Characteristics Physical Resources

List (for each campus location) all existing buildings used for instruction, housing, and student activities and all buildings under construction (indicate date of completion of construction in parenthesis). Do not list homes used exclusively for faculty or administrative residences. (If a building is used as a residence hall, indicate student housing capacity for each building.) List according to sites or campuses. Comment on the quality of each building, considering the following conditions:

1. General adequacy - Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor

2. Size – Gross square feet

3. Fireproof quality – Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

4. Present state of repair/construction – Satisfactory, Under repair, Under Renovation

USF Polytechnic-Polk State College Joint-Use Campus										
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction				
Lakeland Academic Center	LAC	1	Good	25,336	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Lakeland Learning Center	LLC	2	Good	28,728	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Lakeland Technology Building	LTB	3	Excellent	53,978	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Modular Building A	LMA	4	Good	2,204	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Modular Building B	LMB	5	Good	2,204	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Modular Building C	LMC	6	Good	2,149	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Modular Building D	LMD	7	Good	2,204	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
	1			pplied Learnin	ng Labs	-				
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction				
Blue Sky East Business Incubator & Applied Learning Lab	BSE	8	Good	7,160	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				
Blue Sky West Business Incubator & Applied Learning Lab	BSW	9	Good	6,428	Satisfactory	Satisfactory				

Research Lab(s)						
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction
BecKryger Properties Research	BPR	10	Good	13,139	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
	South Florida Community College					
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction
University Center, Room 108	UC	11	Good	899	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
University Center, Room 109	UC	11	Good	905	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
University Center, Room 204	UC	11	Good	835	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
University Center, Room 209	UC	11	Good	1,048	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Citrus High School						
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction
Citrus High School, Room 543	CHS	12	Fair	1,176	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Current On-Campus Facilities

USF Polytechnic currently shares a joint-use campus with Polk State College, the primary owner of the site and facilities. USF Polytechnic has space allocated in seven (7) on-campus facilities: the Lakeland Academic Center (LAC), the Lakeland Learning Center (LLC), the Lakeland Technology Building (LTB), and four modular buildings (LMA-LMD). On-campus facilities have wireless technology throughout the campus, including outdoor public spaces, and instructional spaces have advanced technology (e.g., SmartPodium, projection and recording capabilities) with several capable of accommodating distance learning (e.g., videoconference and studio classrooms).

Polk State College is responsible for the maintenance and security of all facilities on the campus. USF Polytechnic's Regional Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning and Facilities Operations, as well as the Facilities Manager, meets with Polk State College's Facilities Department monthly to review Polk State College's plans for construction, maintenance or repair and potential impact on USF Polytechnic's programs, services, personnel, activities and events.

Security Officers are employed by Polk State College. They are on duty 24 hours-a-day, 7 days a week. Security Officers perform primarily information and advisory duties, rather than regulatory duties. They patrol and monitor activity throughout the campus and coordinate with PSC and USFP facilities staff for inspection and maintenance of locks, doors, lights and alarms.

On-campus food service is provided by Polk State College. Currently, a modular building houses this service while the cafeteria undergoes renovation that will provide enhanced interior seating and a pleasant outdoor dining and social area. The interior courtyards and exterior spaces on the campus provide places for passive and active event and recreational use. Landscaping, lighting, shade features and seating spaces provide many opportunities for individual quiet space and informal gatherings. Four parking lots provide adequate spaces for day-to-day and event parking. Physical facilities meet ADA minimum requirements for accessibility by the physically challenged.

With the new faculty and staff hires completed for the 2010-2011 academic year, planning for reassignment of office/unit space is underway. It is anticipated that off-campus office space will be needed so that on-campus instructional space can be maximized while we are in transition through construction of the new campus site.

Current Off-Campus Facilities

Two off-campus sites provide instructional space. The University Center at the South Florida Community College enables USF Polytechnic to provide access to baccalaureate degrees to students in Avon Park and surrounding municipalities in Highlands County through the Statewide Articulation Agreement. USF Polytechnic offers the B.S. in Elementary Education, the M.A. in Reading Education and the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership. In collaboration with SFCC four classrooms have been outfitted with the same instructional technology that faculty and students use on the USF Polytechnic campus, including wireless technology SmartPodiums and videoconferencing capabilities. The Citrus County School District began a partnership with USF Polytechnic in 2005 when they were seeking opportunity for building the leadership capacity of the district through the master's degree. When other Florida public and private institutions turned them down, USF Polytechnic responded to their needs, offering the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership in a cohort model. Classes meet in all-day Saturday sessions in a regular classroom at Citrus High School which is equipped with wireless capability and presentation/audiovisual hardware.

Three additional off-campus sites provide space for faculty and staff. The **BlueSky East and West Business Incubators and Applied Learning Labs** house the offices of the BlueSky Director and staff; the leased offices of the BlueSky tenants; and seminar/conference room meeting space. The BecKryger Properties Research Lab is under development with occupancy expected in October 2010. The facility will house the research labs of the Dean of Technology and Innovation and staff. Research on nutrition, food science, technology and safety will be the focus of the labs.

Campus Master Plan

In August, 2003, the USF Lakeland Campus Board accepted the Williams Company proposal for development of a new campus site at the intersection of Interstate 4 and the eastern terminus of the Polk Parkway. The proposal included a donation of a 530+ acre site, a large, open, natural landscape. The **USF Lakeland Final Campus Master Plan (August 2006) [PR1]** provided a structure for initial construction on the I-4 new campus site of a comprehensive regional campus of the University of South Florida.

This **Master Plan Update, completed in October 2009 [PR2]**, is a revision of the USF Lakeland Final Campus Master Plan, and provides a framework of goals, objectives and policies that will guide development of the USF Polytechnic Campus 2010-2020 as a unique "bioscape," designed by world-renowned architect, Dr. Santiago Calatrava. The campus will emerge as an unprecedented synthesis of architecture, design, engineering, agriculture and sustainability – a living example of the research, academic and social missions of USF Polytechnic. Several key revisions in the Master Plan Update included:

• Emphasis on the polytechnic model of an applied learning-centered campus environment, including interactive, problem- and solution-based learning and applications of innovative

research and technology; multi-disciplinary thinking; dynamic learning communities and collaborative learning labs; graduated field experiences and professional internships.

- Establishment of interdisciplinary colleges and a vision of building program planning that will enhance connectivity and collaboration, challenging traditional models of colleges and academic divisions as disciplinary silos.
- Growth toward a four-year, residential destination campus, offering baccalaureate and master's degrees.
- Re-framing the positioning of structures on the campus to establish a central axis within a large, open natural landscape and design of a large central body of water or lake, creating an axial core of the campus as well as opportunity for storm water treatment and conveyance and capacity for site irrigation.
- A phased plan for development of future buildings and their relationship to each other, as well as to visual axes, internal open spaces, pedestrian walkways and paths (e.g., residence halls, a recreation and wellness center, a research and innovation incubator, campus perimeter parking).

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[PR1] USF Lakeland Final Campus Master Plan (August, 2006)

[PR2] USF Polytechnic Master Plan Update (October, 2009)

USF POLYTECHNIC PART B. DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE Core Requirements

Adobe Acrobat Reader may be required to view supporting documents.



Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.1: Degree-granting Authority

The institution has degree-granting authority from the appropriate government agency or agencies.

Compliance Partial Compliance Non-compliance

<u>MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED</u>: A copy of the charter or letter of authorization from the appropriate agency/organization indicating that the institution may award degrees and specifying which degrees may be awarded.

Article IX, Section 7, subsection (d) of the Constitution of the State of Florida [CR2.1-1] establishes a statewide Board of Governors to operate, regulate, control and be fully responsible for the management of the State University System. These responsibilities include, but are not limited to, defining the distinctive mission of each constituent university and its articulation with free public schools and community colleges, ensuring the well-planned coordination and operation of the system, and avoiding wasteful duplication of facilities or programs. Article IX, Section 7, subsection (c) establishes that each local constituent university will be administered by a board of trustees.

Florida Statute 1001.74 (1)(a) [CR2.1-2] provides that the Board of Governors establishes the powers and duties of the university boards of trustees. Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 University Board of Trustees Powers and Duties, Section (4)(a)(1) [CR2.1-3] delegates to the Board of Trustees authority to adopt university regulations or policies, as appropriate, in Academic Programs and Student Affairs, including, but not limited to "authorization and discontinuance of degree programs." BOG Regulation 1.001, Section (2)(c) establishes that the university president serves as the chief executive officer and corporate secretary of the board of trustees and is "responsible to the board of trustees for all operations of the university," which includes conferral of degrees.

In a **Memorandum of Delegation, November 9, 2010 [CR2.1-4]**, the USF System President confirmed that the Vice President and CEO of USF Polytechnic would henceforth hold the title of Regional Chancellor of the University of South Florida, and delegated to the Regional Chancellor the authority and accountability to award degrees earned at USF Polytechnic. USF Polytechnic offers eleven (11) baccalaureate degrees and five (5) master's degrees in the Colleges of Technology and Innovation, and Human and Social Sciences as listed in the inventory of **USF System Academic Degree Programs Inventory August 2011 [CR2.1-5]**. Following are the degrees offered by USF Polytechnic:

Degree Program	Number of Semester Credit Hours Required					
Undergraduate Degrees						
Applied Science, B.S.	120					
Criminology, B.A.	120					
Elementary Education, B.S.	120					
General Business Administration, B.S./B.A.	120					
General Studies, B.G.S.	120					
Industrial Engineering, B.S.	128					
Information Technology, B.S.	120					
Interdisciplinary Social Science, B.A.	120					

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 56

Psychology, B.A.	120				
Graduate Degrees					
Counselor Education, M.A.	60-63				
Educational Leadership, M.Ed.	36				
Reading Education, M.A.	36				
Master of Business Administration, M.B.A.	37-48				
Information Technology, M.S.	36				

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.1-1] Article IX, Section 7, subsection (d) of the Constitution of the State of Florida

[CR2.1-2] Florida Statute 1001.74 (1)(a) University Board of Trustees Powers and Duties

[CR2.1-3] Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 University Board of Trustees Powers and Duties, Section (4)(a)(1)

[CR2.1-4] Delegation of Authority to the USF Polytechnic Regional Chancellor

[CR2.1-5] USF System Academic Degree Programs Inventory August 2011

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.2: Governing Board

The institution has a governing board of at least five members that is the legal body with specific authority over the institution. The board is an active policy-making body for the institution and is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are adequate to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it. Both the presiding officer and a majority of other voting members of the board are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution.

Compliance

pliance 🛛 🗌 Partial Compliance

Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. A list of board members including the following:

(a) their names, addresses, places of employment, term (s) of office and compensation (if any) for board service

(b) designation of which board members, if any, are employees of the institution

(c) designation of which board members have any contractual or personal or familial financial interest in the institution.

1	2	3	4	5
Name and Address of Board Member	Employment	Contractual, Employment, or Personal or Familial Financial Interest in the Institution	Year Term Expires	Group or person that appointed or approved the appointment of the Board Member
Matthew A. Diaz 4202 E. Fowler Avenue, Tampa, FL 33620	University of South Florida Student Body President	The Student Body President receives a salary from fees collected by the Student Government Association.	2012	Elected by the Student Body annually
Mr. Gene Engle ¹ 432 Eunice Road Lakeland, Florida 33803	Developer and Realtor	NA	2013	Board of Governors
Stephanie E. Goforth Gulfport, FL	Northern Trust	NA	2016	Board of Governors
Brian Lamb 201 E. Kennedy Blvd., Ste 2000 Tampa, Florida 33602	Fifth Third Bank	NA	2015	Board of Governors
Elizabeth Bird, Ph.D. 4202 E. Fowler Avenue,	University of South Florida System	Tenured faculty member and President, USF	2011	Elected by the members of the USF System

USF Board of Trustees

Tampa, FL 33620	Faculty Advisory Council President	System Faculty Advisory Council		Faculty Advisory Council
Rhea F. Law, Esq. 501 E. Kennedy Boulevard, Suite 1700 Tampa, Florida 33602	Fowler White Boggs	NA	2013	Governor
Stephen J. Mitchell, Esq. Tampa, FL	Squire Sanders	NA	2016	Governor
Harold W. Mullis, Jr., Esq., VICE-CHAIR 101 E. Kennedy Blvd. Suite 2700 Tampa, Florida 33602	Trenam, Kemker	NA	2015	Board of Governors
John B. Ramil, CHAIR 702 N. Franklin Street Tampa, Florida 33602	TECO Energy, Inc.	NA	2016	Governor
Louis S. Saco, M.D. Lakeland, Fl	Watson Clinic	NA	2016	Board of Governors
Debbie N. Sembler 7741 Hunter Lane Pinellas Park, Florida 33782	NA	NA	2011	Governor
Byron Shinn 1001 3 rd . Ave. West. Suite 500 Bradenton, FL 34205	Shinn & Company, P.A.	NA	2015	Governor
Jordan Zimmerman 2200 W. Commercial Blvd., 3 rd floor Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33309	Zimmerman Advertising	Sponsor of the Zimmerman Advertising Program in the USF Tampa College of Business; provides internships for students and adjuncts for the program.	2015	Governor

¹ Mr. Engle is the Chair of the USF Polytechnic Campus Board

Brief biographies of the members of the USF System Board of Trustees [CR2.2-1] are provided in supporting documentation.

USF Polytechnic Campus Board

1	2	3	4	5
Name and Address of Board Member	Employment	Contractual, Employment, or Personal or Familial Financial Interest in the Institution	Year Term Expires	Group or person that appointed or approved the appointment of the Board Member
Michael E. Carter Lakeland, Fl 33803	NCT Group CPA's, L.L.P.	NA	2012	Board of Trustees

Gene Engle ¹ , CHAIR	Developer and	NA	2013	Board of Trustees
432 Eunice Road	Realtor			
Lakeland, Florida 33803				
Mark Kaylor	Kaylor & Kaylor, P.A.	NA	2013	Board of Trustees
525 Avenue G NW				
Winter Haven, FL 33881				
Ron Morrow	CSX	NA	2011	Board of Trustees
320 Niblick Circle				
Winter Haven, FL 33881				
Bonnie Parker	SunTrust Bank	NA	2014	Board of Trustees
Winter Haven, FL 33884				

¹ Mr. Engle is a member of the USF Board of Trustees

Brief biographies of the members of the USF Polytechnic Campus Board [CR2.2-2] are provided in supporting documentation.

2. A copy of the articles of incorporation (if applicable) and a copy of the bylaws.

Operating Procedures of the University of South Florida Board of Trustees [CR2.2-3] and **USF Polytechnic Campus Board Operating Procedures [CR2.2-4]** are provided in supporting documentation.

3. Board rules and policies.

USF System Policy 0-001 Issuance of Policies and Procedures in the USF System [CR2.2-5] establishes the process for development, review, revision and removal of USF System policies and procedures. The University of South Florida is composed of two SACS-accredited institutions located in Tampa and St. Petersburg, and two regional campuses located in Sarasota-Manatee and Lakeland. USF System policies and procedures apply to all separately accredited institutions and regional campuses in the USF System. The President of USF system has the authority and responsibility for establishing and implementing policies and procedures in accordance with the Board of Trustees Governance Policy (07-001) referenced below and as provided by the Board of Governors. The proposed new, revised or repealed policy and explanation is forwarded to the Office of the General Counsel by the appropriate Vice President, USF system official or designee. The policy then begins a six week review and comment period by the following USF system groups: President's staff, President's Executive Management Council, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Student Government, Council of Deans, Academic Chairs, Administration Council, Staff Senate, Regional Chancellors and Collective Bargaining Officers. Comments received after the six week review period are forwarded to the President and appropriate Vice President for consideration. If necessary, appropriate changes are made to the proposed policy. Final form policy is distributed system-wide and posted to the Office of the General Counsel web page [see below CR2.2-6].

Regional campuses may make necessary adjustments in order to implement a policy consistent with their local facilities or organizational structures. Separately accredited institutions within the USF system may issue separate policies when appropriate, provided that such policies are not inconsistent with system policies, regulations or other legal requirements.

4. Minutes of board meetings for the past two years providing evidence that the governing board is an active policy-making body.

USF Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees meets no fewer than four times per fiscal year, at a time and place designated by the Chair. Meetings of the Board are open to the public, and all official acts are taken at public meetings.

Minutes of the meetings of the Board of Trustees [see below CR2.2-7a-w] are kept by the Corporate Secretary or designee, who prints and preserves them and transmits copies to the members of the Board of Trustees and to others as deemed appropriate. All lengthy reports are referred to in the minutes and are kept on file as part of the University records, but such reports need not be incorporated in the minutes except when so ordered by the Board of Trustees.

USF Polytechnic Campus Board. The USFP Campus Board meets quarterly each fiscal year, at a time and place designated by the Chair. Meetings of the Campus Board are open to the public, and all official acts are taken at public meetings.

Minutes of the meetings of the Campus Board [see below CR2.2-8a-i] are kept by the Corporate Secretary or his/her designee, who prints and preserves them and transmits copies to the members of the Campus Board and to others as deemed appropriate. All lengthy reports are referred to in the minutes and are kept on file as part of the University records, but such reports need not be incorporated in the minutes except when so ordered by the Campus Board.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

- [CR2.2-1] Brief biographies of the members of the USF System Board of Trustees
- [CR2.2-2] Brief biographies of the members of the USF Polytechnic Campus Board
- [CR2.2-3] Operating Procedures of the University of South Florida Board of Trustees
- [CR2.2-4] USF Polytechnic Campus Board Operating Procedures
- [CR2.2-5] USF System Policy 0-001 Issuance of Policies and Procedures in the USF System
- [CR2.2-6] Office of the General Counsel web page: http://generalcounsel.usf.edu/

[CR2.2-7a-w]. USF Board of Trustees Meeting Archives web page http://system.usf.edu/board-of-trustees/meetings/archives.asp

FY2008-2009 BOT Meeting Minutes

CR2.2-7a BOT Meeting Minutes 9-11-08 CR2.2-7b BOT Conference Call 9-30-08 CR2.2-7c BOT Meeting Minutes 12-11-08 CR2.2-7d BOT Meeting Minutes 3-19-09 CR2.2-7e BOT Conference Call 5-20-09 CR2.2-7f BOT Conference Call 6-15-09 CR2.2-7g Compensation Committee Conference Call 6-18-09 CR2.2-7h BOT Meeting Minutes 6-25-09 FY2009-2010 BOT Meeting Minutes

CR2.2-7i BOT Conference Call 7-13-09 CR2.2-7j Impasse Hearing 7-16-09 CR2.2-7k BOT Conference Call 7-28-09 CR2.2-7l BOT Meeting Minutes 9-10-09 CR2.2-7m Special BOT Meeting 10-27-09 CR2.2-7n BOT Meeting Minutes 12-3-09 CR2.2-7o Compensation Committee Meeting 12-11-09 CR2.2-7p BOT Conference Call 12-16-09 CR2.2-7q BOT Conference Call 1-21-10 CR2.2-7r BOT Meeting Minutes 3-18-10 CR2.2-7s Impasse Hearing 3-29-10 CR2.2-7t BOT Conference Call 3-31-10 CR2.2-7v BOT Conference Call 4-15-10 CR2.2-7v BOT Conference Call 6-15-10 CR2.2-7w BOT Meeting Minutes 6-24-10

FY2010-2011 BOT Meeting Minutes

CR2.7-x BOT Meeting Minutes 10-7-10 CR2.7-y BOT Conference Call Meeting 10-27-10 CR2.7-z BOT Conference Call Meeting 11-9-10 CR2.7-aa BOT Compensation Committee 12-10-10 CR2.7-bb BOT Meeting Minutes 12-18-10 CR2.7-cc BOT Executive Committee Meeting 2-17-11 CR2.7-dd BOT Conference Call Meeting 3-4-11 CR2.7-ee BOT Meeting Minutes 3-17-11 CR2.7-ff BOT Meeting Minutes 6-8-11

[CR2.2-8a-i] USF Polytechnic Campus Board Meeting Archives web page http://www.poly.usf.edu/AboutUs/Leadership/CampusBoard/MeetingInformation.html

FY2008-2009 USF Polytechnic Campus Board Meeting Minutes

CR2.2-8a – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 7-22-08

CR2.2-8b – Campus Board Conference Call 8-29-08

CR2.2-8c – Campus Board Conference Call 9-16-08

CR2.2-8d – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 11-4-08

CR2.2-8e – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 2-24-09

CR2.2-8f – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 3-27-09

FY2009-2010 USF Polytechnic Campus Board Meeting Minutes

CR2.2-8g – Campus Board Conference Call 11-9-09

CR2.2-8h – Campus Board Conference Call 3-15-10

CR2.2-8i – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 4-7-10

CR2.8-j – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 4-26-10

CR2.8-k – Campus Board Conference Call 5-10-10

FY2010-2011 USF Polytechnic Campus Board Meeting Minutes

CR2.8-I – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 7-12-10

CR2.8-m – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 12-8-10

CR2.8-n – Campus Board Meeting Minutes 2-7-11 CR2.8-o – Campus Board Conference Call 4-7-11

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.3: Chief Executive Officer

The institution has a chief executive officer whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who is not the presiding officer of the board.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Name of the Chief Executive officer and his/her title.

David M. Touchton, Interim Regional Chancellor and Campus Executive Officer [CR2.3-1 D.M. Touchton Appointment Announcement]

2. A position description for the chief executive officer defining specific duties and responsibilities.

Campus Executive Officer Position Description [CR2.3-2, Regional Chancellor Position Description]

3. A list of other employment duties/responsibilities, if any, of the CEO, both external and internal to the institution (such as chief executive officer of the system or head of another institution/school.

Not applicable.

4. Administrative policy manual.

Policies and procedures are adopted to provide reference and procedural guidelines in the operation, management or implementation of the various programs, services, facilities, and activities of the University of South Florida System (USF System). USF System Policies and Regulations are compiled for reference purposes by the Office of the General Counsel **[CR2.3-3, List of USF System Policies and Regulations].** Policies are organized in ten major areas: Academic Affairs, Administration, Business and Finance, Communications and Marketing, Human Resources, Information Technology, Research and Innovation, Student Affairs, University Advancement and USF Health.

An original USF System-wide "Policies and Procedures Manual" is maintained in the Office of the General Counsel. The policies and procedures of all budget entities of USF are contained in the "Policies and Procedures Manual" except where such policies and procedures expressly or implicitly exempt operations of the budget entity, separately accredited institution or regional Campus.

NARRATIVE:

Campus Executive Officer, USF Polytechnic

Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic [CR2.3-4] established the University of South Florida Polytechnic, a separate organizational and budget entity of the University of South Florida. The statute also provided for a Campus Executive Officer that is appointed by, reports directly to, and

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 63

serves at the pleasure of the President of the University of South Florida. The Campus Executive Officer has authority and responsibility as provided in law, including the authority to:

- a. Administer campus operations within the annual operating budget as approved by the Campus Board.
- b. Recommend to the Campus Board an annual legislative budget request that includes funding for campus operations and fixed capital outlay.
- c. Recommend to the Campus Board an annual campus operating budget.
- d. Recommend to the Campus Board appropriate services and terms and conditions to be included in the annual central support services contracts.
- e. Carry out any additional responsibilities assigned or delegated by the President of the University of South Florida for the efficient operation and improvement of the campus, especially any authority necessary for the purpose of vesting the campus attributes necessary to meet the requirements for separate accreditation.

The USF System President appointed Mr. Touchton as Interim Regional Chancellor and Campus Executive Officer of USF Polytechnic, effective December 20, 2011. Mr. Touchton has a 100% administrative appointment and no other employment duties/responsibilities. He is not the presiding officer of the USF System Board of Trustees (John Ramil, Chair) or of the USF Polytechnic Campus Board (Gene Engle, Chair) **[USF System Organizational Chart, CR2.3-5]**. The responsibilities of the Regional Chancellor [see CR2.3-2] include:

- Representing the interests of USF Polytechnic in the strategic planning, priority setting, and policy development for the USF System;
- Strategic planning for USF Polytechnic and providing oversight for its implementation;
- Coordinating activities with others within the USF System to formulate strategic plans, legislative requests, and operating budgets;
- Providing leadership to USF Polytechnic to further its mission with respect to teaching, research, and service to students and the community;
- Providing direction to program development and organization for USF Polytechnic;
- Working with faculty to improve the programs, services, and products of USF Polytechnic;
- Exercising administrative authority over the use of USF Polytechnic resources in service of the mission of the institution and the USF System;
- Maintaining sound management practices for USF Polytechnic, including program and fiscal accountability, enrollment numbers, retention and graduation rates, and fundraising;
- Working with the Provost and system Vice President for Academic Affairs and other USF System vice presidents and deans in the furtherance of the educational, research, and service goals of USF Polytechnic and the USF System;
- Working with the USF System Vice President for Advancement and the system Associate Vice President for Governmental Relations to build financial, alumni, and legislative support for USF Polytechnic and the USF System;
- Working with external constituencies in the community, especially school districts, to promote excellence in education at all levels;

- Formulating, issuing, implementing, and/or interpreting philosophy, policies, procedures, and organization concepts as they relate to USF Polytechnic. Coordinating all policy for the institution, providing for consistency in philosophy and approach, both institution-wide and university-wide. Directing the development and/or revision of policies in the areas of responsibility;
- Serving as a member of the USF System President's staff;
- Providing direct oversight to administrative areas, including but not limited to budget and finance, campus computing, purchasing and financial services, development and public affairs, student advising, recruiting, campus registrar, and financial aid services;
- Representing the USF System and USF Polytechnic with the Legislature and/or individual legislators, the Florida Board of Governors, local government, the broader public community, local and regional organizations and businesses, administrators of all levels within the USF System and the State, and the USF System faculty and staff and USF Polytechnic faculty and staff. Having responsibility for contacts with other institutions and organizations nationally.

In addition, a **Memorandum of Delegation of Authority from the USF System President [CR2.3-6]**, delegated to the USF Polytechnic Regional Chancellor authority and accountability for:

- Awarding degrees earned at USF Polytechnic carrying the institutional designation "University of South Florida Polytechnic."
- Assigning unique college codes in the student information system (SIS) to USF Polytechnic academic units.
- Making undergraduate and graduate admission decisions regarding student applicants to USF Polytechnic.
- Advising and certifying USF Polytechnic students for graduation.
- Providing for USF Polytechnic students registration and records processes.
- Approving new courses, academic programs, and curricular changes at USF Polytechnic.
- Developing and implementing tenure and promotion guidelines specific to USF Polytechnic, recommending USF Polytechnic faculty tenure and rank promotions to the USF System President, credential faculty to teach specific courses, and approve and support sabbatical leave.
- Searching for and hiring USF Polytechnic faculty and staff and conduct contracting functions with coordination and monitoring at the USF System level.
- Establishing the USF Polytechnic Faculty Senate, whose president serves on the USF System Faculty Advisory Council.
- Creating and promulgating institutional policies and procedures in accordance with USF systemwide policies and procedures.

President and Chief Executive Officer of the USF System

The USF System Board of Trustees appoints and evaluates the performance of the USF System President, who is authorized to implement policies, recommend regulations to the USF Board of Trustees, and is responsible for the operation of the USF System. As identified in the **Operating Procedures of the Board of Trustees [CR2.3-7]**, the University of South Florida System President serves as Corporate Secretary

and is responsible to the Board of Trustees for all operations and administration of the University and for setting the agenda for meetings of the Board in consultation with the Chair (Article I, C3).

Dr. Judy Genshaft, USF System President and President of the University of South Florida, is the Chief Executive Officer of the USF System. The President exercises such powers as are appropriate to her position in promoting, supporting, and protecting the interests of the University and in managing and directing its affairs. The President may issue directives and executive orders not in contravention of existing Board policies. The President is responsible for all educational, financial, business, and administrative functions of the University, consistent with University policy, and exercises such other powers, duties and responsibilities as are delegated or established by the Board (Article I, C3).

Reporting directly to Dr. Genshaft are all Vice Presidents and the Regional Chancellors of USF St. Petersburg, Sarasota-Manatee, and Polytechnic. As system President, Dr. Genshaft delegates system-wide authority to the Vice Presidents as appropriate.

The Regional Chancellors of USF St. Petersburg, USF Sarasota-Manatee, and USF Polytechnic meet monthly with the USF System President to discuss the initiatives and operations of each campus.

The USF System

The University of South Florida is a system comprised of three separately accredited institutions and USF Polytechnic:

- USF Tampa, including USF Health, USF St. Petersburg, USF Sarasota-Manatee
- USF Polytechnic

The University of South Florida System (USF System) is governed by the USF Board of Trustees, the public body corporate created by Article IX, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of Florida [CR2.3-8] and empowered to administer the USF System by Section 1001.74 F.S., Powers and duties of university boards of trustees [CR2.3-9]. The USF Board of Trustees is responsible for cost-effective policy decisions appropriate to the system mission and the implementation and maintenance of high quality education programs within the laws and rules of the State. The USF Board of Trustees' charge is broad, including approval of University rules and regulations, establishing specific degree programs, fiscal oversight, monitoring of DSOs and strategic planning. The USF Board of Trustees appoints and evaluates the performance of the system President, who is authorized to implement policies, recommend regulations to the USF Board of Trustees, and is responsible for the operation of the USF System.

The USF System operates within the USF Board of Trustees governance structure **[CR2.3-10, USF System Governance Workgroups and Councils Organizational Chart]** and governance policy for the USF System [see CTRL5 USF System Governance Policy 07-001]. The President is the Chief Executive Officer of the USF System and of the University of South Florida, and chairs the USF System Leadership Council, which advises and supports the President by, among other duties, reviewing all USF System Council agendas, reviewing federal and state legislative requests, reviewing Board of Governors agendas, reviewing PECO lists and other budget submissions; guiding and supporting the implementation of the strategic plan; identifying issues and suggesting solutions for system-wide matters. The USF System Vice Presidents, Regional Chancellors, USF System services unit heads, and USF System staff are members of the USF System Leadership Council.

USF Vice Presidents with system-wide authority and responsibilities chair the other USF System Councils which provide forums for communication across the university to ensure system-wide consistency and efficiency in decision-making and planning. The USF System Councils ensure communication and inclusion of stakeholders across the USF System on substantive matters. USF System Council agendas may include program planning, system-wide processes, federal and state legislative updates, identifying potential partnerships and opportunities, and updates on relevant topics. USF System Councils serve an important function in support of the University of South Florida Board of Trustees governance process. USF System Councils review proposed action items on BOT workgroups agendas which have either a fiscal or programmatic impact on more than one college, institution or campus.

• USF System Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council (ACEAC)

The USF System Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council, established September 2010 **[CR2.3-11]**, has cross-institutional membership (as needed) and serves as a forum for communications. It advises the USF System President and the USF System Provost on what items should be reviewed and/or acted upon by the Board of Trustees Academics and Campus Environment Workgroup; reviews and advises the USF System President and USF System Provost on the substance of all items placed on the Board of Trustees Academics and Campus Environment Workgroup agenda; and develops and/or reviews USF System initiatives and reviews and/or advises on USF System institutional activities related to academic issues. The ACEAC may, at its discretion, form smaller subgroups for particular areas, issues, or initiatives. Whenever possible, the Advisory Council seeks consensus on issues. The Advisory Council meets six (6) times a year, with its meetings aligned with preparation for the meetings of the Board of Trustees ACE Workgroup.

Areas within the scope of the ACEAC include, academic programs, faculty matters, enrollment management, academic support functions; student housing, student judicial, student life, student health and student security; strategic planning, student success, accreditations, and diversity and equal opportunity; campus master plans, real estate and facilities priorities, and deferred maintenance of facilities; student athletics, marketing and attendance; study abroad, and international curricular and collaborative opportunities, policies and procedures, incentives; fee and tuition recommendations.

Membership on the Council includes the following:

- USF System Provost (or designee) (1)
- USF Academic Affairs (1) [Designated by USF System Provost]
- Chief Academic Officers from Regional Campuses (3)
- Academic Officer from USF Health (1) [Designated by USF Health SVP]
- Chief Student Affairs Officers and a Student Affairs representative from USF Health (5) [Designated by USF System President and Regional Chancellors, USF Health SVP]
- Equal Opportunity Director (1)
- Facility Officer from USF and one from a Regional Campus (2) [USF designated by USF System President; other by agreement of Regional Chancellors]
- International Affairs Officer (1) [Designated by Senior International Officer]

- USF System Faculty Advisory Council President and Vice President and two members of the Faculty Council designated by the Faculty Advisory Council President from campuses that are not represented by the sitting President or Vice President of the Council.
- Athletics Representative [1]
- Chief Information Officer

• Finance and Audit Advisory Council (FAAC)

The FAAC, established September 2010 **[CR2.3-12]**, also has cross-institutional membership (as needed) and serves as a forum for communications. It advises the USF System President and the USF System Chief Operating Officer (COO) on what items should be reviewed and/or acted upon by the Board of Trustees Finance and Audit Workgroup; reviews and advises the USF System President and USF System COO on the substance of all items placed on the Board of Trustees Finance and Audit Workgroup and/or reviews USF System initiatives and/or advises on USF System institutional activities related to financial and budget issues. The Advisory Council should meet six (6) times a year, with its meetings aligned with preparation for the meetings of the Board of Trustees Workgroup.

Areas within the scope of the FAAC include, collaborations that enhance effectiveness and cost efficiencies, annual USF System strategic budget planning process, adequacy of financial resources to meet the missions of the USF System and its member institutions, USF System operating and capital budgets requests of the Florida Board of Governors (FBOG) and State Legislature, investment policies and procedures, tuition and fees, direct support organizations and auxiliaries, capital campaign and annual giving, annual financial statements, issuance of debt instruments, consistent with Florida statutes and FBOG rules; risk assessment and enterprise-wide risk management policies and procedures, internal controls for information technology security and control, cash-handling and asset management, internal audit work plan and outcomes, compliance of federal and state laws and regulations, "Whistleblower" policies and procedures; policies, procedures, and practices for interacting with the federal government, executive, congress, and agencies; for interacting with state government executive, legislative, and agencies; and for interacting with local government, agencies, and non-profit organizations.

Membership on the Council includes the following:

- USF System Chief Operating Officer [or designee] (1)
- USF System Financial Operating Officer (1)
- USF System Treasurer (1)
- USF System Comptroller (1)
- USF System Budget Officer (1)
- Office of the USF System Provost (1) [Designated by the Provost]
- USF Health [Designated by Senior Vice President Health] (1)
- Chief Fiscal Officers Regional Campuses (3)
- Student Affairs [Designated by the USF System Executive Vice President]
- Advancement (1) [Designated by USF System Senior Vice President Advancement]
- Faculty Members at Large (4) [Designated by USF System President in consultation with the USF System Faculty Advisory Council and Regional Chancellors as appropriate.]

- USF System General Counsel, ex officio
- USF System Executive Director Audit and Compliance, ex officio

• Research, Innovation, Engagement, & Job Creation Advisory Council (RIEJCAC)

The RIEJCAC, repurposed and established in November 2011, has cross-institutional membership (as needed) and serves as a forum for research, innovation, engagement, and job creation issues by sharing appropriate and timely information, and as a "brainstorming" forum to identify "game changing" ideas and innovations for the USF System. It advises the USF System President and the USF System Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation & Global Affairs on what items should be reviewed and/or acted upon by the Board of Trustees Research, Innovation, Engagement, & Job Creation Workgroup. The Council also reviews and advises the System President and the appropriate USF System Senior Vice President on the substance of all items placed on the Board of Trustees Research, Innovation, Engagement, & Job Creation Workgroup. The Council develops and/or reviews USF System initiatives and review and/or advise on USF System institutional activities related to research, innovation, engagement, and job creation issues, including:

- Strategic planning
- Economic development leadership
- Research collaborations, both internal and external
- Technology transfer and commercialization
- Business and technology incubators
- Research parks
- Research Foundation
- Center of Excellence planning, development, and assessment
- Related policies and procedures
- Research integrity and compliance
- Research grants and contracts management
- Research infrastructure

Membership on the council includes:

- USF System Vice President for Research, Innovation & Global Affairs (or designee) (1)
- Office of the USF System Provost (1) [designated by the Provost]
- USF System Associate Vice President for Sponsored Research (1)
- USF System Associate Vice President for Technology Development (1)
- Research administrators from the Regional campuses and USF Health (4) [designated by
- Regional Chancellors and USF Health Senior Vice President, respectively]
- Faculty with expertise in Health Sciences (2), Basic Research (1), and Community Engaged Research (1) [designated by USF System President in consultation with the Regional Chancellors and the Faculty Advisory Council]
- Health Sciences and Research Advisory Council (HSRAC)

The HSRAC, established September 2010, has cross-institutional membership (as needed) and serves as a forum for communications. It advises the USF System President and either the USF System Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation and Global Affairs or the USF System

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 69

Senior Vice President for Health on what items should be reviewed and/or acted upon by the Board of Trustees Health Sciences and Research Workgroup; reviews and advises the USF System President and the appropriate USF System Senior Vice President on the substance of all items placed on the Board of Trustees Health Sciences and Research Workgroup; and develops and/or reviews USF System initiatives and reviews and/or advises on USF System institutional activities related to research issues. The Advisory Council should meet six (6) times a year, with its meetings aligned with preparation for the meetings of the Board of Trustees Workgroup.

Areas within the scope of the HSRAC include, research strategic planning, research policies and procedures, research integrity and compliance, research grants and contracts management, research collaborations, Centers of Excellence planning, development, and assessment, research infrastructure, research faculty recruitment and retention, technology transfer and commercialization, research parks, incubators and economic development, Research Foundation; Health Sciences strategic planning, Health Sciences academic policies and procedures, Health Sciences faculty matters, Health Sciences enrollment management, Health Sciences delivery and outreach programs, Health Sciences research development, student, faculty, and staff health and wellness, clinical practice and hospital affiliations, and Health Sciences accreditations; providing economic development leadership; producing graduates in high demand fields; developing applied research; incubating new companies, agencies, and occupations; maintaining the Carnegie "Community Engaged" designation; collaborations among units and institutions aimed at community engagement.

Membership on the Council includes the following:

- USF System Vice President for Research, Innovation and Global Affairs (or designee) (1)
- USF System Senior Vice President for Health (or designee) (1)
- Office of the USF System Provost (1) [Designated by the Provost]
- USF System Associate Vice President for Sponsored Research (1)
- USF System Associate Vice President for Technology Development (1)
- Research administrators from the Regional campuses and USF Health (4) [Designated by Regional Chancellors and USF Health Senior Vice President]
- Faculty with expertise in Health Sciences (2), Basic Research (1), and Community Engaged Research (1) [Designated by USF System President in consultation with the Regional Chancellors and the Faculty Advisory Council]

• System Faculty Council (SFC)

The USF System Faculty Council (SFC) **[CR2.3-15]** constitutes the principal, representative faculty governance body with System-wide responsibilities. As such, it advises the President, and the Executive Vice-President for the USF System, and coordinates communications among the constituent Faculty Senates within the USF System. The SFC provides a mechanism to discuss issues of importance to faculty across the constituent institutions, and to provide specific recommendations to USF administration on all system-wide academic policies, including approval of new proposals or changes to existing policies and procedures. The SFC will also bring forward its own proposed policies and procedures on academic matters that pertain to all constituent institutions.

The president of the SFC sits on the USF Board of Trustees, as the elected representative of the entire System faculty.

The SFC Executive Committee is comprised of the SFC President and Vice President, elected by the USF System faculty, and the Presidents of the USF Tampa, St. Petersburg, Sarasota-Manatee and Polytechnic Faculty Senates. Other members of the SFC are elected from the membership of the constituent USF System Faculty Senates.

USF Polytechnic Representatives on the USF System Councils

David Touchton, Interim Regional Chancellor and Campus Executive Officer – USF System Leadership Council

Dr. James Payne, Regional Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs and Research – Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council

Joshua Bresler, Executive Director, Finance and Administration, and CFO – Finance and Audit Advisory Council

Dr. Jan Lloyd, Dean of Students – Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council

Dr. Sherry Kragler, President, USF Polytechnic Faculty Senate – System Faculty Council

Hiring, Termination, and Evaluation of CEOs

The Regional Chancellor/Campus Executive Officer is appointed by, reports directly to, and serves at the pleasure of the President of the University of South Florida System, as established by **Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic** [see CR2.3-5]. Florida Statute 1004.345 also designates that the President will consult with the Campus Board before hiring or terminating the Campus Executive Officer (1004.345, 3).

To select the regional chancellor, the President appoints an official search committee and often hires an outside search firm to oversee the committee, to make recommendations, and initially to screen applicants. After the outside search firm screens credentials, the search committee discusses and reviews the qualifications of each candidate and selects candidates for initial interviews, conducted by telephone or held at an airport hotel. The search committee discusses and assesses the candidates' responses in the initial interviews and recommends candidates for on-site interviews. During on-site interviews the search committee, staff, faculty, members of the Campus Board and Board of Trustees, the USF System Provost, USF System vice presidents, and the President meet with the candidates. All search committee meetings and records are open to the public as provided in Florida Statute 286.011 Public meetings and records [CR2.3-16].

The USF System President makes the final hiring decision with input from the search committee, faculty, staff, and other interested parties. Campus funds pay for the search. The candidate and the USF System President negotiate the final salary which is approved by the Campus Board and funded by the Campus.

The Regional Chancellor is evaluated annually by USF Polytechnic Campus Board and the USF System President. The evaluation process includes opportunity for comment by campus faculty and staff. In addition, the Regional Chancellor prepares an annual self-evaluation to assist the President in this evaluation process.

Institutional Mission Development

The **USF System Governance Policy 07-001** [see CTRL5] indicates that the USF System institutions will articulate differentiated, yet complementary, missions through the development of strategic plans and compact plans. These plans will be consistent with the USF System strategic plan and will be approved by the Board of Trustees.

The Mission of USF Polytechnic was developed through its strategic planning process for the **USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012 [CR2.3-17]**. The process included a broad range of constituent groups, including campus administrators, faculty, Student Government Association representatives, staff, Campus Board, and regional community representatives. The strategic planning process was facilitated by external consultants and overseen by a campus steering committee. The USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan was approved by the campus governance councils, the Campus Board, the USF System Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council, the USF Board of Trustees ACE Workgroup, and the USF Board of Trustees.

Funding Structure for All Institutions

Florida Statute 1004.345 (1)(a) University of South Florida Polytechnic [see CR2.3-5] established USF Polytechnic as a separate organizational and budget entity of the University of South Florida, and provided for all legislative appropriations to be set forth as separate line items in the annual General Appropriations Act, effective July 1, 2008.

The statute further provides that the Campus Board has the authority to 1) review and approve an annual legislative budget, which includes items for campus operations and fixed capital outlay, to be submitted to the Board of Trustees (2)(a); and 2) approve and submit an annual operating plan and budget for review and consultation by the Board of Trustees (2)(b). The annual budget is developed by the USF Polytechnic Executive Director for Finance and Administration, in consultation with the Regional Chancellor and unit administrators. Budget resources come from general revenue, tuition, fees, auxiliary-generated funds (e.g., bookstore, extended education, computer store), grants, and contracts.

USF Polytechnic is fiscally autonomous, but shares some functions with the USF System as outlined in the **USF System Governance Policy 07-001** [see CTRL5].

Extent of Autonomy of Other Institutions in the system

USF in Tampa, USF St. Petersburg and USF Sarasota-Manatee have academic and fiscal autonomy through separate SACS accreditation. USF Polytechnic has academic and fiscal autonomy through delegation of authority by the USF System President's **USF Polytechnic Memorandum of Delegation of Authority, November 9, 2010** [see CR2.3-6].
SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.3-1] D.M. Touchton Appointment Announcement

[CR2.3-2] Regional Chancellor Position Description

[CR2.3-3] List of USF System Policies and Regulations, Office of the General Counsel website: http://generalcounsel.usf.edu/policies-and-procedures/policy-procedures2.asp

[CR2.3-4] Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic

[CR2.3-5] USF System Organizational Chart

[CR2.3-6] Memorandum of Delegation of Authority from the USF System President

[CR2.3-7] Operating Procedures of the Board of Trustees

[CR2.3-8] Article IX, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of Florida

- [CR2.3-9] Section 1001.74 F.S., Powers and duties of university boards of trustees
- [CR2.3-10] USF System Governance Workgroups and Councils Organizational Chart

[CR2.3-11] USF System ACEAC Council

[CR2.3-12] USF System FAAC Council

- [CR2.3-13] USF System RIEJCAC Council
- [CR2.3-14] USF System HSRAC Council
- [CR2.3-15] USF System SFC Council
- [CR2.3-16] Florida Statute 286.011 Public meetings and records
- [CR2.3-17] USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.4: Institutional Mission

The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. A copy of the institution's mission statement as it appears in the catalog and other institutional documents.

The mission statement of the University of South Florida Polytechnic appears in the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012 [CR2.4-1], the USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2011-2012, p. 14 [CR2.4-2], and the USF Polytechnic Graduate Catalog 2011-2012, p. 2 [CR2.4-3]:

The University of South Florida Polytechnic is committed to excellence in interdisciplinary and applied learning; to the application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs; and to collaborative partnerships that support economic, social, and community development.

2. A description of how it was developed and approved and how it is reviewed.

Development

In June, 2006 a Strategic Planning Steering Committee developed a strategic plan for 2007-2012 based on a vision of USF Lakeland as a destination campus based on a polytechnic model. The fifteen member Strategic Planning Steering Committee was comprised of representatives of campus administration, faculty, staff, student government, alumni, Campus Board, USF Foundation Board and community:

Kristin Dailey, President, Student Government Association, USF Lakeland Gene Engle, USF Foundation Board Debra Gula, Director, Business, Finance & Auxiliary Services, USF Lakeland A&P Staff Representative Dr. JoAnne Larsen, Chair, USF Lakeland Faculty Governance Council Dr. Bernard Mackey, Associate Vice President, Campus Planning & Development, USF Lakeland Dr. Preston Mercer, former Vice President and CEO, USF Lakeland Lorie Miros, Assistant to the Vice President, USF Lakeland USPS Staff Representative Dr. Alice Murray, Associate Vice President, Administrative & Academic Support Services, USF Lakeland Dr. Sherrie Nickell, Associate Superintendent, Polk County Schools Dr. Gregory Paveza, Professor, Chair, Campus Master Plan Steering Committee Dr. Judith Ponticell, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs, USF Lakeland – Committee Chair Janet Smith, Past-President, Polk County USF Alumni Chapter David Steele, Director, University Relations, USF Lakeland Dr. Nathan Thomas, Director, Office of Diversity, USF Lakeland Kelly Underhill, Vice President of Finance, Publix, and Campus Board Member The Strategic Planning Steering Committee reviewed the vision, mission, and goals statements of other polytechnic institutions and developed common **Foundational Concepts of a Polytechnic University Model [CR2.4-4]**.

At two large planning events in November 2006 and April 2007, a new strategic plan was drafted. On November 29, 2006 faculty and staff, together with members of the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, engaged in a Strategic Plan Reaffirmation Process at the Collaborative Labs at St. Petersburg College. The planning events were scheduled so that every faculty and staff member could participate. Participants were provided with copies of the **USF Lakeland 2006-2011 vision, mission, and strategic goals [CR2.4-5]**; the Foundational Concepts of a Polytechnic University Model; and an article on **Millennial Behaviors and Higher Education [CR2.4-6]**.

A process facilitated by the staff of the Collaborative Labs resulted in a web-based, real-time record providing complete documentation of the results of participants' work in tasks facilitated by the Collaborative Labs staff. Every idea, decision and thought was recorded with supporting transcription of notes, diagrams, spreadsheets and pictures. This real-time record was available the very next day. The documents were then analyzed for common themes in the content, and these themes were viewed by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, resulting in a **Content Analysis of the Collaborative Labs Documents [CR2.4-7]** and a companion document which positioned the themes in a **Framework for a Strategic Plan [CR2.4-8]**. All documents from the November 2006 event were made available to participants.

On April 6, 2007, 53 administrators, faculty, and staff met at Bok Tower to develop a vision, mission and core values from the content analysis and framework for a strategic plan. A **Summary of the Writing Work Sessions [CR2.4-9]** was created on-site and distributed to all participants electronically the next day.

From the documents created at these two events, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee crafted a working draft of the strategic plan and distributed it to campus governance councils for campus review and comment. A final draft was reviewed and approved by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee in May 2007, reviewed and approved by the USF Polytechnic Campus Board in June 2007, and reviewed and approved by the USF Board of Trustees in September 2007 **[USF Lakeland Strategic Plan, CR2.4-10]**.

On July 1, 2008 references to USF Lakeland in the Strategic Plan were changed to USF Polytechnic to reflect its establishment by Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic [CR2.4-11, USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012].

<u>Review</u>

The USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan was reviewed and updated for the USF Board of Trustees, with the **Update of the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan [CR2.4-12]** provided to the USF Board of Trustees and approved on **[October 27, 2009, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, CR2.4-13]**. The update describes the progress that the campus has made toward reaching its strategic goals and outlines future initiatives that will be targeted so as to meet additional goals based on available resources and accreditation constraints.

Strategic Planning for 2012-2018

A Distinctive Mission

The USF Polytechnic 2007-2012 Strategic Plan expanded the regional campus' vision beyond its local service area, focusing on transition to a destination campus with a polytechnic mission. In a meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee of the State University System Board of Governors on June 23, 2011 [see HIST5], the committee indicated that the Board of Governors would review its options in the coming months "for expanding access in the System." One option identified was expanding one or more branch campuses into "designation campuses"; another was increasing the number of institutions in the System.

In the September 14, 2011, meeting of the State University System of Florida Board of Governors, Academic and Strategic Planning Committee, USF Polytechnic presented information on the polytechnic model, its unique curriculum, and its importance in higher education. In the committee discussion that followed, a motion was made and passed to examine the model further.

On October 3, 2011 Board of Governors Chancellor Brogan requested that USF Polytechnic prepare a 15 year plan for development of USF Polytechnic as an independent institution in the State University System. The Business Plan: A New Polytechnic University in Florida [see HIST6A] was presented to the Board of Governors on November 9, 2011.

In a 13-3 in favor vote by sixteen of the seventeen members of the Board of Governors, a set of benchmarks was established for USF Polytechnic to achieve, in order to be reviewed for final approval as the 12th university in the State University System [see HIST 7 Statement Regarding USF Polytechnic by Chair Ava L. Parker, Florida Board of Governors, State University System, November 9, 2011]. These benchmarks are:

• The USF Polytechnic Campus securing of separation accreditation for the branch campus pursuant to s. 1004.345 Florida Statutes;

• After separate accreditation is achieved, Polytechnic shall implement the programs identified in Phase I of the Business Plan upon approval of the programs by SACS (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools). Highest priority for program development and implementation shall be focused on programs in STEM fields, and appropriate discipline-specific accreditation shall be sought.

• Polytechnic must attain a minimum FTE of 1,244 as calculated in the Business Plan, with a minimum 50 percent of that FTE in STEM and 20 percent in STEM-related programs;

• The following facilities and infrastructure shall be in place – the Science and Technology Building, Phase I of the Wellness Center, the modular resident hall (70 beds), and the residence hall (120 beds);

Polytechnic shall have a full complement of the following services or functions, provided either directly or where feasible through a shared services model – financial aid, admissions, student support, information technology, and finance and accounting with an internal audit function;
 Students shall be given an option to graduate with a diploma from USF, subject to university

criteria;

• The Board of Governors shall monitor the development of the campus and its operations, working in collaboration with the appropriate boards, on a semi-annual basis; and

• The Board shall be consulted on any significant change to the Business Plan prior to any action being taken on such change.

As USF Polytechnic enters into its strategic planning process for development of the 2012-2018 strategic plan, these benchmarks will drive the goals, objectives and action priorities of that plan. The Board of Governors has established a three-member oversight committee, and the USF Board of Trustees has established a five-member oversight committee, both of which will monitor the development of the campus and its operations in accordance with the criterion for monitoring established in the Board of Governors benchmarks.

A new strategic planning process for the development of a strategic plan for 2012-2018 is planned for 2011-2012 with completion of a new strategic plan targeted for spring-summer 2012.

3. A list of institutional publications where the mission statement is described.

[CR2.4-1] USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012; webpage: http://www.poly.usf.edu/AboutUs/StrategicPlan.html

[CR2.4-2] USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2010-2011

[CR2.4-3] USF Polytechnic Graduate Catalog 2010-2011

ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.4-4] Foundational Concepts of a Polytechnic University Model

[CR2.4-5] USF Lakeland 2006-2011 vision, mission, and strategic goals

- [CR2.4-6] Millennial Behaviors and Higher Education
- [CR2.4-7] Content Analysis of the Collaborative Labs Documents

[CR2.4-8] Framework for a Strategic Plan from Content Analysis – Positioning of Themes

[CR2.4-9] Summary of the Writing Work Sessions

[CR2.4-10] USF Lakeland Strategic Plan 2007-2012

[CR2.4-11] July 1, 2008 USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012

[CR2.4-12] Update of the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan, October 2009

[CR2.4-13] Minutes of the USF Board of Trustees, October 27, 2009

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.5: Institutional Effectiveness

The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

A description of the institutional planning and evaluation processes, including an explanation of how all units of the institution are integrated into planning and how the planning and evaluation processes intersect with the budgeting process.

Following the development of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan (see Core Requirement 2.4), the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Director of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning were responsible for the development of a planning and evaluation process to monitor progress toward implementation of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan.

1. Unit Planning and Evaluation

Progress toward achievement of the USF Polytechnic mission, strategic goals and objectives is reviewed annually through 1) unit strategic plan action plans, 2) unit annual reports and 3) university annual reports and work plans for the Florida Board of Governors.

Unit Strategic Plan Action Plan

A Unit Action Planning Template [CR2.5-1] was developed. Administrative and academic support units completed Unit Strategic Plan Action Plans [CR2.5-2, Report of Administrative & Academic Support Unit Assessments, 2008-2009] for implementation and benchmarking of progress toward the achievement of the five strategic goals. [Note: Action Plans are included in CS3.3.1 Institutional Effectiveness]. Each unit reviewed the five strategic goals and objectives, and identified the unit's responsibility for goal achievement and implementation of objectives. If the unit had responsibility for the goal and/or a component objective, the unit then identified specific actions to be taken, person(s) responsible, resources needed, target completion dates, and achievement benchmarks. The unit action plans were completed June 1, 2008 with mid-point review completed in June 2010 and final report on achievement of action plans targeted for June 2012.

Unit Annual Reports

A **Unit Annual Reporting Template [CR2.5-3]** was also provided. Administrative and academic units complete **Unit Annual Reports [CR2.5-4, Annual Report Example]** for implementation and benchmarking of progress toward the achievement of the strategic plan goals development of the polytechnic core values, highlights of notable events and accomplishments, and primary or significant

goals for the next calendar year. Unit annual reports are due February 1. [Note: Annual Reports are included in CS3.3.1 Institutional Effectiveness].

University Annual Report and Work Plan

Board of Governors compact planning was initiated through the Office of the USF System Executive Vice President and Provost in fall 2008. Compact plans were developed by all vice presidential sectors (academic affairs/colleges, health/colleges, budget and finance, research, student affairs, and advancement), and university campuses. Compacts are short term (18-24 months), intended to align broad University goals with the priorities, investments, and actions of campuses and colleges, as well as academic and service units. Compact plans may be revised annually based upon prior performance and changing financial/budget realities.

The **USF Polytechnic Compact Plan for 2008-2009 [CR2.5-5]** was submitted in September 2008 to the Office of the Provost. The Compact Plan was informed by both the Unit Strategic Plan Action Plans completed in June 2008 and Unit Annual Reports completed in January 2009.

Board of Governors Regulation 2.002 University Work Plans and Annual Report [CR2.5-6] then established in November 2009, a planning and performance monitoring system that includes submission of work plans and annual reports designed to inform strategic planning, budgeting, and other policy decisions for the State University System. Each university's work plans and annual reports reflect the institution's distinctive mission and focus on core institutional strengths within the context of State University System goals and regional and statewide needs. The work plans and annual report replaced the compact plan.

The work plan includes 1) the university's mission statement and vision for the next five to ten years; 2) a listing of new academic degree program proposals that the university plans to submit to its board of trustees within the next three years; 3) a tuition differential proposal, if applicable, as outlined in **Board of Governors Regulation 7.001 Tuition and Associated Fees [CR2.5-7]**. (The tuition differential is intended to promote improvements to undergraduate education and provide financial aid to undergraduate students who have financial need.); 4) University projected contributions on metrics related to specific System-wide strategic goals identified by the Board of Governors; 5) a minimum of three additional institution-specific goals on which university effort will be focused within the next three years, the proposed strategy for achieving each goal, the metrics by which success will be measured, and any assumptions, including financial, upon which the projected outcomes are predicated; 6) unique opportunities that have presented themselves to the university but that have not been included in prior plans; and 7) any other specific planning information requested by the Board of Governors in advance of the submission deadline.

The annual report includes 1) an executive summary that captures key performance data required by the Board of Governors; 2) the university's mission and vision; 3) summary information on budgets, enrollments, and other core resources; 4) reports on undergraduate education, graduate education, and research and economic development, as appropriate to the university's mission, including narrative to provide context and perspective on key goals, data trends, and university performance on metrics specified by the Board of Governors; and 5) any other specific performance information requested by the Board of Governors in advance of the submission deadline.

On December 16, 2009 the USF System Board of Trustees approved the five **Annual Reports for the USF Campuses and USF System 2009** [CR2.5-8] for submission to the Board of Governors, including USF **Polytechnic's Annual Report to the Board of Governors on p. 180**. USF Polytechnic's performance on the Board of Governors common performance indicators for the State University System is summarized in the table that follows.

2009 USF Polytechnic Contributions to System-Level Goals Actual & Projected										
NUMERIC TARGETS										
Dashboard Metric Date Actual Value Date Projected Value										
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded	2008-09	29	99	2012-13	363					
Master's Degrees Awarded	2008-09	1()3	2012-13	1	31				
Research and Professional Doctorates Awarded	2008-09	()	2012-13		0				
Federal Academic Research and Development Expenditures	2007-08	System-wid	le Function	2011-12	System-wi	de Function				
Total Academic Research and Development Expenditure	2007-08	System-wic	le Function	2011-12	System-wi	de Function				
FTIC Six-Year Retention and Graduate Rates	2003-09 FTIC Cohort	NA		2007-13 FTIC Cohort	NA					
AA Transfer Four-Year Retention and Graduation Rates	2005-09 AAT Cohort	73%		2009-13 AAT Cohort	76%					
DIRECTIONAL TARGETS [Indicate Direc	tion: I=Increa	ase, M=Maint	tain, D=Decre	ease]					
Dashboard Metric	Date	Actua	Value	Date	Projected	Direction**				
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Black,		#	%*		#	%*				
Non-Hispanics	2008-09	35	11.7%	2012-13	I	М				
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Hispanics	2008-09	# 28	%* 9.3%	2012-13	#	%* I				
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Pell		#	9.5% %*		#	۲ %*				
Recipients	2008-09	28	9.5%	2012-13		M				
		Bacc.	Grad.		Bacc.	Grad.				
Degrees Awarded in Specified STEM Fields	2008-09	19	0	2012-13	1					
Degrees Awarded in Specified Health	2000.00	Bacc.	Grad.	2042.42	Bacc.	Grad.				
Profession Critical Need Areas	2008-09	7	2	2012-13	I	М				
Degrees Awarded in Specified Education		Bacc.	Grad.		Bacc.	Grad.				
Critical Need Areas	2008-09	0	29	2012-13	I	I				

On December 16, 2010 the USF System Board of Trustees approved the five **Annual Reports for the USF Campuses and USF System 2010** [CR2.5-9] for submission to the Board of Governors, including USF **Polytechnic's Annual Report to the Board of Governors on p. 156**. USF Polytechnic's performance on the Board of Governors common performance indicators for the State University System is summarized in the table that follows. The next annual report will be completed in December 2011.

2010 USF Polytechnic Contributions to System-Level Goals Actual & Projected										
NUMERIC TARGETS										
Dashboard Metric	Dashboard Metric Date Actual Value Date Projected Value									
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded	2009-10	25	54	2012-13	363					
Master's Degrees Awarded	2009-10	7	8	2012-13	1	31				
Research and Professional Doctorates Awarded	2009-10	C)	2012-13		0				
Federal Academic Research and Development Expenditures	2008-09	System-wid	le Function	2011-12	System-wi	de Function				
Total Academic Research and Development Expenditure	2008-09	System-wid	le Function	2011-12	System-wi	de Function				
FTIC Six-Year Retention and Graduate Rates	2003-09 FTIC Cohort	NA		2007-13 FTIC Cohort	NA					
AA Transfer Four-Year Retention and Graduation Rates	2005-09 AAT Cohort	73%		2009-13 AAT Cohort	76%					
DIRECTIONAL TARGETS [Indicate Direc	tion: I=Increa	se, M=Maint	ain, D=Decre	ease]					
Dashboard Metric	Date	Actual	Value	Date	Projected	Direction**				
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Black, Non-Hispanics	2009-10	# 26	%* 10.4%	2012-13	# I	%* I				
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Hispanics	2009-10	# 29	%* 11.6%	2012-13	#	%*				
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Pell Recipients	2009-10	# 97	%* 38.1%	2012-13	#	%* M				
	2000.40	Bacc.	Grad.		Васс.	Grad.				
Degrees Awarded in Specified STEM Fields	2009-10	22	0	2012-13	I	I				
Degrees Awarded in Specified Health	2009-10	Bacc.	Grad.	2012-13	Bacc.	Grad.				
Profession Critical Need Areas	2003-10	1	0	2012-13	I	м				
Degrees Awarded in Specified Education	2009-10	Bacc.	Grad.	2012-13	Bacc.	Grad.				
Critical Need Areas	2003-10	0	11	2012-13	I	I				

Data reported for the preparation of the annual report provide a more detailed view of these indicators. Data indicate that from 2004-2010 the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded increased. Degrees awarded to underrepresented groups have increased since 2004-2005 and have ranged from 11.5 to 11.9% for Black, Non-Hispanic students and from 9.3 to 9.5% for Hispanic students with a slightly higher percentage (10.2%) in 2007-2008. Degrees awarded to Pell Grant recipients have increased, and the percentage of degrees awarded to Pell Grant recipients in relation to the total number of baccalaureate degrees has decreased.

Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
Baccalaureate Degrees	160	209	226	233	299	300
Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Underrepresented Groups	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
# of Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Black Non-Hispanic Students	15	17	23	27	35	35
% of Total Baccalaureate Degrees (Excluding Those Awarded to Non- Resident Aliens and Unreported) Awarded to Black Non-Hispanic Students	9.7%	8.4%	10.7%	11.5%	11.9%	11.7%
# of Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to Hispanic Students	9	21	20	24	28	28
% of Total Baccalaureate Degrees (Excluding Those Awarded to Non- Resident Aliens and Unreported) Awarded to Hispanic Students	5.8%	10.3%	9.3%	10.2%	9.5%	9.3%
Number of Baccalaureate Degrees Awarded to PELL Recipients (Defined as Those Receiving PELL Within 6 Years of Graduation)	72	79	89	92	104	TBD
% of Total Baccalaureate Degrees (Excluding Those Awarded to Non- Resident Aliens) Awarded to PELL Recipients (Defined as Those Receiving PELL Within 6 Years of Graduation)	46.5%	38.9%	41.2%	40.7%	35.4%	TBD

Data indicate a cycle of decrease followed by increase from 2005-2010. Master's degrees offered at USF Polytechnic are primarily in the Education fields. The degree programs are largely cohort-structured with

cohorts completing degrees every other year. All Education master's degrees do not start their cohorts in the same semester, also contributing to the increase-decrease cycle.

Graduate Degrees Awarded	2004- 2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
Master's and Specialist	113	47	80	66	103	78

Recruitment efforts for the Master's degrees in Counselor Education, Educational Leadership and Reading Education were increased, an MBA program in collaboration with the College of Business Administration in Tampa will complete its first cohort in summer 2010, and a new Master's degree in Information Technology was approved by the USF System Board of Trustees in March 2010; initial implementation is scheduled for fall 2011.

Enrollment data indicate that USF Polytechnic's FTE have increased from 2007-2008 to 2009-2010:

USF Polytechnic FTE	2007-08 Actual	2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Actual
Lower*	11	22	31
Upper	596	757	795
Grad I	111	133	123
Grad II	1	1	0
Total**	719	913	928
Total by U.S./IPEDS*** Definition	959	1,217	1,237

*As part of an agreement with Polk State College, USF Polytechnic has offered limited lower-level courses to accommodate transfer student need for common core pre-requisites required for degree programs offered at USF Polytechnic and courses not offered by Polk State College.

**FTE for this metric uses the State of Florida definition of FTE, equal to 40 credit hours for undergraduates and 32 for graduates.

***FTE for this metric uses the standard IPEDS definition of FTE, equal to 30 credit hours for undergraduates and 24 for graduates.

Data reported for federal IPEDS reporting indicate that class size, which had decreased from 2004-2005, has increased in 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 to a level slightly above class size in 2004-2005:

Student/Faculty Ratio	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
IPEDS/Common Data Set Student-to-Faculty Ratio	21	17	17	17	22	23

Data also indicate that the number of full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty has increased, and the number of full-time non-tenure track faculty and part-time faculty has increased:

Personnel	Fall	2004	Fall 2	2005	Fall 20	06	Fa 20			all 08		all 09	F	all 2010
Headcount	FT	РТ	FT	РТ	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	РТ	FT	РТ	FT	РТ
Total Tenure/ Tenure-track Faculty	15	2	22	0	22	0	23	0	19	0	20	0	36	0
Total Non-Tenure Track Faculty	8	6	10	3	13	3	14	2	12	6	11	5	17	1 + Adjuncts

In Fall 2009 a **Faculty Phase 1 Hiring Plan for 2009-2010 Recruitment [CR2.5-10a]** was developed to add full-time faculty, particularly in tenured and tenure-earning positions, to support current degree programs, minors and concentrations. Twenty-two full-time faculty were recruited for 2010-2011: six in the Human and Social Sciences, four in Education, five in Innovation Management, three in Engineering, three in Technical and Professional Communication and one in Library.

In Fall 2010 a **Faculty Phase 2 Hiring Plan for 2010-2011 Recruitment [CR2.5-10b]** was approved to add 33 additional full-time faculty in the following areas: Allied Health Sciences, four; Social Sciences, seven; Education, five; Innovation Management, seven; IT and Engineering, seven; Applied Science, two; and Library, one.

While research and development activity is reported in the Board of Governors Annual Report at the USF System level only, the USF Polytechnic Office of Academic Affairs and Research reports campus research funding annually in the Academic Affairs and Research Annual Report. Following is a table showing campus research funding over the last 7 years:

USF Polytechnic Research Awards Fiscal Year	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
Awards	\$414,614	\$229,597	\$251,588	\$210,863	\$56,717	\$892,124	\$241,381
Proposals	\$956,217	\$619,416	\$338,457	\$2,679,039	\$1,080,647	\$2,107,192	TBD
Federal Awards	\$262,467	\$129,597		\$113,307		\$646,954	\$43,850
F&A (Indirect Cost) Earnings	\$274	\$4,834	\$28,700	\$39,176	\$61,267	\$166,663	TBD
Internal Grant Awards	\$16,653				\$5,000		

Source: Office of Research Services CRYSTAL Reports

USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan Review and Update

The USF System Board of Trustees approved the USF Lakeland 2007-2012 Strategic Plan in September 2007, and on July 1, 2008 references to USF Lakeland in the Strategic Plan were changed to USF

Polytechnic to reflect its establishment by Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic [CR2.5-11, USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012].

The Strategic Plan identified five goals with accompanying objectives:

Goal 1. Recruit, develop, and retain world-class practitioner scholars with capacity to deliver the polytechnic vision in teaching, research, and community engagement and impact.

1.1 Develop and implement a comprehensive faculty recruitment, development, and incentive plan that aligns with the polytechnic vision.

1.2 Develop a faculty culture that values applied learning, applied research, interdisciplinary thinking, and integration of innovative technology.

1.3 Develop clear, well-articulated criteria for promotion and tenure that reflect the nature of faculty work on a polytechnic, undergraduate and master's level campus.

1.4 Provide faculty resources and professional development sufficient for successful tenure and promotion, including a faculty mentoring program.

1.5 Secure resources to recognize and reward faculty achievement in research and creative activity, outstanding teaching, and community engagement and impact.

1.6 Increase the number of faculty receiving regional, national, and international awards.

1.7 Secure funding for endowed chairs in the five areas of distinction: applied health sciences; mathematics and science education; business and entrepreneurship; manufacturing engineering and technology; and information technology.

1.8 Develop a comprehensive research support infrastructure to enable faculty to conduct world-class research with administrative support for grant development, management, and compliance.

Goal 2. Recruit students locally, nationally, and internationally who are prepared for a polytechnic learning environment, and provide programs and opportunities that enhance student retention and academic, personal, and professional success.

2.1 Collaborate with feeder institutions (community colleges and pre K-12 schools) to develop a common understanding of a polytechnic campus and program admissions requirements. Develop a recruitment and marketing plan for middle schools and high schools.

2.2 Develop a comprehensive enrollment management plan for marketing, recruitment, admissions, advising, retention, and graduation of diverse and high quality students.

2.3 Recruit, retain, and graduate higher numbers of underrepresented students in both undergraduate and graduate programs.

2.4 Provide exceptional customer service to students in all administrative areas.

2.5 Increase student participation in programs that serve as models for academic, social, and cultural integration of underrepresented students, e.g., McNair Scholars, ENLACE (Engaging Latino Communities for Education), Project Thrust Corporate Mentoring Program.

2.6 Develop early admissions/access programs, and enhance advising to increase retention and ensure timely completion of degree programs.

2.7 Increase scholarships available for students.

2.8 Develop student leadership, mentoring, and learning community programs to contribute to student success and create a sense of belonging to USF Polytechnic.

2.9 Increase comprehensive student life activities to include academic and technology extra- and cocurricular activities; social and community engagement opportunities; and personal, academic, and career support services.

2.10 Create opportunity for student participation in honor societies and academic award programs.

2.11 Develop a system for tracking graduates and establish a strong alumni base.

Goal 3. Expand and create academic programs that focus on applied learning, applied research, applied technology, and interdisciplinary approaches in a polytechnic model. Develop and implement new degree programs in five areas of distinction: applied health sciences; mathematics and science education; business and entrepreneurship; manufacturing engineering and technology; and information technology.

3.1 Increase campus autonomy in program development.

3.2 Carefully assess potential long-term regional workforce development needs. Expand program offerings at the baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate, master's, and graduate certificate levels; cooperative programs and internships; collaborative degree and professional development programs with businesses and other agencies.

3.3 Develop new degree programs in five areas of distinction: applied health sciences; mathematics and science education; business and entrepreneurship; manufacturing engineering and technology; and information technology. Focus on a polytechnic model of applied learning, applied research, and applied, innovative technology in all programs.

3.4 Integrate globalization issues in program curricula.

3.5 Increase general education course offerings to match FTIC enrollment growth, and develop first-year experience programs for all entering freshmen and transfer students.

3.6 Develop competency- and skills-based student outcomes and assessments in all programs.

3.7 Develop comprehensive program information publications, both print and online.

3.8 Achieve separate institutional and program accreditation.

Goal 4. Implement the Campus Master Plan and develop a campus infrastructure to support a polytechnic learning and research environment, and develop a stable economic base for continued campus and program development as a polytechnic campus.

4.1 Build the new primary campus location.

4.2 Recruit, develop, and retain well-qualified staff to meet the needs of a polytechnic campus, and provide sufficient resources for support functions.

4.3 Create a service-oriented and professional culture through administrative, faculty, and staff collaboration.

4.4 Develop a comprehensive, multi-year resource plan for infrastructure (e.g., library, enhanced academic and administrative technology infrastructure for a polytechnic model, space allocation and utilization, student life activities).

4.5 Develop training and learning communities to enhance faculty and staff capacity to build and develop a polytechnic campus.

4.6 Support the development of a new business incubator and applied research park.

4.7 Develop a stable economic base for campus and program development by refining and enhancing a comprehensive budget planning process; promoting effective and efficient use of human, facility, and fiscal resources; developing mission-appropriate programs to enhance revenue; and expanding private contributions.

4.8 Increase fiscal self-sufficiency in all campus units.

Goal 5. Develop collaborative public and private partnerships that enhance funding opportunities, including leveraging state and federal funding.

5.1 Achieve increased visibility by developing and implementing an annual image and marketing plan that communicates our vision and mission and highlights our achievements and contributions to the region.

5.2 Establish mutually beneficial partnerships with pre K-12 school systems and human services organizations; identify mutually beneficial research and grant development opportunities.

5.3 Establish an Office of Community Education and Outreach and provide community education opportunities to support lifelong learning for all generations.

5.4 Develop an infrastructure for campus advancement and development, and achieve ambitious fundraising goals through collective efforts and creative vision of the campus community.

5.5 Encourage and support faculty and staff involvement in civic, professional, and local service organizations.

5.6 Strengthen the Alumni Organization in the central Florida region and promote alumni affinity with USF Polytechnic.

Progress and Future Initiatives

The USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan was reviewed and updated for the USF Board of Trustees, with the **Update of the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan [CR2.5-12]** provided to the USF Board of Trustees and approved on **[October 27, 2009, Minutes of the Board of Trustees, CR2.5-13]**. The update describes the progress that the campus has made toward reaching its stated goals within the Strategic Plan and to outline future initiatives that will be targeted so as to meet additional goals based on available resources and accreditation constraints. Highlights of progress toward the achievement of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan and strategies for continued progress follow:

Goal 1: Recruit, develop, and retain world-class practitioner scholars with capacity to deliver the polytechnic vision in teaching, research, and community engagement.

In 2008, the Central Florida Development Council hired SRI International, an independent research firm, to conduct a detailed analysis of the region's current economic strengths and opportunities. The resulting "cluster analysis" study identified seven industry sectors prime for future growth: research & engineering services; logistics & supply chain management; life science & medical services; education & government; construction & real estate; business & financial services; and agriculture & agritechnology.

USF Polytechnic aligned its design with its socio-economic context, providing a distinct focus for the development of academic programs. In addition, rather than reifying the "silo" paradigm so common in American higher education, USF Polytechnic will orient teaching and scholarship collaboratively in pursuit of cross-disciplinary synergies and innovation. The Update of the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan includes a graphic representation of the interdisciplinary structure for the development of three interdisciplinary colleges (Technology & Innovation, Human & Social Sciences, and Applied Arts & New Media, each housing three academic divisions:



A summary of the faculty and staff hiring plans for 2009-2012 recruitment were provided based on a careful review of USF Polytechnic's full-time faculty and staff needs. Emphasis in **faculty recruitment** is the identification of practitioner-scholars with capacity to deliver the polytechnic vision in teaching, research, and community engagement and impact. Of preference are faculty who have academic degrees from polytechnic or polytechnic-like universities or experience working in polytechnic or polytechnic.

Degree Program, Minor and/or	Current Full-time Faculty	New Full-time Faculty Recruitment							
Concentration									
College of Technology & Innovation									
Applied Science, B.S.									
(Concentrations in Criminal Justice,									
Early Childhood Development,	Concentrations comprised of courses offered in existing degree programs.								
Industrial Operations, Information									
Technology, Leadership Studies)									
General Business Administration	9	5							
B.S./BA (concentrations in									
Accounting, Finance, Management									
and Marketing); M.B.A.									
General Studies, B.G.S.		1							
(Concentrations in Aging Studies,	Concentrations comprised of courses offered in existing degree programs.								
Business, Information Technology)	•								

Applied Learning, Applied Research & Applied Technology

Industrial Engineering, B.S.	2	3
Information Technology, B.S.,	7	3
Minor & Certificates; MSIT		
	College of Human and Social Science	es
Criminology, B.A. & Minor	2	2
Elementary Education, B.S.	2	4
Interdisciplinary Social Science, B.A.	1	1
(Cognate – Aging Studies)		
Interdisciplinary Social Science, B.A.	1	1
(Cognate – Communication)		
Interdisciplinary Social Science, B.A.		
(Cognates – Criminology,	Concentrations comprised of cours	ses offered in existing degree programs.
Psychology, Sociology)		
Psychology, B.A. & Minor	2	2
Counselor Education, M.A.	3	1
Educational Leadership, M.Ed.	4	1
Reading Education, M.A.	4	0
Sociology (Minor)	0	2
	College of Applied Arts and New Me	dia
Communication (Minor)	1	1
English/Professional and Technical	1	1
Writing (Minor)		
	Library	
Engineering & IT	1	0
Business	1	0
Education & Social Sciences	1	0

* Information Technology, M.S., approved by USF System Board of Trustees on March 18, 2010; initial delivery fall 2011

The focus in full-time **staff recruitment** is on support for Student Affairs and the Learning Labs/Entrepreneurship areas:

Student Affairs	6	Enrollment Management Specialist, Admissions Evaluator, Student
		Programs Coordinator, Recruiter/Admissions Advisor, Academic Advisor
Learning Labs/	3	Assistant Program Director, Administrative Specialist
Entrepreneurship		
Business, Finance &	2	Fiscal & Business Assistant, Accounting Specialist
Auxiliary Services		

Goal 2: Recruit students locally, nationally, and internationally who are prepared for a polytechnic learning environment, and provide programs and opportunities that enhance student retention and academic, personal, and professional success.

Goal 2 of the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan includes recruitment of students locally, nationally, and internationally who are prepared for a polytechnic learning environment. A comprehensive student recruitment plan is being developed to include regional, state, national and international markets.

Home Campus FTE Enrollment in Current Degree Program Majors Source: USF Data Warehouse Undergraduate Majors	FALL 2009	FALL 2010 Projections based on historical trends and information from USF Polytechnic recruiters and academic advisors
Elementary Education	175	182
Industrial Engineering	11	14
General Business Administration	200	208
Marketing	19	20
Management	18	19
Applied Science	168	175
Psychology	132	137
Information Technology	122	127
Interdisciplinary Social Science	93	97
Criminology	61	63
General Studies	6	18
Non Degree	28	30
Graduate Majors		
Educational Leadership	86	95
Counselor Education	44	48
Reading Education	18	20
Business Administration	17	20
Information Technology (approved by Board of Trustees, March 2010; initial implementation fall 2011)		(Fall 2011) 18

Goal 3: Expand and create academic programs that focus on applied learning, applied research, applied technology, and interdisciplinary approaches in a polytechnic model. Develop and implement new degree programs in five areas of distinction: applied health sciences; mathematics and science education; business and entrepreneurship; manufacturing engineering and technology; and information technology.

USF Polytechnic's academic structure will enable USF Polytechnic, following USF System degree and program approval procedures and SACS and Board of Governors notification and approval requirements, to develop new degree programs in a polytechnic model, including programs in identified economic development industry sectors and in the five areas of distinction identified in Goal 3 of the USFP Strategic Plan. *Examples* of potential future "polytechnic" programs that could be developed, based on faculty hires, budget resources, and faculty interest and commitment are:

College of Technology and Innovation

- B.S. Interdisciplinary Engineering
- B.S. Manufacturing Engineering Technology

- M.S. Manufacturing Engineering
- B.S. Agricultural & Biological Engineering
- B.S. Accounting with Technology Minor
- B.S. Sales Leadership
- B.S. Supply Chain Management

College of Human and Social Sciences

Pre-Pharmacy Program
B.S. Medical Research Technologist
B.S. Nutrition
B.S., M.Ed. Integrated STEM Education (Elementary Track, Secondary Track)
B.S., M.Ed. Technology-Mediated Learning
B.S. Forensic Science/Studies

College of Applied Arts and New Media

- B.A. Digital Arts & Digital Media
- B.S. Communication Sciences & Technologies
- B.A. Architecture
- B.A. Design

Goal 4: Implement the Campus Master Plan and develop a campus infrastructure to support a polytechnic learning and research environment, and develop a stable economic base for continued campus and program development as a polytechnic campus.

In fulfillment of Goal 4, USF Polytechnic has been moving through the planning and approval steps necessary for development of its new campus site at Interstate 4 and the Polk Parkway:

- Completed a Master Plan with update scheduled for completion in October 2009
- Selected an internationally acclaimed architect
- Selected a location for the first facility

The Architect/Engineer RFP included the opportunity to update the existing Master Plan which was developed in 2005-06 and approved by the USF Board of Trustees in 2007. As a result of the RFP process, the campus engaged a world-class architect, Dr. Santiago Calatrava who is a product of several polytechnic universities in Europe. The Master Plan update, scheduled for completion in October 2009, allows for the exposure of the first facility to the millions of annual travelers along Interstate 4 (movement of the location of that facility was approved by the Academic and Campus Environment Workgroup on May 28, 2009, and the full Board of Trustees on June 25, 2009). The first facility will establish an open, multipurpose design in support of the interdisciplinary and collaborative learning environment foundational to a polytechnic experience for our students. It will also focus on sustainability and synergy with the natural environment. This update will be incorporated into the University's 2010 Master Plan update currently being developed.

The site for the campus is currently a green field undeveloped pasture land with no existing amenities or infrastructure (including internal roads, water, electricity, sewers, waste removal, etc.). Access to the site is only available via a 6-mile long construction road. Clearing and construction of infrastructure will begin in late 2010 while Phase I facilities are in design. Construction of Phase I facilities will begin in fall 2011 with a 20-month construction period anticipated, projecting occupancy in summer 2013.

Goal 5: **Develop collaborative public and private partnerships that enhance funding opportunities, including leveraging state and federal funding.** To this end, numerous activities have been underway to encourage and facilitate such partnerships, with a clear understanding of the value of the campus to the future economic growth and development of the region and beyond:

- **Polk County Investment \$11.7 million.** Polk County officials identified the need to reach the site from the East, seeing value in combining efforts with the University by creating synergistic sports opportunities in the county's Lake Myrtle complex and linking them to the campus site (less than 2 miles away). To that end Polk County designed and constructed a four-lane access from Berkeley Road to the Polk Parkway, creating a major entrance gateway to the campus from the east.
- State of Florida Turnpike Authority Investment \$31.9 million; Williams Company \$9.4 million. The Turnpike Authority recognized the need for access to the campus and its surrounding developments via the Polk Parkway. Numerous discussions have taken place over several years resulting in a pledge to create a \$32 million exit interchange at Pace Road from the Polk Parkway. This commitment, along with a project to four-lane the Polk Parkway from Interstate 4 to the Pace Road interchange, resulted in a partnership that included a pledge from the Williams Company toward the project. Construction of this project is currently underway with completion scheduled for fall 2011.
- Florida Department of Transportation Investment \$37.2 million. While the Pace Road and Turnpike projects yielded access to the site from the east, the more pressing concerns from the local host community revolved around access to the property from the west for life-safety responses as well as for access for the largest concentration of constituents for the campus. The Florida Department of Transportation, in concert with the City of Lakeland and the Transportation Planning Council of Polk County, identified the East/West Road project (a 6-mile long road connecting State Road 33 from the west with Pace Road on the east) as their Number 1 priority for this year. Construction of this project is currently underway with expected completion by December 2011.
- PECO State Funds \$31.2 million (received) and additional \$35 million anticipated in 2010; CITF funds of \$390,000; Investments from Private Sources \$11.7 million with anticipated FECG match and \$10 million not eligible for FECG match. These funds will build the first facility on the campus (Phase I), the Science, Innovation & Technology Building as well as contribute toward the overall campus infrastructure. The estimated total cost of the first facility is \$62 million, and the estimated total cost of the infrastructure is \$32 million.
- PECO request \$5 million (on current CIP listing); Private Investment \$5 million (pledged over 3 years, first year received) eligible for FECG match. These funds will build the Interdisciplinary Center for Wellness Education and Research, a multi-purpose facility exemplifying the ideal blend of Town and Gown, bringing the general public and the campus community together around wellness issues, education and research.
- **Private Investment \$1 million (received).** These funds will be used toward construction of the campus' Business Incubator and Applied Learning Lab.

New Strategic Plan 2012-2018

A new strategic planning process for the development of a strategic plan for 2012-2018 is planned for 2011-2012 with completion of a new strategic plan targeted for spring 2012.

2. Budget Planning

USF Polytechnic, as each campus in the USF System, follows a Legislative Budget Request process, coordinated by the USF System Senior Vice President for Business & Finance and CFO and facilitated at USF Polytechnic by the Executive Director of Finance and Administration. The LBR is intended to be need-based and to provide flexibility for the Board of Governors and the USF System Board of Trustees to jointly manage the system to meet the critical needs of the state, achieve the statewide goals and objectives of the State University System (SUS) Strategic Plan, address specific institutional needs, and demonstrate accountability/justification.

In March 2009 the Board of Governors approved and distributed the **Legislative Budget Request (LBR) Guidelines for 2010-2011 [CR2.5-14]**. The following goals/objectives of the SUS Strategic Plan were highlighted:

- 1. Access to and production of degrees
- 2. Meeting statewide professional and workforce needs
- 3. Building world-class academic programs and research capacity
- 4. Meeting community needs and fulfilling unique institutional missions

The SUS system goals and objectives, as well as institutional goals and initiatives outlined in University Compacts, should be incorporated into the following priorities, which will be reflected in the LBR:

Operating and Specialized Program Funds

- 1. Continuing costs associated with existing
- 2. Access to and production of degrees
- 3. Global Competitiveness
- 4. Task Force Reports and Studies
- 5. Shared System Resources

The timeline for submission of LBR requests for operating funds is:

- March: The Board of Governors approves the LBR Policy Guidelines
- May June: Chancellor works with Universities to develop system LBR issues
- July: Board of Governors' staff reviews and prepares operating LBR; Continue discussions with universities
- August: Board of Governors approves the operating LBR
- October: LBR is submitted to the Governor and Legislature

Fixed Capital Outlay Funds

1. PECO funding for Remodeling/Renovation/Maintenance/Repair

2. The University's approved Five Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) will be prioritized, in the first year, as indicated below. Any exceptions to these priorities must be justified. Each university should submit one and only one prioritized, sequentially numbered list.

The timeline for submission of LBR requests for operating funds is:

- March: The BOG approves the LBR Policy Guidelines.
- April: Chancellor provides technical instructions and requests universities to submit their Five-Year Capital Improvement Plans to include proposed projects and authorizations.
- May: BOG staff will review with University designee(s) the draft CIPs.
- August: Universities' BOT submit Five-Year Capital Improvement Plans.
- September: BOG approval of the Fixed Capital Outlay LBR.
- October: Fixed Capital Outlay LBR is submitted to the Governor and Legislature.
- December: Universities submit amended Fixed Capital Outlay requests to BOG.
- January: BOG approval of amended FCO requests.
- March: If necessary, potential PECO amendments to reflect March PECO Revenue Estimating Conference allocations.

USF Polytechnic's LBRs are developed based on the campus strategic plan, enrollment growth plan, and other goals and objectives for campus initiatives that are aligned with the Board of Governors goals and objectives.

The LBR is approved by the USF Polytechnic Campus Board and forwarded to the USF System Board of Trustees for submission with the other campuses' LBRs to the Board of Governors for its consideration for adoption in the development of the overall LBR for the enter State University System. The Governor presents his budget to the Legislature in February for consideration; the Legislature meets in March to adopt an appropriations bill. The Governor approves and signs the General Appropriations Bill into law in June.

Operating Budget Development Process

In March, the USF System Budget and Policy Analysis Office prepares operating budget development guidelines which provide a timeline [CR2.5-15a 2010-11 Operating Budget Timeline], ledger input procedures [CR2.5-15b, Instructions for Budget Ledger Input], and budget upload instructions [CR2.5-15c Budget Upload Process Instructions]. Budget procedures and forms are discussed at bi-weekly Budget Council meetings and are posted on the USF Budget and Policy Analysis webpage [see CR2.5-16 link below].

The development and preparation of the operating budget at USF Polytechnic involves many campus units. The Executive Director of Finance and Administration is responsible for working with the USF Budget and Policy Analysis Office timeline and procedures. **Campus budget units prepare** their **Operating Budget Request [CR2.5-17a], Other Capital Outlay (OCO) Projects Request [CR2.5-17b] and Foundation Funding Requests [CR2.5-17c]** in May, as well as a **Recruitment Plan [CR2.5-17d],** in June. Budget unit directors are responsible for aligning their unit requests with the Strategic Goals and Objectives of the campus strategic plan as reflected in the unit action plans. The Executive Director of Finance and Administration reviews all budget requests with the unit directors to ensure funds requested support the strategic plan. The Campus Operating Budget is developed from the unit operating budget requests, in addition to campus-wide priorities. The Campus Operating Budget is reviewed and approved by the Executive Council. The Regional Chancellor presents the recommended Operating Budget to the USF Polytechnic Campus Board for approval. The approved Campus Operating Budget is submitted to the USF System Budget and Policy Analysis Office for inclusion in the overall USF System Operating Budget that is approved by the USF System Board of Trustees.

Throughout the year budget unit directors monitor the budget revenues and expenditures. The Executive Director of Finance and Administration provides quarterly reports to the USF System Budget Council and the Campus Board.

USF Polytechnic Budget Controls	2007-2008	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12 Estimated
	2007 2000	2000 05	2005 10	2010 11	Listinuted
General Revenue	10,539,947	9,538,939	9,297,681	12,527,511	22,527,511
General Revenue - Special Appropriations			5,000,000	10,000,000	
General Revenue – Non-recurring				90,500	
Lottery	35,944	349,647	237,361	439,620	439,620
Federal Stimulus – Education non-recurring			662,401	678,080	
Federal Stimulus - Discretionary			46,255		
Tuition (Authority)	2,573,208	2,778,444	3,292,846	3,945,515	4,641,782
TOTAL CONTROL BUDGET WITHOUT REDUCTIONS	13,149,099	12,667,030	18,536,544	27,681,226	27,608,913
Reduction – General Revenue/Lottery			(1,458,468)		
TOTAL OPERATING CONTROL BUDGET	13,149,099	12,667,030	17,078,076	27,681,226	27,608,913
Additional Budget Controls					
General Revenue – Allocation for College of Pharmacy				6,000,000	6,000,000
Phosphate Research Trust Fund (FIPRI)				7,312,164	7,312,164
Excess Tuition Authority			1,776,155	1,457,406	1,139,343
TOTAL BUDGET CONTROL	13,149,099	12,667,030	18,854,231	42,450,796	42,060,420

Below are the budget control totals provided by the Executive Director as of July 14, 2010:

While the economy of the State of Florida continues to be in decline and with the Florida Legislature in current discussions of the state budget, the projected 2011-2012 budget for USF Polytechnic is sufficient to continue delivery of academic programs and services at the level anticipated.

3. A description of the research component which supports the planning and evaluation processes.

The Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning (IREP) has primary responsibility for analyzing and interpreting data about the performance and environment of USF Polytechnic in achieving

its mission; transforming data into information for decision-support, policy analysis and planning; and communicating institutional information to the USF Polytechnic community. The IREP Office also supports and maintains records for accreditation by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and other professional accreditation organizations.

The Director of IREP reports to the Regional Chancellor, and serves on the campus Executive Council. The position provides overall leadership and direction for the Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning unit which includes personnel in Statistical and Data Analysis, Outcomes Assessment, and Faculty Academic Services. The position is responsible for coordination with the USF System Associate Vice President for Decision Support and Academic Budgets in all matters pertaining to the coordination of data integrity, management and reporting for assessment of the effectiveness of the University of South Florida System in achieving its mission. The position also coordinates with USF Polytechnic organizational units for administration, implementation, oversight and accountability for strategic plan outcomes assessment.

IREP compiles data for regular reporting for the USF System Office of Decision Support and IPEDS. The following table illustrates the types of data reports generated by IREP; examples are provided as well **[CR2.5-18a-m]**:

Data Collection and Reporting by the Office of Ir	stitutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning
Type of Data/Function	Example of Report
Outcomes Assessment/Data Management	Academic Learning Compacts [See CS3.3.1
	Institutional Effectiveness]
	Report of Administrative & Academic Support Unit
	Assessments 2008-2009 [CR2.5-18a]
	MAPP Results and Summary Analysis [See C.S.3.5.1
	College-level Competencies]
Ad Hoc/Planning or Research Support	USFP Service Area Population 2003-2030 [CR2.5-
	18b]
	Faculty Demographic Tables [CR2.5-18c]
BOG Annual Report and Work Plan/Identify Data and	 USF Annual Report to the BOG 12-09 [CR2.5-8]
Draft Plan	• 2010 USF Polytechnic SUS Work Plan [CR2.5-18d]
	USF Annual Report to the BOG 12-10 [CR2.5-9]
Employment and Continuing Education Data/FETPIP	• 2007 FETPIP Summary Analysis Report [See FR4.1
Summary Analysis	Student Achievement]
Enrollment/Comparisons	DropAdd Spring 2009 Comparison to Spring 2008
	[CR2.5-18e]
	Spring 2009 First Day Comparison to Spring 2008
Even llux and /Data Marification	[CR2.5-18f]
Enrollment /Data Verification	• E-Profiles Academic Year 2008-2009, 2009-2010
Francillas ant /Ducie ations	[See CR2.5-18g below]
Enrollment/Projections	Board of Governors Enrollment Growth Plan
Freedland at /Device was Foregoeting	Projections, June 2009 [CR2.5-18h]
Enrollment/Revenue Forecasting	Revenue Projections BOG Report 6-09 [CR2.5-18i]
IPEDS Data/Electronic Reporting	IPEDS Reporting [CR2.5-18j]
	IPEDS Data Feedback Report 2010 [CR2.5-18k]
Student Perception/Perspective	Graduating Student Survey [See CS3.5.1 College
	Level Competencies]
	Climate Survey USF Poly ALL Students 2008

	[CR2.5-18I] Climate Survey USF Poly Home Campus Students 2008 [CR2.5-18m]
Unit Action Plans and Annual Reports/Process and	Administrative and Academic Support Unit Action
Document Management	Plans and Annual Reports [See CS3.3.1 Institutional
	Effectiveness]

4. Identification of who is responsible for ensuring that the planning and evaluation processes function systematically.

Kevin Calkins, Director [CR2.5-19a K.Calkins Resume] Richard Kevan, Statistical and Data Analyst [CR2.5-19b R. Kevan Resume] Dr. Judith Ponticell, Regional Vice Chancellor, Assessment & Accountability [CR2.5-19c, J. Ponticell CV]

5. Calendar of Campus Planning & Reporting Processes

All academic, student affairs and administrative units participate in campus planning and reporting processes. A calendar of campus planning and reporting activities for the period 2008-2012 follows:

USF Polytechnic Calendar of Campus Planning & Reporting 2008-2012

	1	r					r	
	Unit	Unit	Regional	Campus	BOG	BOG	LBR	Campus
	Strategic	Calendar	Vice	Compact	Annual	Work	Budget	Operating
	Plan	Year	Chancellor	Plan	Report	Plan	Planning	Budget
	Action	Annual	Academic					Planning
	Plan &	Reports	Affairs					
	Updates		Annual					
			Report					
August								
September				2008				
October								
November								
December					2009			
					2010			
					2011			
					2012			
January								
February		2009		Now the				
-		2010						
		2011		BOG				
		2012		Annual Report				
March			2009	and Work				
			2010	Plan				
			2011	Pidli				
			2012					
April						2009	2009	2009
						2010	2010	2010

				2011 2012	2011 2012	2011 2012
May						
June	2008					
	2010					
	2012					

6. A copy of the institution's master (or strategic) plan, including the institutional goals and an indication of how the plan relates specifically to the purpose of the institution.

The USF System Board of Trustees approved the USF Lakeland 2007-2012 Strategic Plan in September 2007, and on July 1, 2008 references to USF Lakeland in the Strategic Plan were changed to USF Polytechnic to reflect its establishment by Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic [see CR2.5-11, USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012].

The USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan was reviewed and updated for the USF Board of Trustees, with the Update of the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan [see CR2.5-12] provided to the USF Board of Trustees and approved on October 27, 2009 [see Minutes of the Board of Trustees, CR2.5-13]. The update describes the progress that the campus has made toward reaching its stated goals within the Strategic Plan and to outline future initiatives that will be targeted so as to meet additional goals based on available resources and accreditation standards.

The strategic goals of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan are aligned with the campus vision and mission:

Vision and Mission	Strategic Goals		
Vision 2012: The University of South Florida Polytechnic will be a premier destination campus for applied learning, research, and innovative technology. Our students and graduates will inspire and lead change, locally and internationally.	 Goal 1. Recruit, develop, and retain world-class practitioner scholars with capacity to deliver the polytechnic vision in teaching, research, and community engagement and impact. Goal 2. Recruit students locally, nationally, and internationally who are prepared for a polytechnic learning environment, and provide programs and opportunities that enhance student retention and academic, personal, and professional success. 		
	Goal 4. Implement the Campus Master Plan and develop a campus infrastructure to support a polytechnic learning and research environment, and develop a stable economic base for continued campus and program development as a polytechnic campus.		
Mission: The University of South Florida Polytechnic is committed to excellence in interdisciplinary and applied learning; to the application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs; and to	Goal 3. Expand and create academic programs that focus on applied learning, applied research, applied technology, and interdisciplinary approaches in a polytechnic model.		

collaborative partnerships that support economic,	Goal 5. Develop collaborative public and private
social, and community development.	partnerships that enhance funding opportunities,
	including leveraging state and federal funding.

7. A copy of the plan for the upkeep of property; the comprehensive safety plan; the current facilities master plan; and the financial plan.

The **2005-2015 Campus Master Plan for USF Lakeland [CR2.5-20 or hard copy in binder]** was approved by the University Board of Trustees in 2006. Reductions in total funding and a multi-year staging of allocations delayed the beginning of the project.

In 2008 the Florida Legislature passed SB 186 creating Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic establishing the University of South Florida Polytechnic, a separate organizational and budget entity of USF. The differentiation of mission caused a review and update of the 2005-2015 Campus Master Plan, provided to the USF System Board of Trustees on December 3, 2009 [CR2.5-21a, 2010-2020 Master Plan Update, or hard copy in binder]. The update was approved [CR2.5-21b Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes 12-3-09].

The current campus facilities at 3433 Winter Lake Rd., Lakeland, FL are jointly shared with Polk State College, the primary owner of the site and facilities. Polk State College is responsible for the maintenance and security of the campus. USF Polytechnic's Regional Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning and Facilities Operations, as well as the Facilities Manager, meets with Polk State College's Facilities Department monthly to review Polk State College's plans for construction, maintenance or repair and potential impact on USF Polytechnic's programs, services, personnel, activities and events.

USF Polytechnic's Office of Campus Planning and Facilities Operations provides leadership for planning and development of campus facilities, oversight of campus facilities operations, and leadership and compliance oversight for campus safety and security. Security Officers are employed by Polk State College. They are on duty 24 hours-a-day, 7 days a week. Security Officers perform primarily information and advisory duties, rather than regulatory duties. They patrol and monitor activity throughout the campus and coordinate with PSC and USFP facilities staff for inspection and maintenance of locks, doors, lights and alarms. Security officers are also available to escort students, faculty and staff to their vehicles at night if requested. While Security Officers cannot make arrests, they work closely with local law enforcement agencies when needed. The Polk County Sherriff's Office Sub-Station is located adjacent to campus, less than one-minute away. **Polk State College's Annual Security Report 2010 [CR2.5-22]** is posted on their website. USF Polytechnic does maintain its own **Campus Emergency Operations Plan [CR2.5-23, hard copy only].**

Financial Plan. As part of a report submitted to the Board of Governors in June 2009, a **2008-2015 USFP Campus Budget Projection [CR2.5-24]** was prepared. In addition more detailed **Enrollment Projections [CR2.5-25a]** and **Revenue Projections based on Enrollment Projections [CR2.5-25b]** were prepared at the same time.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.5-1] Unit Action Planning Template

[CR2.5-2] Report of Administrative & Academic Support Unit Assessments 2008-2009

- [CR2.5-3] Unit Annual Reporting Template
- [CR2.5-4] Unit Annual Report Example
- [CR2.5-5] USF Polytechnic Compact Plan for 2008-2009
- [CR2.5-6] Board of Governors Regulation 2.002 University Work Plans and Annual Report
- [CR2.5-7] Board of Governors Regulation 7.001 Tuition and Associated Fees
- [CR2.5-8] 2009 Annual Report to the Board of Governors for the USF Campuses and USF System
- [CR2.5-9] 2010 Annual Report to the Board of Governors for the USF System and the USF Campuses
- [CR2.5-10a] Faculty Phase 1 Hiring Plan for 2009-2010 Recruitment
- [CR2.5-10b] Faculty Phase 2 Hiring Plan for 2010-2011 Recruitment
- [CR2.5-11] USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan 2007-2012
- [CR2.5-12] Update of the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan, October 27, 2009
- [CR2.5-13] Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, October 27, 2009
- [CR2.5-14] Legislative Budget Request (LBR) Guidelines for 2010-2011
- [CR2.5-15a-c] 2010-2011 Operating Budget Timeline and Procedures CR2.5-15a 2010-2011 Operating Budget Timeline CR2.5-15b Instructions for Budget Ledger Input CR2.5-15c Budget Upload Process Instructions

[CR2.5-16] USF Budget and Policy Analysis web page: http://usfweb2.usf.edu/bpa/

[CR2.5-17a-d] Operating Budget Request (a), Other Capital Outlay (OCO) Projects Request (b), Foundation Funding Request (c), and Recruitment Plan (d)

CR2.5-17a Operating Budget Request
CR2.5-17b Other Capital Outlay (OCO) Projects Request
CR2.5-17c Foundation Funding Request
CR2.5-17d Recruitment Plan

- [CR2.5-18a-m] IREP types of data reports
 - o Report of Administrative & Academic Support Unit Assessments 2008-2009 [CR2.5-18a]
 - USFP Service Area Population 2003-2030 [CR2.5-18b]
 - Faculty Demographic Tables [CR2.5-18c]

- 2010 USF Polytechnic SUS Work Plan [CR2.5-18d]
- DropAdd Spring 2009 Comparison to Spring 2008 [CR2.5-18e]
- Spring 2009 First Day Comparison to Spring 2008 [CR2.5-18f]
- E-Profiles website http://usfweb3.usf.edu/eprofiles/default.aspx [CR2.5-18g]
- o Board of Governors Enrollment Growth Plan Projections, June 2009 [CR2.5-18h]
- Revenue Projections BOG Report 6-09 [CR2.5-18i]
- IPEDS Reporting Example [CR2.5-18j] http://usfweb3.usf.edu/INFOCENTER/?silverheader=5&report_category=SUR&report_typ e=IPEDS
- IPEDS Data Feedback Report 2010 [CR2.5-18k]
- o Climate Survey USF Poly ALL Students 2008 [CR2.5-18I]
- Climate Survey USF Poly Home Campus Students 2008 [CR2.5-18m]
- [CR2.5-19a] Kevin Calkins Résumé
- [CR2.5-19b] Richard Kevan, Résumé
- [CR2.5-19c] Dr. Judith Ponticell, CV
- [CR2.5-20] 2005-2015 Campus Master Plan for USF Lakeland
- [CR2.5-21a] 2010-2020 Master Plan Update, December 3, 2009
- [CR2.5-21b] Board of Trustees Meeting Minutes, December 3, 2009
- [CR2.5-22] Annual Security Report 2010 Polk State College
- [CR2.5-23] USF Polytechnic Campus Emergency Operations Plan, hard copy only
- [CR2.5-24] 2008-2015 USFP Campus Budget Projection
- [CR2.5-25a-b] 2008-2015 Enrollment and Revenue Projections 6-09 [CR2.5-25a] 2008-2015 Enrollment Projections [CR2.5-25b] Revenue Projections based on Enrollment Projections 6-09

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.6: Continuous Operation

The institution is in operation and has students enrolled in degree programs.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. A list of programs and the number of students enrolled in each program.

USF Polytechnic offers nine bachelor's degree programs and five master's degree programs. The following chart lists the degree programs offered at USF Polytechnic, the number of home campus students in each program in Fall 2011, and the number of full-time faculty assigned to each program.

USF Polytechnic Degree Programs, Students in Majors and Full-time Faculty FALL 2011

Degree Program	Program Code in USF INFOCENTER	TOTAL	Number of Full-time Faculty		
College of Human & Social Sciences					
Counselor Education, M.A.	HTAGC	23	4		
Criminology, B.A.	НТССЈ	64	5		
Applied Science, B.S.A.S. Criminal Justice concentration	TTACJ	23	Students take courses offered in the B.A. Criminology Program		
Educational Leadership, M.Ed.	HTCAS	66	4		
Elementary Education, B.S.	HTBEE	62	9, including Special Education (1), Early Childhood/Psychology & Social Foundations (1), Mathematics Education (1), Science Education (1), ESOL (1)		
Applied Science, B.S.A.S. Early Childhood Development concentration	TTAEC	20	1, some courses are offered in the B.S. Elementary Education Program		
Interdisciplinary Social Science, B.A.	HTISS	69	Students take cognates from coursework offered in Aging Studies (3), Criminology (5), Psychology (4) & Sociology (2)		
Psychology, B.A.	HTPSY	81	4		
Reading Education, M.A.	HTARD	20	4, two faculty also teach in Elementary Education		
	College of Techno	logy & Innovation			
General Business Administration, B.A./B.S.	TTGBA	45	11		

Management concentration in B.S./B.A. General Business Administration	TTMAN	14	4
Marketing concentration in B.S./B.A. General Business Administration	ттмкт	20	4
MBA	TTBUS	19	8
Industrial Engineering, BSIE	TTEIE	17	4
Applied Science, B.S.A.S. Industrial Operations concentration	ΤΤΑΙΟ	3	Students take courses offered in the B.S Industrial Engineering Program
Information Technology, BSIT	ттітс	70	9
Applied Science, B.S.A.S. Information Technology concentration	ТТАТС	47	Students take courses offered in the B.S. Information Technology Program
Applied Science, B.S.A.S. Leadership Studies concentration	TTALS	1	Courses are taught by full- time professional staff in Student Affairs

Source: USF INFOCENTER, Unduplicated Headcount

NARRATIVE:

The University of South Florida was founded in 1956 as the first public university established specifically to address the needs of Florida's rapidly emerging urban regions. In 1982 the Florida Legislature authorized funds to begin planning for a USF campus in Lakeland, after demand for a new educational facility in the region had been established. The USF Lakeland Center was established in 1988, providing a limited range of instructional programs or courses to citizens of Polk, Highlands, Hardee and eastern Hillsborough counties. In December 1993 the Lakeland Center was officially reclassified as a Branch Campus **[CR2.6-1, Letter of Notification USF Lakeland Branch Campus Status]** and has been in operation ever since.

In Fall 2006 1,048 students attended USF Lakeland as their "home campus" [CR2.6-2, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2006] while 1,441 students were enrolled in courses funded by USF Polytechnic [CR2.6-3, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2006].

In Fall 2007 1,143 students attended USF Lakeland as their "home campus" [CR2.6-4, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2007] while 1,612 students were enrolled in courses funded by USF Polytechnic [CR2.6-5, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2007].

In 2008 the Florida Legislature passed SB 186 creating **Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic [CR2.6-6]**, renaming USF Lakeland as the University of South Florida Polytechnic, effective July 1, 2008.

In Fall 2008 1,291 students declared USF Polytechnic as their "home campus" [CR2.6-7, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2008] while 2,319 students were enrolled in courses funded by USF Polytechnic [CR2.6-8, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2008].

In Fall 2009 1,299 students declared USF Polytechnic as their "home campus **[CR2.6-9, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2009]** while 2,346 students were enrolled in courses funded by USF Polytechnic **[CR2.6-10, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2009]**.

In Fall 2010 1,269 students declared USF Polytechnic as their "home campus **[CR2.6-11, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2010]**; 2,191 students were enrolled in courses funded by USF Polytechnic **[CR2.6-12, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2010]**.

In Fall 2011 1,320 students declared USF Polytechnic as their "home campus **[CR2.6-13, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2011]**; 2,514 students were enrolled in courses funded by USF Polytechnic **[CR2.6-14, USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2011]**.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.6-1] Letter of Notification USF Lakeland Branch Campus Status

[CR2.6-2] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2006

[CR2.6-3] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2006

[CR2.6-4] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2007

[CR2.6-5] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2007

[CR2.6-6] Florida Statute 1004.345 University of South Florida Polytechnic

[CR2.6-7] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2008

[CR2.6-8] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2008

[CR2.6-9] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2009

[CR2.6-10] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2009

[CR2.6-11] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2010

[CR2.6-12] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2010

[CR2.6-13] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount Fall 2011

[CR2.6-14] USF Polytechnic Student Headcount by Funding Campus Fall 2011

Part B - Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.7

2.7.1 Program Length

The institution offers one or more degree programs based on at least 60 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the associate level; at least 120 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the baccalaureate level; or at least 30 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the post-baccalaureate, graduate, or professional level. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification for all degrees that include fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Identification of number of hours required for degree programs.

Degree Program	Number of Semester Credit Hours Required			
Undergraduate Degrees				
Applied Science, B.S. with concentrations in Criminal Justice, Early Childhood Development, Industrial Operations, Information Technology and Leadership Studies	120			
Criminology, B.A.	120			
Elementary Education, B.S.	120			
General Business Administration, B.S./B.A. with concentrations in Accounting, Finance, Management and Marketing	120			
General Studies, B.G.S. with concentrations in Aging Studies, General Business and Information Technology	120			
Industrial Engineering, B.S.	128			
Information Technology, B.S.	120			
Interdisciplinary Social Science, B.A. with concentrations in Aging Studies/Gerontology, Communication, Criminology, Psychology and Sociology	120			
Psychology, B.A.	120			
Graduate	Degrees			
Counselor Education, M.A.	60-63			
Educational Leadership, M.Ed.	36			
Reading Education, M.A.	36			
Master of Business Administration, M.B.A.	37-48			
Information Technology, M.S.	36			

Baccalaureate Degrees

All of the baccalaureate degrees offered by USF Polytechnic meet the minimum requirement of at least 120 semester credit hours. **Florida Statute 1007.25(8)** [CR2.71-1] indicates the following:

(8) A baccalaureate degree program shall require no more than 120 semester hours of college credit, including 36 semester hours of general education coursework, unless prior approval has been granted by the Board of Governors for baccalaureate degree programs offered by state universities and by the State Board of Education for baccalaureate degree programs offered by community colleges.

USF System basic requirements for a baccalaureate degree completion of at least 120 semester hours with an overall 2.00 GPA, including a 2.00 GPA on all courses attempted at the University of South Florida [CR2.71-2, USF System Regulation 3.007, Graduation Requirements – Undergraduate, (2)].

Graduate (Master's) Degrees

All of the master's degrees meet the minimum requirement of at least 30 semester credit hours. USF System minimum requirements for the master's degree are a minimum of thirty (30) hours, at least sixteen (16) hours of which must be at the 6000 level. At least twenty (20) hours must be in formal, regularly scheduled course work, ten (10) of which must be at the 6000 level. Up to six (6) hours of 4000-level courses may be taken as part of a planned degree program. Additional graduate credit may be earned in 4000-level courses only if specifically approved by the appropriate College Dean. Students enrolled in undergraduate courses as part of a planned degree program are expected to demonstrate a superior level of performance. Graduate students may not enroll for more than 18 hours in any semester without written permission from the College Dean [CR2.71-3, USF System Regulation 3.009 Graduate Degree Requirements; and CR2.7.1-4 Graduate Catalog, Section 8 "Master's Degree Requirements"].

2. A justification and rationale for program equivalency <u>if appropriate</u> for the length of degrees.

USF Polytechnic does not use a unit other than semester credit hours.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.71-1] Florida Statute 1007.25 General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements

[CR2.71-2] USF System Regulation 3.007, Graduation Requirements – Undergraduate

[CR2.71-3] USF System Regulation 3.009 Graduate Degree Requirements

[CR2.7.1-4] Graduate Catalog, Section 8 "Master's Degree Requirements"

Part B - Documentation of Compliance

Core Requirement 2.7

2.7.2 Program Content

The institution offers degree programs that embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with its stated purpose and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education.

 \square Compliance \square Partial Compliance \square Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

3. Demonstration that degree programs are appropriate to the institution's mission.

Degree programs at the University of South Florida are in disciplines classified as postsecondary in the United States Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) [CR2.7.2-1]. The CIP provides a taxonomic scheme that supports the accurate tracking, assessment, and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity (p. iii). It is the accepted federal government statistical standard on instructional program classifications (see list of USF System degree program CIP codes [CR2.7.2-2, USF Degree Programs by Location August 2011]).

USF System Policy 10-036 Authorization of New Degree Programs [CR2.7.2-3] requires that new degree program proposals meet the criteria listed in BOG Regulation 8.011 New Academic Program Authorization [CR2.7.2-4] and be prepared in accordance with the common state university new degree proposal format. Proposals are reviewed and approved by appropriate institutional/campus committees (e.g., USF Polytechnic Academic and Student Affairs Council, USFP Executive Council); by the campus Senate (e.g., USFP Faculty Senate Undergraduate or Graduate Council); by the USFP Campus Board; and by appropriate USF System Councils (e.g., Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council), prior to submission to the Board of Trustees Academic and Campus Environment (ACE) Work Group which reviews and recommends for approval, if appropriate, to the USF Board of Trustees.

The **Florida Board of Governors New Degree Program Proposal Form (IB) [CR2.7.2-5]** requires that the proposed new program demonstrate its consistency with the current State University System (SUS) Strategic Planning Goals, identifying specifically which goals the program will directly support and which goals the program will indirectly support. In addition, the form requires a description of how the goals of the proposed program relate to the institutional mission statement (6A). Furthermore, the form (IIA) requires a description of national, state, and/or local data that support the need for the program.

Degree programs offered by USF Polytechnic are consistent with its mission [CR2.7.2-6, USF Polytechnic 2007-2012 Strategic Plan]:

The University of South Florida Polytechnic is committed to excellence in interdisciplinary and applied learning; to the application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs; and to collaborative partnerships that support economic, social, and community development.
In 2008, the Central Florida Development Council hired SRI International, an independent research firm, to conduct a detailed analysis of the region's current economic strengths and opportunities. The resulting "cluster analysis" study identified seven industry sectors that were already represented in the regional economy and primed for future growth. These areas were: research and engineering services; logistics and supply chain management; life science and medical services; education and government; construction and real estate; business and financial services; and agriculture and agritechnology **[CR2.7.2-7, SRI International Study]**.

Five of the seven industry clusters map to degree programs currently offered at USF Polytechnic as illustrated in the table below:

Industry Cluster	Current USF Polytechnic Degree Program
Business & Financial Services	BGS, General Business
	BS/BA, General Business Administration
	MBA
Education & Government	BSAS, Leadership Studies
	BSAS, Criminal Justice
	BA, Criminology
	BA, Interdisciplinary Social Science
	BSAS, Early Childhood Development
	MA, Counselor Education
	MEd, Educational Leadership
	MA, Reading Education
	BS, Elementary Education
Life Science & Medical Services	BA, Interdisciplinary Social Science
	BA Psychology
Logistics & Supply Chain Management	BSAS, Industrial Operations
	BS, Industrial Engineering
Research & Engineering Services	BS, Information Technology
	BSAS, BGS Information Technology
	MS, Information Technology

The industry clusters also provide opportunity for growth and development of new degree programs that leverage the region's economic strengths and opportunities and align with polytechnic values in interdisciplinary and applied learning, application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs, and collaborative partnerships that support economic, social, and community development. New degrees in such fields as agricultural and biological engineering, entrepreneurship and venture planning, supply chain management, cyber crime and safety, forensic studies, nutrition, health information technology, health informatics, medical research technology, integrative STEM education, technology-mediated learning, interdisciplinary engineering, for example, would well support the mission of a polytechnic and the economic development of the region.

A Distinctive Mission

The USF Polytechnic **2007-2012 Strategic Plan** expanded the regional campus' vision beyond its local service area, focusing on transition to a destination campus with a polytechnic mission. The Business Plan: A New Polytechnic University in Florida [see HIST6A] presented to the Board of Governors on

November 9, 2011 outlines a three phase program development plan. A thoughtful, deliberative analysis, informed by national sources, identified new programs that would rapidly build the polytechnic model in Florida. Resources were consulted to gain both a regional and state perspective, as well as a national perspective, on STEM fields, typical paths to STEM job, educational attainment of STEM workers, employment projections, and worker earnings.

Since 2008, degree programs offered at 10 other universities, nine of which are "polytechnic" by institutional name and one "institute of technology", have been regularly reviewed: Arizona State University Polytechnic Campus; California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo; Georgia Institute of Technology; Polytechnic Institute of New York University; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Southern Polytechnic State University; University of Wisconsin – Stout; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; and Worcester Polytechnic Institute. Analysis of the degrees provided insight into fields of study, department and college structures, levels of degrees offered, and similarities and differences in relation to planned degree offerings at a new polytechnic university. In addition, the analysis provided an overview of the proportion of degrees that were in STEM fields and STEM-related professions and those that were liberal arts in nature.

	Percent of Degrees in	Percent of Degrees in	Percent of Degrees in
	STEMFields	STEM-related	Liberal Arts Fields
		Professional Fields	
Arizona State	54%	34%	12%
Cal Poly Pomona	41%	27%	32%
Cal Poly San Luis	F C 9/	23%	21%
Obispo	56%	23%	21%
Georgia Tech	70%	20%	10%
NYU Polytechnic	71%	19%	10%
Rensselaer	66%	17%	17%
Southern Poly	65%	21%	14%
U Wisconsin-Stout	26%	52%	22%
Virginia Tech	38%	41%	21%
Worcester	73%	9%	18%
Mean Distribution	56%	26%	18%
USF Polytechnic	29%	57%	14%
NEW UNIVERSITY	55%	35%	10%

Distribution of Degree Programs in STEM, STEM-related Professions, and Liberal Arts Fields

Benchmarks established by the Board of Governors for USF Polytechnic to achieve, in order to be reviewed for final approval as the 12th university in the State University System attainment of a minimum FTE of 1,244 with a minimum 50% of the FTE in STEM and 20% of the FTE in STEM-related programs.

The Business Plan: A New Polytechnic University in Florida also included a two phase program development plan [see HIST6b]. As USF Polytechnic enters into its strategic planning process for

development of the 2012-2018 strategic plan, this benchmark and curriculum development plan will drive academic program planning:

Phase I Programs

Accounting& Financial Management, BS Alternative Energy, MS Biological Sciences, BS Business Administration, BS/MBA Accelerated Program Dietetics & Nutritional Science, BS, MS Digital Design & Technology, BS Health Information Technology, BS Informatics, BS, MS Integrated STEM Education, MS Law Enforcement Science & Technology, BS Software Engineering, BS Systems Engineering, BS, MS Technology & Innovation Management, BS, MS

Phase II Programs

Applied Economics & Public Policy, BS Animal Sciences, BS Applied Mathematics & Statistics, MS Applied Psychology, BS Architectural Engineering & Design, BS Biochemistry, BS Chemistry, BS Clinical Laboratory/Medical Research Technology, BS Cultural Resource Administration & Policy, BS Cyber Security & Safety, MS Design& Applied Arts, BS Elementary Mathematics & Science Education, BS Engineering Psychology, BS Financial Engineering & Risk Management, MS Food Science, Production & Technology, BS Forensic Science/Studies, MS Green Technology Management, MS Health Promotion & Education, MS Human Factors Integration, MS Language& Global Culture Studies, BS Learning Psychology, MS Logistics& Supply Chain Management, MS Mathematics, BS Mobile Technologies, MS Modeling& Simulation, MS Pharmaceutical Sciences, BS Photonics/Optics, MS Physics, BS

Recreational Therapy, MS Secondary Mathematics & Science Education, BS Systems Engineering, PhD Talent Management, MS Technology-Mediated Learning, MAT, MEd Veterinary Biomedical & Clinical Sciences, MS

Peer Institutions

To guide our development as a polytechnic from 2012 - 2018, we have selected *three developmental peers*: Arizona State University's Polytechnic Campus in Mesa, AZ; Southern Polytechnic State University, Marietta, GA; and the University of Wisconsin Stout Campus in Menomonie, WI. We have also selected *three aspirational peers*: California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; and Virginia Polytechnic & State University (Virginia Tech). Below is a comparison of degrees offered by USF Polytechnic and degrees offered at peer institutions, indicating that in some ways we are consistent with other "polytechs" and in others we can develop distinctiveness of programming among our peers.

Comparison of USE Pol	lytechnic Current Degree	s Offered and Pe	er Institution D	egrees Offered
	y comme can one begied	S Officied and i c		Sices offered

USF Polytechnic	Arizona State	Southern	University	California	Rensselaer	Virginia
Degrees	University's	Polytechnic	of	Polytechnic	Polytechnic	Polytechnic
	Polytechnic	State	Wisconsin	State	Institute	& State
	Campus	University	Stout	University in		University
			Campus	San Luis		
				Obispo		
Applied Science,	x		x		х	
B.S.	~		Â		X	
Criminology, B.A.						
Elementary	X			х		х
Education, B.S.	~			~		~
General Business						
Administration,			Х	Х		
B.S.						
General Studies,						
B.G.S.						
Industrial				х	х	х
Engineering, B.S.				^	~	~
Information			x			
Technology, B.S.			~			
Interdisciplinary						
Social Science,						
B.A.						
Management, B.S.			Х	Х	Х	Х
Marketing, B.S.			Х	Х		Х
Psychology, B.A.			Х	Х	Х	Х
Counselor			x	х		
Education, M.A.			^	~		
Educational				х		
Leadership, M.Ed.				~		

Reading			х		
Education, M.A.			^		
Business					
Administration,			Х	Х	Х
M.B.A.					
Information		v			
Technology, M.S.		~			

Program Review

Board of Governors Regulation 8.015 Academic Program Review 2007-2014 [CR2.7.2-8] requires the cyclic review of all academic degree programs in State universities at least every seven years:

(1)(b) Program reviews must document how individual academic programs are achieving stated student learning and program objectives within the context of the university's mission, as illustrated in the academic learning compacts. The results of the program reviews are expected to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level and, when appropriate, at the state level.

Program review must at least include the following components (3)(b):

- Review of the mission(s) and purpose(s) of the program within the context of the university mission and the Board of Governors' Strategic Plan
- Establishment of teaching, research, service, and other program goals and objectives, including expected outcomes, particularly in the area of student learning
- An assessment of how well program goals/objectives are being met and how well students are achieving expected learning outcomes
- How the results of the assessments are used for continuous program improvement
- Sufficiency of resources and support services to achieve the program goals/objectives

The Office of the USF Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs, coordinates all activities for USF System program reviews in accordance with BOG Regulation 8.015. The **USF Program Review Process and Guidelines [CR2.7.2-9]** include specific instructions for each component of the review process and a recommended timeline. The current program review process includes the following elements:

- A program self-study prepared by the chair and faculty of the program under review.
- A Dean's Report prepared by the Dean of the College that house(s) the program under review.
- A written report from one or more external reviewers selected by the Office of Academic Affairs in consultation with the program under review and the Dean's Office. As the program review process is web-based, external reviewer(s) will participate in the process via the web unless the Office of Academic Affairs in consultation with the Dean determines that a site visit is necessary. For programs with specialized professional accreditation, external reviews conducted for professional accreditation may be used for the purposes of program review.

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 113

• A summary report of the program review prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs and sent by the USF System Executive Vice President and Provost (or designee) to the BOG.

A general timeline template is provided in the guidelines for program review:

January-March

The USF Office of Academic Affairs sends the USF Program Review Plan and other relevant guidelines (e.g., the BOG Program Review Policies) to the College Dean, Associate Dean and the Department Chair [College Dean, Division Director, and Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at USF Polytechnic], along with a reminder indicating which program(s) are to be reviewed during the coming academic year. Directions are provided on where to access the documents in the Program Review Website.

March-October

The academic unit prepares the self-study which is submitted to the Dean (or Associate Dean) [College Dean and Division Director at USF Polytechnic]. The Self-Study Report is submitted electronically via the web-site on or about October 1. The Dean (or Associate Dean) [College Dean or Division Director at USF Polytechnic] is given access to the web-site and prepares the Dean's Report. The Dean's report is submitted electronically via the web-site on or about December 1.

By May 1, the academic unit sends a list of three to five potential external reviewers to the Dean (or Associate Dean) [College Dean and Division Director at USF Polytechnic], who will review the list, amend it if appropriate, and forward it to the USF Office of Academic Affairs which will correspond with potential external reviewer(s) to determine their willingness and availability to review the program(s). Once an external reviewer has been selected, s/he will be provided with exact dates for review of program reports, and a web-site log-on ID and password.

November-February

The self-study will be reviewed online by the external reviewer(s). If the unit wishes to have the reviewer(s) examine other non-electronic supplementary materials (e.g., brochures, flyers, etc.) as part of the self study report, they will be sent to the USF Office of Academic Affairs at least a month before the scheduled date of the beginning of the review. The USF Office of Academic Affairs will mail them to the reviewer(s).

If no site visit is conducted, a meeting will be organized via webinar/video conferencing or phone conference. This meeting will include the external reviewer(s), who will deliver an oral report, representatives from the USF System Provost's Office, the College Dean and Associate Dean, and the Dean of the Graduate School and/or the Dean of Undergraduate Studies (or Associate Dean). [For USF Polytechnic degree programs, attendees are representatives from the USF System Provost's Office, the College Dean and Division Director.]

The external reviewer(s) will be requested to submit a complete electronic report no later than four weeks following the exit meeting. The report will be submitted to the USF Office of Academic Affairs, which will distribute a copy to the Dean of the College [Dean of the College and Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at USF Polytechnic] for further dissemination and discussion.

May-June

The USF Office of Academic Affairs prepares a summary report for submission to the BOG Office.

The program review process within the USF System encompasses a systematic, ongoing, and intentional gathering of information on academic program performance and effectiveness. The results of the selfstudy, report of the external reviewer(s), and summary report submitted to the BOG Office are used to enhance student learning and improve academic programs in the context of the USF Board of Trustees, campus and BOG strategic priorities.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.7.2-1] United States Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP)

[CR2.7.2-2] USF Degree Programs by Location Fall 2009

[CR2.7.2-3] USF System Policy 10-036 Authorization of New Degree Programs

[CR2.7.2-4] BOG Regulation 8.011 New Academic Program Authorization

[CR2.7.2-5] Florida Board of Governors New Degree Program Proposal Form (IB)

[CR2.7.2-6] USF Polytechnic 2007-2012 Strategic Plan

[CR2.7.2-7] SRI International Study, pp. 1-5 Executive Summary included in hard copy

[CR2.7.2-8] Board of Governors Regulation 8.015 Academic Program Review 2007-2014

[CR2.7.2-9] USF Program Review Process and Guidelines

[CR2.7.2-10a-t] Course requirements for each degree program offered at USF Polytechnic are posted on the campus website by degree program: http://www.poly.usf.edu/Academics.html

UNDERGRADUATE

[CR2.7.2-10a] Applied Science, BS - Criminal Justice concentration [CR2.7.2-10b] Applied Science, BS - Early Childhood Development concentration [CR2.7.2-10c] Applied Science, BS - Industrial Operations concentration [CR2.7.2-10d] Applied Science, BS - Information Technology concentration [CR2.7.2-10e] Applied Science, BS - Leadership Studies concentration (18 credits from Leadership Minor) [CR2.7.2-10f] Criminology, BA [CR2.7.2-10g] Elementary Education, BS [CR2.7.2-10h] General Business Administration, BS/BA [CR2.7.2-10i] General Studies, BGS [CR2.7.2-10j] Industrial Engineering, BS [CR2.7.2-10k] Information Technology, BS [CR2.7.2-10] Interdisciplinary Social Science, BA [CR2.7.2-10m] Management concentration in BS/BA General Business Administration

[CR2.7.2-10n] Marketing concentration in BS/BA General Business Administration [CR2.7.2-10o] Psychology, BA

GRADUATE

[CR2.7.2-10p] Counselor Education, MA - Community/Mental Health Plan

[CR2.7.2-10q] Counselor Education, MA – Professional School Counseling Plan

[CR2.7.2-10r] Educational Leadership, MEd

[CR2.7.2-10s] Master of Business Administration, MBA

[CR2.7.2-10t] Reading Education, MA

[CR2.7.2-10u] Information Technology, MS

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.7

2.7.3 General Education

In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that

- 1. is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree,
- 2. ensures breadth of knowledge, and
- 3. is based on a coherent rationale.

For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts; social/behavioral sciences; and natural science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. The institution provides a written justification and rationale for course equivalency.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

4. Description of the general education component including a coherent rationale for the component.

USF Polytechnic has provided a 2+2 bachelor's program consistent with the statewide articulation agreement. Students complete the first two years (approximately 60 semester credit hours) at their local community college or another college or university and the last two years (approximately 60 semester credit hours) with USF Polytechnic to obtain a bachelor's degree.

Florida Statute 1007.23 Statewide Articulation Agreement [CR2.7.3-1] preserves Florida's 2+2 system of articulation, facilitating seamless articulation of student credit across and among Florida's educational entities. The articulation provisions govern

(a) Articulation between secondary and postsecondary education;

(b) Admission of associate in arts degree graduates from community colleges and state universities;

(c) Admission of applied technology diploma program graduates from community colleges or career centers;

(d) Admission of associate in science degree and associate in applied science degree graduates from community colleges;

(e) The use of acceleration mechanisms, including nationally standardized examinations through which students may earn credit;

(f) General education requirements and statewide course numbers; and

(g) Articulation among programs in nursing.

The statewide articulation agreement (2)(a) provides that every associate in arts graduate of a Florida college shall have met all general education requirements and must be granted admission to the upper division of a 1) State university, except for a limited access or teacher certification program or a major program requiring an audition, and 2) Florida college if it offers baccalaureate degree programs, except for a limited access or teacher certification.

The agreement (4) also provides that statewide articulation of appropriate courses within associate in science degree programs to baccalaureate degree programs must be guaranteed.

The **Statewide Course Numbering System [Florida Statute 1007.24, CR2.7.3-2]** is maintained by the Department of Education, in conjunction with the Board of Governors. It is intended to improve program planning, increase communication among all delivery systems, and facilitate student acceleration and the transfer of students and credits between public school districts, public postsecondary educational institutions, and participating nonpublic educational institutions.

Any student who transfers among postsecondary institutions that are fully accredited by a regional or national accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education and that participate in the statewide course numbering system shall be awarded credit by the receiving institution for courses satisfactorily completed by the student at the previous institutions **[F.S. 1007.24. (7)]**.

General Education Policy

Florida Statute 1007.25 General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements [CR2.7.3-3] provides in Section (6) that the boards of trustees of the community colleges identify their core curricula, which shall include courses required by the State Board of Education, and that the boards of trustees of the state universities identify their core curricula, which shall include courses required by the State Board of Education, and that the boards of trustees of the state universities identify their core curricula, which shall include courses required by the Board of Governors. An associate in arts degree must require no more than 60 semester hours of college credit, including 36 semester hours of general education coursework (section 7). A baccalaureate degree program shall require no more than 120 semester hours of college credit, including 36 semester hours of general education coursework, unless prior approval has been granted by the Board of Governors for baccalaureate degree programs offered by state universities and by the State Board of Education for baccalaureate degree programs offered by community colleges (section 8).

Following Board of Governors Regulation 6.004 Admission of Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Transfer Students [CR2.7.3-4], students who transfer to USF Polytechnic with an Associate in Arts degree will have completed sixty (60) semester hours of college credit courses in an established program of study, exclusive of courses not accepted in the state university system, and including a general education core curriculum of thirty-six (36) semester hours of college credit in communication, mathematics, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences with the remaining twenty-four (24) semester hours consisting of appropriate common program prerequisite courses and electives.

Regulation 6.004 further provides that students must complete requirements for English and mathematics courses as adopted by the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education. Board of Governors Rule 6.017 Criteria for Awarding the Baccalaureate Degree [CR2.7.3-5] articulates the requirements of the Florida Administrative Code Rule 6A-10.030 Other Assessment Procedures for College-Level Communication and Computation Skills, also known as the "Gordon Rule" [CR2.7.3-6]. Students must complete six (6) semester hours of English coursework and six semester hours of

additional coursework in which the student is required to demonstrate college-level writing skills through multiple assignments. Each institution designates the courses that fulfill the writing requirements of this section. Students awarded college credit in English based on their demonstration of writing skills through dual enrollment, advanced placement, or international baccalaureate instruction are considered to have satisfied this requirement to the extent of the college credit awarded.

The Rule further requires that students complete six (6) semester hours of mathematics coursework at the level of college algebra or higher. Applied logic, statistics and other computation-based coursework that may not be offered by a mathematics department may be used to fulfill three (3) of the six (6) hours required by this section. Students awarded college credit based on their demonstration of mathematics skills at the level of college algebra or higher through dual enrollment, advanced placement, or international baccalaureate instruction are considered to have satisfied this requirement to the extent of the college credit awarded. Courses approved by the BOG [6.017 (1)(c)] to fulfill the computation requirement are:

Any combination of two (2) courses from the list below: Any MAC course with the last three (3) digits of 102 or higher MGFX106 – Liberal Arts Mathematics I MGFX107 – Liberal Arts Mathematics II MGFX113 –Topics in College Mathematics I MGFX114 –Topics in College Mathematics II MGFX118 – Mathematics for CLAST Review Any MGF course with last three (3) digits of 202 or higher Any Gordon Rule statistics course Any mathematics course that has College Algebra (MACX105) as a prerequisite

The Gordon Rule communication and computation requirements are considered met for any student entering the university with an A.A. degree from a Florida public community college. Gordon Rule communication requirement is considered met for any student entering the university with 60 or more hours. Students must achieve a proficiency level of at least C- in the course in order to receive Gordon Rule Communication credit.

5. A list of courses in the required general education core and the number of hours required.

Consistent with state policy, USF Polytechnic recognizes its commitment to the requirements for general education in Florida, including Gordon Rule requirements. Baccalaureate degree programs require no more than 120 semester hours of college credit, including 36 semester hours of general education coursework. To gain admission into USF Polytechnic, students must have a minimum of 60 transferrable credit hours at time of transfer, and a minimum of a 2.0 cumulative transfer GPA. USF Polytechnic strongly recommends that students complete the Associate in Arts degree or as required for certain majors, the Associate in Science degree, before transferring. USF Polytechnic accepts transfer credit from institutions that are regionally accredited at the time the credits are earned as provided for in F.S. 1007.24. Thus, students enter USF Polytechnic having met their general education requirements in the institutions from which they transferred and through a variety of curricula that address the state's common skills and subject areas. Or, students may take upper-level courses at USF Polytechnic to meet general education requirements that may not have been completed prior to transfer.

For this reason, USF Polytechnic accepts the State of Florida's general education requirements as articulated in Board of Governors Regulation 6.004, a general education core curriculum of thirty-six (36) semester hours of college credit in communication, mathematics, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences, as well as Gordon Rule requirements.

Consistent with the University of South Florida's Liberal Arts Education requirements, students must satisfy the following general education requirements [CR2.7.3-7, see CR2.4-2, USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog, p. 71]:

General Education Requirements – 36 hours

6 English Composition
3 Fine Arts
3 Human and Cultural Diversity in a Global Context
6 Humanities
6 Mathematics *Or* 3 Mathematics and 3 Quantitative Reasoning
3 Natural Sciences (Life Science)
3 Natural Sciences (Physical Science)
6 Social and Behavioral Sciences

Exit Requirements – 6 hours 3 Capstone

3 Writing Intensive

Students must receive a minimum grade of "C-" in each course to fulfill any core requirement in either the core curriculum or the exit courses.

General Education Outcomes Assessment

USF Polytechnic assesses reading, writing and mathematics, in addition to critical thinking and diversity, in keeping with core values expressed in its 2007-2012 Strategic Plan:

- 1. We expect students to **read critically**, interpreting meaning and purpose and recognizing fact vs. inference and opinion.
- 2. We expect students to **write correctly and effectively**, producing well-organized and meaningful prose.
- 3. We expect students to recognize and interpret mathematical terms, data, formulas and representations.
- 4. We expect students to **think critically and analytically**, recognizing and questioning assumptions and hypotheses, interpreting information, drawing appropriate conclusions, and presenting persuasive argument.
- 5. We expect students to **value diversity of human thought, experience and perspective** and to be open to individual and cultural uniqueness.

Means of Assessment

Several means of assessment are used: (1) the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) Test, short form; (2) the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); (3) Graduating Student Survey; and (4) the Diversity/Campus Climate Survey.

General Education Competency	Nationally-Standardized Instrument	Nationally- Standardized Student Self-Report Instrument	USF Polytechnic Student Self- Report Instruments
Reading	MAPP Test		
Writing	MAPP Test		Graduating Student Survey
Mathematics	MAPP Test		
Critical Thinking	MAPP Test Reading Level 3	NSSE Survey Academic Challenge & Active Learning	Graduating Student Survey
Diversity		NSSE Survey Supportive Campus Environment	Graduating Student Survey Diversity/Campus Climate Survey

MAPP Test

USF Polytechnic first administered the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) test, short form, in 2009 to sample populations of students. The students were volunteers; no random sampling strategy was used. The campus receives aggregate results from Educational Testing Service (ETS) at the end of the spring semester, and the results are reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association and Executive Council. USF Polytechnic student scores are compared to a sample of similar Master's level colleges and universities.

USF Polytechnic MAPP Assessment – 2009					
Sampling Method	Students at the Junior level were solicited for the MAPP test. The test was administered to 62 Polytechnic students. The Sample size was reduced to 60 students who actually finished the test. USFP student scores are compared to a sample of similar Master's Colleges and Universities including 24,832 students and 80 institutions.				
Measurement Methodology	This MAPP assessment measures the student's proficiency at three levels within reading, writing and math; for a total of nine specific areas. Based on the scoring developed for these assessments, students are rated as proficient, not proficient or marginal in the nine skill areas. A student is classified as marginal if there is not enough evidence to classify the student as either proficient or not proficient.				

Performance Expectation	The proficiency of USF Polytechnic students will be at a level consistent with other students at similar Master's level colleges and universities in each of the nine skill levels.					
READING	Students are expected to read critically, interpreting meaning and purpose and recognizing fact vs. inference and opinion. Students will be able to a) interpret the meaning of key terms, b) recognize the primary purpose of a passage, c) recognize explicitly presented information, d) make appropriate inferences, and e) recognize rhetorical devices. Level 3 assesses Critical Thinking.					
	Level 1 USFP: 65% All Schools: 65%					
Assessment Results	Level 2 USFP: 31% All Schools: 31%					
	Level 3 USFP: 2% All Schools: 5%					
WRITING	Students are expected to write correctly and effectively, producing well- organized and meaningful prose. Students will be able to a) recognize the most grammatically correct revision of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences; b) organize units of language for coherence and rhetorical effect; c) recognize and reword figurative language; and d) organize elements of writing into larger units of meaning.					
Assessment Results	Level 1USFP:60%All Schools:76%Level 2USFP:22%All Schools:18%Level 3USFP:10%All Schools:7%					
MATHEMATICS	Students are expected to recognize and interpret mathematical terms, data, formulas and representations. Students will be able to a) recognize and interpret mathematical terms; b) read and interpret tables and graphs; c) evaluate formulas; d) order and compare large and small numbers; e) interpret ratios, proportions, and percentages; f) read scientific measuring instruments; and g) recognize and use equivalent mathematical formulas or expressions.					
	Level 1 USFP: 68% All Schools: 52%					
Assessment Results	Level 2 USFP: 38% All Schools: 24%					
	Level 3 USFP: 5% All Schools: 7%					

Discussion of 2009 MAPP Results. The sample size was neither large enough nor diverse enough to draw any strong conclusions. Based on this limited sample, student proficiency in Reading was comparable with other schools at Level 1 and Level 2 proficiency, and slightly lower than other schools at Level 3 proficiency which assesses Critical Thinking. USFP student proficiency in Writing was less than other schools at Level 1 proficiency, but slightly higher than other schools at Level 2 and Level 3 proficiencies. USFP student proficiency in Mathematics was higher than other schools at Level 1 and Level 2 proficiencies and slightly less than other schools at Level 3 proficiency.

Use of Results. MAPP test results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council. Data collected for 2009 will be a baseline for future years. The MAPP test is scheduled to be repeated in summer/fall 2010 with a focus on improving the sample size and methodology. Senior students will be solicited for this sample. As the general education curriculum is developed, these data will be utilized as a foundation to build a strong, focused and integrated general education program. In addition, the campus will examine benefits that may be gained from implementing the long form of the MAPP which includes discipline specific areas such as communication, social sciences, humanities and natural sciences. In addition, the use of subject-specific assessments from ETS will also be examined.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was first administered in spring 2007, in 2009 and again in spring 2010. Results are analyzed by NSSE and reported separately as well as comparatively with other USF institutions. Because USF Polytechnic's enrollment is a small proportion of the total USF System enrollment, USF Polytechnic Institutional Research paid an additional fee to oversample USFP senior students in 2007, 2009 and 2010. USF Polytechnic Institutional Research will now administer the NSSE to USFP seniors online during the spring semester every other year, with the next administration of the assessment in spring 2012.

NSSE Results 2007 and 2009

NSSE identifies five benchmarks of effective educational practice: 1) level of academic challenge, 2) active and collaborative learning, 3) student – faculty interaction, 4) enriching educational experiences, and 5) supportive campus environment. The 2007 survey was the first year where baseline data specific to USF Polytechnic Seniors were available. Therefore, this survey became the baseline to compare with the 2009 data. Comparisons were: academic years, gender, race and USF campuses. The framework of the study was a series of two-way analyses of variances (linear model – least square means Scheffe test with a significance level of .01). The results of the study are presented graphically below, comparing academic years (2007, 2009) and gender:







WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 124





Discussion of Results. Comparisons of year of assessment, campus and race were not significantly different among the Polytechnic students. However, as other studies have found, females and males rated the NSSE benchmarks differently. The study found that within the dimensions of active learning and enriching educational environment female students rated their experiences significantly higher than male students.

In the dimension of Academic Challenge, both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009. In Active Learning both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female students perceptions increasing slightly more. In the area of Student Faculty Interactions, again both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female students perceptions increasing slightly more. In Enriching Educational Environment, both male and female students' perceptions increased positively with female students rating the benchmark higher than male students. In Supportive Campus Environment, male students' perceptions decreased from 2007 to 2009 while female students' perceptions increased positively.

Use of Results. NSSE results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council. The purpose of this analysis was twofold: 1) to get some preliminary information about USF Polytechnic students and how they compare with other USF students; and 2) to get some baseline results for further analysis. The graphs fulfill the spirit of the first purpose. The second purpose was fulfilled as well. Having determined baseline significance of gender, race, campus and year of assessment in the NSSE benchmarks, it is possible to undertake further studies in the future.

In relation to the decrease from 2007 to 2009 in male students' perceptions of the dimension of Supportive Campus Environment, campus demographics indicate that female students comprise 61% of the student population. USF Polytechnic's Diversity Office instituted an annual panel discussion in April 2009 on "Where Are the College Men?" and in April 2010 on "Where Are the Men?" Both panels engaged attendees in discussions with current male students and male alumni around why more men are not attending college, increasing a male student support environment, and issues in male students' successful completion of college degrees.

NSSE 2009 – USF Polytechnic Students and Other NSSE College Students

The 2009 administration of the NSSE also examined USF Polytechnic students' attitudes and experiences as compared to other college students taking the NSSE. Again, an attempt was made to over sample seniors at USFP. NSSE scores are reported for USF Polytechnic students, for students in schools that were categorized in the top 50 percent or top 10 percent of schools based on the weighting system used by NSSE to calculate benchmarks for various subgroups in the NSSE student sample, and for all students. Although a significance level based on means of USF Polytechnic students and the NSSE subgroups might have been calculable, it would have presumed a level of statistical accuracy that was probably unfounded. The following graphics portray our findings:











Discussion of Results. In the benchmark categories of **Level of Academic Challenge** and **Active and Collaborative Learning**, USF Polytechnic students scored their institution higher than the average of all NSSE students sampled. In the categories of **Student Faculty Interaction**, **Enriching Educational Experiences** or **Supportive Campus Environment**, USF Polytechnic students, on average, rated their institution slightly lower than the average NSSE responder. USF Polytechnic students, on average, did not rate their institution higher than the average NSSE responder in schools categorized in the top 50 percent or top 10 percent of schools based on benchmark scores.

Use of Results. It is difficult to determine demographic information for any of the NSSE groups. How significantly they varied from the USF Polytechnic population is difficult to know and could be important. Certainly, as USF Polytechnic shares a campus with a state college which sets the policies for campus use, it is challenging to develop strategies to create a campus environment specific to USFP students. The planning and development of the new campus site is an important opportunity for USF Polytechnic to involve students in the planning stages and to communicate the importance of their interests, needs and perspectives in creating a new campus environment.

The NSSE results were reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association and the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup. Student Affairs is addressing the slightly lower scores on Student Faculty Interaction, Enriching Educational Experiences and Supportive Campus Environment to develop action plans to better engage the students inside and outside the classroom. These new initiatives will be monitored closely.

NSSE Results 2010

The 2010 NSSE questionnaire was administered in May 2010 to 137 USF Polytechnic seniors. Benchmark means were compared for students from USF Polytechnic, USF Sarasota-Manatee, USF St. Petersburg, USF Tampa and the Carnegie "Master's Small" cohort. The table below provides this comparison.

	USF Poly		USF Sa	USF Sarasota USF St. Pe		USF St. Pete		USF St. Pete		USF St. Pete		USF Tampa		USF Tampa		USF Tampa		's Sm.	US	F Poly A	bove/Be	low
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Sar	S.P.	Тра	Sm. Mst.								
Level of Academic Challenge	58.26	14.52	58.35	14.42	56.32	14.15	55.77	14.08	59.0	14.1	-0.10	1.94	2.49	-0.74								
Active and Collaborative Learning	53.34	20.53	50.04	18.12	48.70	18.19	45.15	17.25	53.9	17.4	3.30	4.64	8.19	-0.56								
Student-Faculty Interaction	36.95	21.42	36.25	17.59	34.34	18.83	34.43	19.00	46.5	21.4	0.70	2.61	2.52	-9.55								
Enriching Educational Experiences	38.50	17.52	32.51	16.67	34.97	17.36	35.16	16.46	43.5	19.1	5.99	3.53	3.33	-5.00								
Supportive Campus Environment	58.95	20.06	62.24	19.49	56.89	18.36	54.99	19.35	62.3	19.5	-3.29	2.07	3.96	-3.35								

Comparisons of Results for NSSE Benchmark Means

NOTE: While means for a given benchmark are on the same scale and may be compared across institutions, the scales vary across benchmarks and do not permit comparisons between benchmarks.

Discussion of Results: Note that the mean for USF Polytechnic is below that of the Master's Small cohort on each of the five benchmarks. However, the results are much different when USF Polytechnic means are compared to the other USF campuses. In fact, the USF Polytechnic mean is above the corresponding mean for USF Tampa and USF St. Pete on <u>all five benchmarks</u> – most dramatically on the three benchmarks that most assess characteristics closely aligned with the Polytechnic mission. The USF Polytechnic mean is above USF Sarasota on three of the five benchmarks.

If one peruses the questions comprising each benchmark, one can see that the special polytechnic mission of USF Polytechnic is best measured by the items making up the benchmark labeled "Active and Collaborative Learning," followed by "Level of Academic Challenge" and "Enriching Educational Experiences." Note that for "Active and Collaborative Learning," USF Polytechnic is above all three of its local peers, as is also the case for "Enriching Educational Experiences." For "Level of Academic Challenge" USF Polytechnic is above two of its three local peers.

These results strongly support the assertion that USF Polytechnic is differentiating itself from other USF campuses in terms of delivering education consistent with its Polytechnic mission.

Use of Results: The NSSE results were reviewed with the Executive Council. As the results report was received at the end of June 2011, the report will be distributed and reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association, the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and faculty at the beginning of the fall 2011 semester.

■ Graduating Student Survey Results

Institutional Research administers a **Graduating Student Survey** during fall and spring semester registration for Commencement. The survey was first administered in the 2008-2009 academic year; a total of 50 students responded. In 2009-2010 one hundred twenty-four (124) students completed the survey. The following table provides the data on students' views of their courses:

2008-2009 N=50 2009-2010 N=113		Strongly Disagree Disagree		Ag	ree	Strongly Agree		
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Courses in my major provided me with adequate knowledge and skills.	12%	7%	2%	4%	42%	55%	44%	34%
My writing skills improved.	12%	8%	8%	16%	54%	48%	26%	28%
My oral communication skills improved.	12%	8%	10%	11%	40%	48%	38%	33%
My critical thinking skills improved.	10%	6%	4%	8%	36%	48%	50%	37%

Graduating Student Survey

Discussion of Results. In the category of adequacy of knowledge and skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall (i.e., combined percentage in strong disagree and disagree responses) with the statement decreased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 14% to 11% while the percentage of students agreeing overall (i.e., combined percentage in agree and strongly agree responses) with the statement increased from 86% to 89%.

In the category of writing skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement increased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 20% to 24%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement decreased from 80% to 76%.

In the category of oral communication skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement decreased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 22% to 19%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement increased from 78% to 81%.

In the category of critical thinking skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement remained the same from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 at 14%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement decreased slightly from 86% to 85%.

Use of Results. The Graduating Student Survey results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council and will be reviewed by academic units and the Student Government Association at the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year.

The increase in student disagreement and decrease in student agreement with the statement, "My writing skills improved," from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010, in addition to the Level 1 performance of students on the MAPP short form test (60%) in comparison to all schools in similar master's level colleges and universities (76%) suggests that writing skills is an area for improvement. Additional full-time faculty have been hired for academic year 2010-2011 to teach literature and writing exit courses, as well as technical and professional writing courses. This will reduce the number of courses that would be taught by adjunct faculty. The full-time faculty will be following the results of the 2010-2011 administration of the MAPP test to determine potential curricular changes or the need for additional common course assessments.

Level 3 proficiency in Reading on the MAPP test assesses Critical Thinking; only 2% of USF Polytechnic students and 5% of students in similar master's level colleges and universities demonstrated proficiency in Level 3 Reading/Critical Thinking. In the dimensions of Academic Challenge and Active Learning on the NSSE, both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences at USF Polytechnic as academically challenging increased positively from 2007 to 2009. In addition, USF Polytechnic students scored their institution higher on these two benchmarks than the average of all NSSE students sampled. The decrease from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 on the Graduating Student Survey in student agreement with the statement, "My critical thinking skills improved," is slight (1%); however, results in the area of critical thinking will be monitored in academic year 2010-2011 as this is a key area of value for USF Polytechnic and for student success and achievement.

Graduating Student Survey 2010-2011

Preliminary results of the 2010-2011 Graduating Student Survey were distributed to Executive Council at the end of July 2011. Of the 350 graduating students, 101 completed the survey.

2010-2011 N=101	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Courses in my major provided me with adequate knowledge and skills.	1%	4%	40%	55%
My writing skills improved.	2%	12%	41%	45%
My oral communication skills improved.	1%	6%	35%	58%
My critical thinking skills improved.	1%	3%	30%	66%

Preliminary Discussion of Results. In the category of adequacy of knowledge and skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 4% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 44% in 2008-2009 and 35% in 2009-2010 to 55% in 2010-2011.

In the category of writing skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 8% in 2009-2010 to 2% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 26% in 2008-2009 and 28% in 2009-2010 to 45% in 2010-2011.

In the category of adequacy of oral communication skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 10% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 38% in 2008-2009 and 33% in 2009-2010 to 58% in 2010-2011.

In the category of adequacy of critical thinking skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 10% in 2008-2009 and 6% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 50% in 2008-2009 and 37% in 2009-2010 to 66% in 2010-2011.

Use of Results: The preliminary results were reviewed with the Executive Council. As the results report was received at the end of July 2011, the report will be distributed and reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association, the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and faculty at the beginning of the fall 2011 semester.

Campus Climate/Diversity Survey Results

Institutional Research, in collaboration with the USF Polytechnic Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement, administers the **Campus Climate/Diversity Survey** every other year [see CR2.5-18 l&m]. The first administration of the survey was in spring 2008, and the next administration of the survey was fall 2010. The survey measures students' perceptions of the following factors: 1) experience with diversity, 2) academic achievement and personal development, 3) peer relationships, 4) diversity programs and policies, 5) camaraderie among groups, 6) classroom environment, 7) treatment and inter-group relations, 8) expression of insensitivity and prejudice, 9) diversity experiences impact, 10) disabled students, and 11) overall evaluation of campus experiences.

In spring 2008 the total number of USF students responding to the survey was 2,712 with 447 students who took classes at USF Polytechnic participating. In fall 2010 the total number of USF students responding to the survey was 2,395 with 319 students who took classes at USF Polytechnic participating.

The following table presents a summary of USF Polytechnic respondents' perceptions of the campus/ diversity climate:

	Spring 2008 (N=447)	Fall 2010 (N=319)
Percentage of students moderately to extremely satisfied with their overall experience at USF Polytechnic [Q167, Q169]	95.8%	86.5%
Percentage of students feeling accepted by the campus community at USF Polytechnic [Q168, Q170]	90.4%	71.1%
Percentage of students feeling the quality of academic programs at USF Polytechnic is excellent [Q169, Q171]	95.6%	82.6%
Percentage of students feeling USF Polytechnic provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs [Q170, Q172]	96.8%	83.2%
Percentage of students feeling an environment that includes diversity improves the quality of education [Q171, Q173]	96.3%	84.3%
Percentage of students who would recommend USF Polytechnic to siblings or friends as a good place to go to college [Q172, Q174]	96.2%	84.4%

Discussion of Results. In spring 2008 USF Polytechnic was USF Lakeland, a regional campus of the University of South Florida System with a newly differentiated mission of applied learning, applied research and applied technology. In fall 2008 USF Polytechnic was established with legislative charge to seek separate SACS accreditation. In fall 2010 USF Polytechnic had evidenced strategic changes to meet its distinct mission, and in faculty, staff and student populations changes occurred as individuals considered and made decisions regarding their "fit" for that mission. Decreases in students' feelings about USF Polytechnic in fall 2010 are not inconsistent with a campus identity change.

Use of Results. Results are distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council and Student Government Association. Units utilize the results to address objectives and subsequent improvements within their assessment plans. The Diversity Office was integrated into Student Affairs and restructured as the Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement to increase collaboration communication with Student Affairs units (e.g., Recruitment, Admissions, Student Activities, Student Government). Survey results data going forward will be assessed for trends and improvements through comparison with administrations of the instrument on a two-year cycle. Fall 2010 data were received in July 2011 and were distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council at the end of July.

Development of USF Polytechnic as a Four-Year Destination Campus

USF Polytechnic's Strategic Plan 2007-2012 [see CR2.4-1] sets a bold vision for becoming a "premier destination campus for applied learning, research, and innovative technology." On September 20, 2009 the USF System Board of Trustees approved the addition of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic [CR2.7.3-8a, Board of Trustees Agenda Item for approval of lower-level courses 9-10-09] and [CR2.7.3-8b, Board of Trustees Meeting minutes 9-10-09]. The request was subsequently approved by the Board of Governors on September 24, 2009 [CR2.7.3-9, Board of Governors Meeting Minutes, Item 6(E)(2)].

On July 8, 2011 Dr. Belle Whelan, President, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, issued a letter to Dr. Judy Genshaft, President, University of South Florida System, approving the offering of lower-level courses at USF Polytechnic, effective spring 2012 with the first freshman class to be admitted in fall 2013 **[CR2.7.3-10 Whelan Approval Letter 7-8-11]**. A pilot freshman cohort of approximately 100 students is planned for fall 2012.

In spring 2011 a General Education Committee of the Faculty Senate developed a General Education Core Curriculum and Assessment Plan for the first Freshman class anticipated in fall 2013. The plan transitions from the USF Foundations of Knowledge and Learning (FKL), providing a polytechnic philosophy of education and learning outcomes drawn from that philosophy, a rationale for course selection, a listing of and description of courses with relationship of each course to the learning outcomes indicated. An assessment plan continues use of the ETS Proficiency Profile and NSSE survey, and adds a Written Communication Rubric and a common rubric for assessment of Capstone Experiences. (See CR2.7.3-11a-d)

6. Identification of at least one required course in each of the three categories: humanities/fine arts; social/behavioral sciences; mathematics/natural sciences.

Humanities/fine arts	HUM 1020 The Arts
Social/behavioral sciences	CCJ 3014 Crime & Justice in America
Mathematics/natural sciences	PSY 3204 Psychological Statistics

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.7.3-1] Florida Statute 1007.23 Statewide Articulation Agreement

[CR2.7.3-2] Statewide Course Numbering System F.S. 1007.24

[CR2.7.3-3] Florida Statute 1007.25 General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements

[CR2.7.3-4] Board of Governors Regulation 6.004 Admission of Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Transfer Students

[CR2.7.3-5] Board of Governors Rule 6.017 Criteria for Awarding the Baccalaureate Degree

[CR2.7.3-6] Florida Administrative Code Rule 6A-10.030 Other Assessment Procedures for College-Level Communication and Computation Skills, also known as the "Gordon Rule"

[CR2.7.3-7, see CR2.4-2] USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2010-2011, p. 71

[CR2.7.3-8a-b] USF System Board of Trustees approval of addition of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic

[CR2.7.3-8a] Board of Trustees Agenda Item for approval of lower-level courses 9-10-09 **[CR2.7.3-8b]** Board of Trustees meeting minutes 9-10-09

[CR2.7.3-9] Board of Governors approval of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic, BOG Agenda Item 6(E)(2) 9-24-09

[CR2.7.3-10] Whelan Approval Letter 7-8-11

[CR2.7.3-11a-d] USF Polytechnic General Education and Assessment Plan for fall 2013

[CR2.7.3-11a] General Education Conceptual Framework [CR2.7.3-11b] General Education Course Descriptions [CR2.7.3-11c] Initial General Education Assessment Plan [CR2.7.3-11d] Written Communication Rubric AAC&U

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.7

2.7.4 Course Work for Degrees

The institution provides instruction for all course work required for at least one degree program at each level at which it awards degrees. If the institution does not provide instruction for all such course work and (1) makes arrangements for some instruction to be provided by other accredited institutions or entities through contracts or consortia or (2) uses some other alternative approach to meeting this requirement, the alternative approach must be approved by the Commission on Colleges. In both cases, the institution demonstrates that it controls all aspects of its educational program.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. If the institution does not offer instruction for all course work for at least one degree program at each level that it awards degrees, it provides justification for an alternative approach (consistent with the referenced Commission policy).

Graduate (Master's) Degrees

The University of South Florida Polytechnic provides instruction for all course work required for its Master's degree programs. Course requirements for each of the Master's degree programs are posted on the USF Polytechnic website [see CR2.7.2-1p-t].

Graduate Admission Requirements

Each applicant to a graduate program at USF Polytechnic is required to meet the following minimum requirements established by the USF Graduate School [CR2.7.4-1, USF System Regulation 3.008 Admission to the Graduate School; and CR2.7.4-2, USF Graduate Catalog Section 4 Graduate Admissions, "Admissions Requirements"]:

- 1. An applicant must have **one** of the following:
 - a. A bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution and satisfying at least one of the following criteria: 1) a "B" average or better in all work attempted while registered as an undergraduate student working for a degree, or 2) a "B" or better average in all work attempted while registered as an upper division undergraduate student working for a baccalaureate degree.
 - b. A bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution and a previous graduate degree from a regionally accredited institution.
 - c. The equivalent bachelor's and/or graduate degrees from a foreign institution.

2. Submission of standardized test scores at the discretion of the graduate program.

3. All specific and additional requirements of the graduate program to which admission is sought (including requirements to submit standardized test scores), consistent with the Statement of Principles regarding use of multiple sources of information in graduate admissions decisions (p. 15).

The USF Polytechnic Graduate Program Coordinator, Division Director and College Dean must approve any exceptions to these requirements with information copies to the Graduate School.

The USF Polytechnic Enrollment Management Office and the Graduate Program Coordinator for the degree to which the application is being made review the application for admission. Graduate applicants are urged to submit accurate and complete information as early as possible. Applications and supporting documents received after the application deadline are processed for the next available term. All inquiries regarding application status should also be directed to the program.

For international students the USF Polytechnic Enrollment Management Office coordinates with the USF System International Services Office which evaluates the applicant's financial statement after the applicant is admitted to determine eligibility for a student visa. Each of these offices may request additional documents from the applicant in order to make a decision.

Transfer of Graduate Credit

Following transfer of credit criteria established by the USF Graduate School [CR2.7.4-3a, USF System Regulation 3.011 Graduate School Requirements; and CR2.7.4-3b, USF Graduate Catalog, Section 7 Academic Policies and Regulations, "Transfer of Credit"], USF Polytechnic accepts up to 12 graduate semester hours from all regionally accredited institutions in the United States with regional accreditation as recognized by the U.S. Department of Education (i.e., Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Education; New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education; North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, The Higher Learning Commission; Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities; Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission for Community and Junior Colleges; and Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities).

Graduate credits transferred must have a grade of B or better. Coursework transferred into a graduate program can be no older than seven (7) years at the time of graduation for a Master's degree program. Grades for courses taken at USF Tampa or USF St. Petersburg are calculated in the GPA and noted on the transcript as the grade earned. Grades for courses transferred from other regionally accredited institutions are not calculated in the GPA at USF and noted on the transcript as N/A.

Transfer credits must be evaluated and transferred by the time of formal admission to a graduate degree program and enrollment at USF Polytechnic. Academic advisors and program coordinators for the academic degree programs at USF Polytechnic are responsible for evaluating, approving, and initiating transfer of credit to the student's transcript following admission.

Students may, with the approval of their graduate program, earn credits at any of the USF institutions. However, for a graduate degree to be awarded, the majority of credits needed for the degree must be earned through courses offered by the institution granting the degree.

Baccalaureate Degrees

<u>Request Approval for Alternative Approach for Documentation of Compliance at the Baccalaureate</u> <u>Level</u>

Consistent with the Commission on Colleges' policy statement on Core Requirement 2.7.4 Documenting an Alternative Approach, USF Polytechnic is requesting approval to use an alternative approach for documenting compliance at the baccalaureate degree level.

USF Polytechnic currently provides a 2+2 bachelor's program consistent with the statewide articulation agreement. Students complete the first two years (approximately 60 semester credit hours) at their local community college or another college or university and the last two years (approximately 60 semester credit hours) with USF Polytechnic to obtain a bachelor's degree.

Statewide Articulation Agreement

Florida Statute 1007.23 Statewide Articulation Agreement [CR2.7.4-4] preserves Florida's 2+2 system of articulation, facilitating the seamless articulation of student credit across and among Florida's educational entities. The articulation provisions govern

(a) Articulation between secondary and postsecondary education;

(b) Admission of associate in arts degree graduates from community colleges and state universities;

(c) Admission of applied technology diploma program graduates from community colleges or career centers;

(d) Admission of associate in science degree and associate in applied science degree graduates from community colleges;

(e) The use of acceleration mechanisms, including nationally standardized examinations through which students may earn credit;

- (f) General education requirements and statewide course numbers; and
- (g) Articulation among programs in nursing.

The statewide articulation agreement (2)(a) provides that every associate in arts graduate of a Florida college shall have met all general education requirements and must be granted admission to the upper division of a 1) State university, except for a limited access or teacher certification program or a major program requiring an audition, and 2) Florida college if it offers baccalaureate degree programs, except for a limited access or teacher certification.

The agreement (4) also provides that statewide articulation of appropriate courses within associate in science degree programs to baccalaureate degree programs must be guaranteed.

The Florida Statute 1007.24 Statewide Course Numbering System [CR2.7.4-5] is maintained by the Department of Education, in conjunction with the Board of Governors. It is intended to improve program planning, increase communication among all delivery systems, and facilitate student acceleration and the transfer of students and credits between public school districts, public postsecondary educational institutions, and participating nonpublic educational institutions.

Any student who transfers among postsecondary institutions that are fully accredited by a regional or national accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education and that participate in the statewide course numbering system shall be awarded credit by the receiving institution for courses satisfactorily completed by the student at the previous institutions [F.S. 1007.24. (7)].

Transfer of Credit to USF

USF accepts credits from regionally accredited institutions but reserves the right to deny credit for specific courses. The receipt and evaluation of transfer credit are the responsibility of the USF Polytechnic Office of Enrollment Management. The Academic Division and College of the student's major will determine which courses are applicable toward a specific degree and will assign equivalent courses.

Admission of Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Transfer Students in the State University System (SUS)

Board of Governors Regulation 6.004 Admission of Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Transfer Students [CR2.7.4-6] outlines minimum eligibility requirements for transfer students seeking admission to an undergraduate degree program in the State University System (SUS). Eligibility for admission to the SUS does not guarantee admission to the specific institution or degree program to which admission is sought.

The regulation requires undergraduate transfer applicants to submit a complete official academic transcript from each postsecondary institution attended, as well as a complete official academic transcript of all secondary work, when applicable. Each transcript must list all courses for which the student was enrolled each term, the status in each course at the end of the term, all grades and credits awarded, and a statement explaining the grading policy of the institution. Each transcript should also specify any college credits the student earned through accelerated mechanisms.

By the provisions of BOG Regulation 6.004, an AA graduate from a Florida public postsecondary institution receives priority for admission to a state university over out-of-state transfer students. The AA degree is the primary basis for admission of transfer students from Florida College System institutions to upper division study in a state university. Every AA graduate from the Florida College System shall be granted admission to an upper division program consistent with the Articulation Agreement between the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education. Within curriculum, space, and fiscal limitations, admission to the upper division of one of the state universities shall be granted to an AA graduate of a Florida public postsecondary institution, provided the AA degree has been awarded based on the following:

- Completion of sixty (60) semester hours of college credit courses in an established program of study, exclusive of courses not accepted in the state university system, and including a general education core curriculum of thirty-six (36) semester hours of college credit in communication, mathematics, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences with the remaining twenty-four (24) semester hours consisting of appropriate common program prerequisite courses and electives.
- 2. Achievement of a grade point average of at least 2.0 in all courses attempted, and in all courses taken at the institution awarding the degree, provided that only the final grade received in courses repeated by the student is used in computing the average. The grade of "D" shall

transfer and count toward the associate and baccalaureate degrees in the same way as "D" grades obtained by native students. The 60 hours that comprise a completed AA degree shall be accepted in total upon transfer to an upper division program. Subsequent admission to a limited access degree program, as defined in BOG Regulation 8.013, may require a higher overall grade point average than 2.0.

- 3. Completion of requirements for English and mathematics courses as adopted by the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education.
- 4. Achievement of the minimum standards for college level communication and computation skills as required by section 1007.25, Florida Statutes.

Undergraduate Admission Requirements

Each applicant to an undergraduate program at USF Polytechnic is required to meet minimum requirements established by **USF System Regulation 3.018 Admission to the University of South Florida [CR2.7.4-7]**. Students must have a minimum of 60 transferrable credit hours at time of transfer, and a minimum of a 2.0 cumulative transfer GPA. USF Polytechnic strongly recommends that students complete the Associate in Arts degree or as required for certain majors, the Associate in Science degree, before transferring. Students who transfer to USF Polytechnic with an Associate in Arts degree will have completed sixty (60) semester hours of college credit courses in an established program of study, exclusive of courses not accepted in the state university system, and **including a general education core curriculum of thirty-six (36) semester hours of college credit in communication, mathematics, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences with the remaining twenty-four (24) semester hours consisting of appropriate common program prerequisite courses and electives. USF Polytechnic accepts transfer credit from institutions that are regionally accredited at the time the credits are earned as provided for in the Statewide Course Numbering System.**

Upper-Level Transfer Applicants (with 60 or more transferable semester credits) [see CR2.4-2, USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2010-2011, pp. 18-20]

To be considered for admission, transfer applicants with 60 or more transferable semester credits must submit a USF or FACTS application for admission, a non-refundable application fee, an official transcript from each previous college attended, and a TOEFL or IELTS score if applicable. Final transcripts with any degree awarded, or a minimum of 60 semester hours of transferable credit earned prior to initial enrollment at USF, must be submitted to determine final admissions eligibility.

Any transfer student with 60 or more semester hours who designates a desire for admission to a limited access undergraduate program must meet the overall admission GPA criteria of that program in order to be admitted to the University.

Applicants with Associate in Arts (A.A.) degrees from Florida College System institutions will be admitted as juniors into the University within curricular, space and fiscal limitations. A.A. degree holders seeking admission to quota/limited access degree programs must also meet all requirements specified by the desired program. The admission of Florida College System A.A. transfer students is governed by the Articulation Agreement between state universities and public colleges in Florida.

Undergraduate transfer students who have not earned the A.A. degree from a Florida public institution or who have attended another college after receipt of the A.A. must minimally meet the following

requirements to be considered for admission; however, satisfying these minimum requirements does not guarantee admission:

1. Be in good standing and eligible to return to the last regionally accredited institution attended as a degree-seeking student or a non-regionally accredited institution participating in the SCNS with SCNS approved transferable credits;

2. Have an overall "B-" average as calculated by USF (transfer GPA of 2.75 on a 4.0 scale) in all collegelevel courses acceptable for transfer credit to USF Tampa (in calculation of the GPA, incomplete grades are computed as failures and course "repeats" are not forgiven when the courses are repeated at different institutions.); USF St. Petersburg, USF Sarasota-Manatee and USF Polytechnic will consider admission with a 2.0 transfer GPA in non-limited access majors.

3. Complete (with passing grades) two years of the same foreign language in high school or 8 to 10 semester hours of the same foreign language at a previous college or university. Students who entered a Florida public college prior to August 1, 1989 and maintain continuous enrollment until the time of their USF entry as degree-seeking students may be admitted without the required foreign language study;

4. Meet the minimum grade point average required by the program if entering a limited access program and transferring 60 or more semester hours;

5. If applicable, present a minimum score of 213 (computer-based test) or 79 (Internet-based test) on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), or 6.5 on the IELTS. The TOEFL requirement may be waived on an individual basis when appropriate alternative evidence of English language proficiency is presented in writing.

6. Transfer applicants whose transcripts demonstrate an unsatisfactory course completion ratio will be denied admission to USF Tampa. For the current percentage required for admission, please consult the transfer admissions web page at www.usf.edu/admissions/transfers.

Applicants who do not fully meet the minimum requirements but who have important attributes, special talents or unique circumstances that may contribute to a representative and diverse student body may be considered for admission by a faculty committee on the basis of other appropriate evidence of promise for academic success. These applicants should also submit appropriate alternative evidence of academic achievement, ability, motivation and responsibility that indicates a potential for academic success at USF.

International Admissions (Non-resident Aliens) [see CR2.4-2, USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2010-2011, pp. 20-21]

International admissions are centralized within the USF system and based in Tampa. To be considered for admission, international applicants (non-resident aliens) must submit a USF Polytechnic or FACTS Application for Admission, a non-refundable application fee payable in U.S. dollars, a Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score (if applicable), a Statement of Financial Responsibility, undergraduate admissions test scores as specified for appropriate applicant category, and transcripts showing subjects and grades from the first year of secondary work to the time of application. Transcripts in a language other than English must be accompanied by a certified English translation. Post-secondary international credentials must be

evaluated by an independent evaluation service, with associated costs paid by the student. An international applicant (non-resident alien) must meet all admission requirements for the appropriate applicant category (undergraduate transfer, graduate). Other minimum requirements are as follows:

- An international applicant whose native language is not English must present a minimum score of 79 (internet-based test), 213 (computer-based test), 550 (paper-based test) on the TOEFL, or 6.5 on the IELTS. The TOEFL requirement may be waived on an individual basis when appropriate alternative evidence of English language proficiency is presented in writing.
- 2. International applicants must be in good standing at the last institution attended.
- 3. International applicants must submit the USF Financial Statement substantiating availability of financial resources sufficient to cover all educational, maintenance, and personal expenses while attending USF Polytechnic, without financial assistance from the institution.
- 4. International applicants seeking admission to limited-access, undergraduate-degree programs must also meet all requirements specified by the program.

Evaluation of Undergraduate Transfer Credit

USF Polytechnic follows the commonly-accepted practices established by the American Council on Education (ACE) and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). Receipt and evaluation of credit is the responsibility of the Office of Admissions in Enrollment Management [see CR2.4-2, USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2010-2011, pp. 19-20].

1. Admissions staff review each course taken by an applicant at his or her previous institution(s) to determine whether or not the course may be accepted toward the USF Polytechnic academic degree program to which the student is applying. If accepted, Admissions staff post approved transfer course work to the admitted student's academic transcript.

2. USF Polytechnic accepts credits from institutions accredited by a regional accrediting agency or commission at the time the credits were earned (i.e., Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Education; New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education; North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, The Higher Learning Commission; Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities; Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges; Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges; and Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities). Credits earned at an institution that is currently in "candidacy" status are not considered for transfer credit until the awarding institution receives full accreditation. Courses approved for transfer by the Statewide Course Numbering System (SCNS) from non-regionally-accredited institutions, in accordance with Florida law.

3. Admitted students who wish to transfer courses from colleges or universities that are accredited by organizations and associations other than regional accrediting associations may request a review of those courses by contacting their academic advisors to initiate the process. Students must submit detailed information about the content and standards for each course to be reviewed, including, but not limited to a detailed syllabus that contains the course description, prerequisites and co-requisites, major learning outcomes, textbooks, and the academic qualifications of the instructor. Admissions staff review only those courses that match courses currently offered by USF Polytechnic.

4. USF Polytechnic reserves the right to deny credit for specific courses. It does not award transfer credit from institutions that Admissions staff determine to be occupational or vocational in nature, except for work that is specifically approved as part of the Bachelor of Science in Applied Science (BSAS) program or approved by the college/school of the student's major.

5. Associate in arts (AA) degree holders from Florida public, regionally-accredited institutions are automatically awarded 60 semester hours of credit, which includes completion of general education requirements. Admissions staff evaluate, on a course-by-course basis, transfer credit for applicants who attended out-of-state and private, in-state institutions.

6. All courses from a Florida community college/university bearing the same SCNS prefix and last three (3) numbers as a USF Polytechnic course are automatically transferred. Transfer students are not required to repeat these courses, unless a college age-of-record policy is involved. The same automatic transferability of credits applies to courses completed at non-regionally accredited institutions that have been specifically approved by the SCNS. Excluded are graduate courses, internships, and practicums.

7. All undergraduate degree programs at USF Polytechnic require a minimum of 48 hours of upper-level work completed at a four-year college or university. This policy does not affect approved, articulated programs based on the AS degree. For information regarding specific articulated AS degree programs, students may consult Admissions.

8. Admissions staff do not award credit for General Education Development (GED) tests.

9. Admissions staff evaluate military service school courses in accordance with the established practices of the American Council on Education (ACE) when the student provides official credentials. The ACE recommendation, however, is not binding upon USF Polytechnic.

10. For Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) and military science courses taken after Fall Quarter 1975, the maximum credit varies with each college/school. A student must confer with his/her advisor to determine the acceptability for his/her major. ROTC and military science courses taken prior to Fall 1975 are not acceptable for transfer credit.

11. A maximum of 45 semester hours of College Level Examination Program (subject and general examinations) credits can be accepted for transfer credit.

12. A maximum of 30 semester hours of extension, correspondence, and military service education credits can be applied toward a degree.

13. Admissions staff do not compute grades earned in transferred courses in the student's USF Polytechnic GPA except for purposes of admission to limited- access programs, the awarding of honors at graduation, and class-ranking of baccalaureate students.

14. International credentials must be evaluated by an independent evaluation service with associated costs paid by the student.

15. A continuously-enrolled, degree-seeking student at USF Polytechnic must obtain prior written approval from the college/school of the student's major in order for courses taken at other regionally-accredited institutions to be applied to the USF Polytechnic degree program.

2+2 Articulation Agreements

USF Polytechnic adheres to the requirements of the Florida Statute 1007.23 Statewide Articulation Agreement [see CR2.7.4-4]. Transfer students take their first 60 hours, including the general education core, at the community college. On September 20, 2009 the USF System Board of Trustees approved the addition of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic, which was subsequently approved by the Board of Governors on September 24, 2009 (see CR2.7.3-8a&b and CR2.7.3-9). Some lower-level prerequisite course offerings are planned for AY 2010-2011. A pilot freshman cohort of approximately 100 students is planned for fall 2012. A freshman class is planned for fall 2013 with a summer 2013 learning community experience. A general education core consistent with the mission of USF Polytechnic is being developed by the faculty in 2011.

With the advent of the Florida State College system and with USF Polytechnic moving forward with lower-level courses and enrollment, we will review carefully the potential of some targeted 2+2 agreements with community college or State College partners.

Development of USF Polytechnic as a Four-Year Destination Campus

USF Polytechnic's Strategic Plan 2007-2012 [see CR2.4-1] sets a bold vision for becoming a "premier destination campus for applied learning, research, and innovative technology." On September 20, 2009 the USF System Board of Trustees approved the addition of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic [CR2.7.3-8a, Board of Trustees Agenda Item for approval of lower-level courses 9-10-09] and [CR2.7.3-8b, Board of Trustees Meeting minutes 9-10-09]. The request was subsequently approved by the Board of Governors on September 24, 2009 [CR2.7.3-9, Board of Governors Meeting Minutes, Item 6(E)(2)].

On July 8, 2011 Dr. Belle Whelan, President, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, issued a letter to Dr. Judy Genshaft, President, University of South Florida System, approving the offering of lower-level courses at USF Polytechnic, effective spring 2012 with the first freshman class to be admitted in fall 2013 **[CR2.7.3-10 Whelan Approval Letter 7-8-11]**. A pilot freshman cohort of approximately 100 students is planned for fall 2012.

Freshman Applicants

Students applying for the pilot freshman cohort targeted for fall 2012 will be required to meet the following general admission criteria, consistent with University of South Florida System guidelines. Admission to the university is selective; meeting requirements does not guarantee admission:

- 1. Applicants must submit a USF or FACTS Application for Admission, a non-refundable application fee, an official high school transcript, official GED scores if applicable, SAT or ACT score, with writing, and a TOEFL or IELTS score if applicable.
- 2. College preparatory academic units (year-long courses or equivalents) required are: 4 units of English (3 of the 4 must incorporate substantial writing requirements); 4 units of mathematics
(Algebra I and above); 3 units of natural sciences (2 of the 3 must incorporate substantial laboratory requirements); 3 units of social sciences (history, civics, political science, economics, sociology, psychology and geography); 2 units of the same foreign language; and 3 units of academic electives.

- 3. Freshman applicants who have between a 3.3 (B+) and 4.0 (A) grade point average as recalculated by USF using all attempted academic courses are considered competitive. In recalculating USF assigns additional weights to grades earned in honors, Dual Enrollment, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and Advanced International Certificate of Education courses.
- 4. Applicants submitting a GED diploma must have an overall score of at least 300 for all five tests and at least 50 on each of the five tests. GED holders must also submit an SAT or ACT score that will be considered in assessing the applicant's probability of success (also required of applicants in an approved home schooling program).
- 5. In the absence of the above, the university will also consider appropriate alternative evidence of academic achievement, ability, motivation and responsibility that indicates potential for successful academic work at USF.
- 6. A first-time college applicant whose native language is not English may be required to present a minimum score of 550 (paper-based test) or 79 (Internet-based test) on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), or a score of 6.5 on the International English Language Testing Service exam (IELTS). The TOEFL or IELTS requirement may be waived on an individual basis when appropriate alternative evidence of English language proficiency is presented in writing (including SAT Critical Reading score of 460 or above, or an ACT English/Writing score of 18 or above and Reading Score of 19 or above).
- 7. First-time-in-college applicants seeking admission at the freshman level to a limited access degree program in Engineering must meet additional requirements specified by the degree program.
- 8. If a student has not earned the following minimum scores on the SAT or the ACT, remedial college preparatory work will be required during the first term of enrollment at USF: SAT Mathematics 460, Critical Reading 460, Writing 440; OR ACT English/Writing 18, Reading 19, Mathematics 19. Students requiring this remedial coursework will be offered admission only for summer term.

Assessing General Education Outcomes in the 2+2 Baccalaureate Degree Programs

As USF Polytechnic has provided a 2+2 baccalaureate programs consistent with the Statewide Articulation Agreement, a general education program is not offered at USF Polytechnic. However, university minimum requirements for graduation with a baccalaureate degree consist of completion of a minimum of 120 semester hours which includes Liberal Arts/General Education requirements [see CR2.4-2 USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2010-2011, "Foundations of Knowledge and Learning Core Curriculum," pp. 69-72].

USF Polytechnic assesses reading, writing and mathematics, in addition to critical thinking and diversity, in keeping with core values expressed in its 2007-2012 Strategic Plan:

1. We expect students to **read critically**, interpreting meaning and purpose and recognizing fact vs. inference and opinion.

- 2. We expect students to **write correctly and effectively**, producing well-organized and meaningful prose.
- 3. We expect students to recognize and interpret mathematical terms, data, formulas and representations.
- 4. We expect students to **think critically and analytically**, recognizing and questioning assumptions and hypotheses, interpreting information, drawing appropriate conclusions, and presenting persuasive argument.
- 5. We expect students to **value diversity of human thought, experience and perspective** and to be open to individual and cultural uniqueness.

Means of Assessment

Several means of assessment are used: (1) the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) Test, short form; (2) the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); (3) Graduating Student Survey; and (4) the Diversity/Campus Climate Survey.

General Education Competency	Nationally- Standardized Instrument	Nationally- Standardized Student Self-Report Instrument	USF Polytechnic Student Self- Report Instruments
Reading	MAPP Test		
Writing	MAPP Test		Graduating Student Survey
Mathematics	MAPP Test		
Critical Thinking	MAPP Test Reading Level 3	NSSE Survey Academic Challenge & Active Learning	Graduating Student Survey
Diversity		NSSE Survey Supportive Campus Environment	Graduating Student Survey Diversity/Campus Climate Survey

MAPP Test

The MAPP test, now the ETS®Proficiency Profile, is produced and scored by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) [see FR4.1-11, ETS®Proficiency Profile Users Guide, p. 4] indicates that the test was "developed to assist in the assessment of the outcomes of general education programs in order to improve the quality of instruction and learning. MAPP is a test of college-level skills in critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics. It is designed to measure the academic skills developed through general education courses, rather than the subject knowledge specifically taught in those courses. All of the subject knowledge required to answer each question is contained in the question itself or in the stimulus materials that accompany the question." Test questions assess the following:

College-level reading questions measure students' ability to a) interpret the meaning of key terms,
 b) recognize the primary purpose of a passage, c) recognize explicitly presented information, d) make appropriate inferences, and e) recognize rhetorical devices.

- College-level writing questions measure students' ability to a) recognize the most grammatically correct revision of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences; b) organize units of language for coherence and rhetorical effect; c) recognize and reword figurative language; and d) organize elements of writing into larger units of meaning.
- Critical thinking questions measure students' ability to a) distinguish between rhetoric and argumentation in a piece of nonfiction prose, b) recognize assumptions, c) recognize the best hypothesis to account for information presented, d) infer and interpret a relationship between variables, and e) draw valid conclusions based on information presented.
- Mathematics questions measure students' ability to a) recognize and interpret mathematical terms;
 b) read and interpret tables and graphs; c) evaluate formulas; d) order and compare large and small numbers; e) interpret ratios, proportions, and percentages; f) read scientific measuring instruments; and g) recognize and use equivalent mathematical formulas or expressions.

USF Polytechnic first administered the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) test, short form, in 2009 to sample populations of students 62 students who were volunteers and compensated by receiving a T-shirt. No random sampling strategy was used. Two students did not complete the assessment, resulting in a final sample size of 60.

The campus received aggregate results from Educational Testing Service (ETS) at the end of the spring semester, and the results were shared with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association and Executive Council. USF Polytechnic students' results were compared by NSSE to a sample of similar master's level colleges and universities. The sample included 24,834 students from 80 institutions.

The sample size was not large enough to draw any strong conclusions; however, an overview of the 2009 MAPP Assessment results follows:

	USF Polytechnic MAPP Assessment - 2009							
Sampling Method	Students at the Junior level were solicited for the MAPP test. The test was administered to 62 Polytechnic students. The Sample size was reduced to 60 students who actually finished the test. USFP student scores are compared to a sample of similar Master's Colleges and Universities including 24,832 students and 80 institutions.							
Measurement Methodology	This MAPP assessment measures the student's proficiency at three levels within reading, writing and math; for a total of nine specific areas. Based on the scoring developed for these assessments, students are rated as proficient, not proficient or marginal in the nine skill areas. A student is classified as marginal if there is not enough evidence to classify the student as either proficient or not proficient.							
Performance Expectation	The proficiency of USF Polytechnic students will be at a level consistent with other students at similar Master's level colleges and universities in each of the nine skill levels.							

READING	Students are expected to read critically, interpreting meaning and purpose and recognizing fact vs. inference and opinion. Students will be able to a) interpret the meaning of key terms, b) recognize the primary purpose of a passage, c) recognize explicitly presented information, d) make appropriate inferences, and e) recognize rhetorical devices.
Assessment Results	Level 1 USFP: 65% All Schools: 65% Level 2 USFP: 31% All Schools: 31% Level 3 USFP: 2% All Schools: 5%
WRITING	Students are expected to write correctly and effectively, producing well- organized and meaningful prose. Students will be able to a) recognize the most grammatically correct revision of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences; b) organize units of language for coherence and rhetorical effect; c) recognize and reword figurative language; and d) organize elements of writing into larger units of meaning.
Assessment Results	Level 1USFP:60%All Schools:76%Level 2USFP:22%All Schools:18%Level 3USFP:10%All Schools:7%
MATHEMATICS	Students are expected to recognize and interpret mathematical terms, data, formulas and representations. Students will be able to a) recognize and interpret mathematical terms; b) read and interpret tables and graphs; c) evaluate formulas; d) order and compare large and small numbers; e) interpret ratios, proportions, and percentages; f) read scientific measuring instruments; and g) recognize and use equivalent mathematical formulas or expressions.
Assessment Results	Level 1 USFP: 68% All Schools: 52% Level 2 USFP: 38% All Schools: 24%
	Level 3 USFP: 5% All Schools: 7%

Discussion of 2009 MAPP Results. Recognizing the limited sample, student proficiency in Reading was comparable with other schools at Level 1 and Level 2 proficiency, and slightly lower than other schools at Level 3 proficiency which assesses Critical Thinking. USFP student proficiency in Writing was less than other schools at Level 1 proficiency, but slightly higher than other schools at Level 2 and Level 3

proficiencies. USFP student proficiency in Mathematics was higher than other schools at Level 1 and Level 2 proficiencies and slightly less than other schools at Level 3 proficiency.

Use of Results. Data collected for 2009 will be a baseline for future years. The MAPP test is scheduled to be repeated in summer/fall 2010 with a focus on improving the sample size and methodology. Senior students will be solicited for this sample. As the general education curriculum is developed, these data will be utilized as a foundation to build a strong, focused and integrated general education program. In addition, the campus will examine benefits that may be gained from implementing the long form of the MAPP which includes discipline specific areas such as communication, social sciences, humanities and natural sciences. In addition, the use of subject-specific assessments from ETS will also be examined.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) obtains, on an annual basis, information from hundreds of four-year colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college. Survey items on The National Survey of Student Engagement represent empirically confirmed "good practices" in undergraduate education. That is, they reflect behaviors by students and institutions that are associated with desired outcomes of college.

Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience inside and outside the classroom that can be improved through changes in policies and practices more consistent with good practices in undergraduate education. This information is also used by prospective college students, their parents, college counselors, academic advisers, institutional research officers, and researchers in learning more about how students spend their time at different colleges and universities and what they gain from their experiences.

The NSSE is administered nationwide to college students selected randomly. The USF System Office of Decision Support submits a student population data file of ALL first-year and senior students, and NSSE selects a random sample (half freshman, half seniors) from this file based on undergraduate enrollment. Customized letters endorsed by an institutional representative are included with the surveys mailed or e-mailed to participating schools in February to March.

The NSSE was first administered as a pilot in spring 2007, again in 2009 and spring 2010. Results were analyzed by NSSE and reported separately as well as together with the USF System. Because USF Polytechnic's enrollment is a small proportion of the total USF System enrollment, USF Polytechnic Institutional Research paid an additional fee to oversample USFP senior students in 2007 and 2009, and again in spring 2010. USF Polytechnic Institutional Research will administer the NSSE to USFP seniors online during the spring semester every other year, with the next administration of the assessment in spring 2012.

NSSE 2007 and 2009 Results

NSSE identifies five benchmarks of effective educational practice: 1) level of academic challenge, 2) active and collaborative learning, 3) student – faculty interaction, 4) enriching educational experiences, and 5) supportive campus environment **[CR2.7.4-8, NSSE Benchmarks]**. The 2007 survey was the first year where baseline data specific to USF Polytechnic Seniors were available. This survey was considered baseline; 2009 results were compared with the 2007 data. Comparisons were made for each of the

benchmarks, using a series of two-way analyses of variances (linear model – least square means Scheffe test with a significance level of .01). The following graphs compare academic years 2007 and 2009 and gender:







WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 150





Discussion of Results. Comparisons of year of assessment, campus and race were not significantly different among the Polytechnic students. However, as other studies have found, females and males rated the NSSE benchmarks differently. We found that within the dimensions of active learning and enriching educational environment female students rated their experiences significantly higher than male students.

In the dimension of Academic Challenge, both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009. In Active Learning both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female students perceptions increasing slightly more. In the area of Student Faculty Interactions, again both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female and female students' perceptions increasing slightly more. In Enriching Educational Environment, both male and female students' perceptions increased positively with female students rating the benchmark higher than male students. In Supportive Campus Environment, male students' perceptions decreased from 2007 to 2009 while female students' perceptions increased positively.

Use of Results. NSSE results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council. The purpose of this analysis was twofold: 1) to get some preliminary information about USF Polytechnic students and how they compare with other USF students; and 2) to get some baseline results for further analysis. The graphs fulfill the spirit of the first purpose. The second purpose was fulfilled as well.

In relation to the decrease from 2007 to 2009 in male students' perceptions of the dimension of Supportive Campus Environment, campus demographics indicate that female students comprise 61% of the student population. USF Polytechnic's Multicultural Education and Engagement Office instituted an annual panel discussion. In April 2009 the topic was "Where Are the College Men?" and in April 2010 the topic was "Where Are the Men?" Both panels engaged attendees in discussions with current male students and male alumni around why more men are not attending college, increasing a male student support environment, and issues in male students' successful completion of college degrees.

NSSE 2009 – USF Polytechnic Students and Other NSSE College Students

The 2009 administration of the NSSE also examined USF Polytechnic students' attitudes and experiences as compared to other college students taking the NSSE. The comparisons were simplistic. The benchmark score for USF Polytechnic students was based on the average score for all USFP students who were seniors and completed the survey. The NSSE scores for All students, top 50% and top 10%, were based on the weighting system used by NSSE to calculate benchmarks for various subgroups in the NSSE student sample. Although a significance level based on means of USF Polytechnic students and the NSSE subgroups might have been calculable, it would have presumed a level of statistical accuracy that was probably unfounded. The following graphs portray our findings:



2009 NSSE	USF Polytechnic	NSSE Top 50%	NSSE Top 10%	All Institutions	
	59.3%	60.1%	62.8%	57.0%	



2009 NSSE	USF Polytechnic	NSSE Top 50%	NSSE Top 10%	All Institutions
	53.2%	55.7%	56.1%	51.0%



2009 NSSE	USF Polytechnic	NSSE Top 50%	NSSE Top 10%	All Institutions
	33.6%	48.8%	54.2%	42.0%



2009 NSSE	USF Polytechnic	NSSE Top 50%	NSSE Top 10%	All Institutions
	36.3%	48.0%	54.1%	40.8%



2009 NSSE	USF Polytechnic	NSSE Top 50%	NSSE Top 10%	All Institutions
	55.0%	64.1%	67.5%	58.2%

Discussion of Results. In the benchmark categories of **Level of Academic Challenge** and **Active and Collaborative Learning**, USF Polytechnic students scored their institution higher than the average of all NSSE students sampled. In the categories of **Student Faculty Interaction**, **Enriching Educational Experiences** or **Supportive Campus Environment**, USF Polytechnic students, on average, rated their institution slightly lower than the average NSSE responder. USF Polytechnic students, on average, did not rate their institution higher than the average NSSE responder in schools categorized in the top 50 percent or top 10 percent of schools based on benchmark scores.

Use of Results. It is difficult to determine demographic information for any of the NSSE groups. How significantly they varied from the USF Polytechnic population is difficult to know and could be important. Certainly, as USF Polytechnic shares a campus with a state college which sets the policies for campus use, it is challenging to develop strategies to create a campus environment specific to USFP students. The planning and development of the new campus site is an important opportunity for USF Polytechnic to involve students in the planning stages and to communicate the importance of their interests, needs and perspectives in creating a new campus environment.

The NSSE results were shared with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association and the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup. A Graduating Senior Survey was established in 2008, as well as a Diversity and Climate Survey, to gain additional perspective in relation to students' responses in the areas of Student Faculty Interaction, Enriching Educational Experiences or Supportive Campus Environment. In addition, Student Affairs sponsored a couple of new activities to provide students with more opportunity to meet and spend time with faculty outside the classroom (e.g., Catered Classroom and Meet the Faculty receptions hosted by Student Affairs).

NSSE Results 2010

The 2010 NSSE questionnaire was administered in May 2010 to 137 USF Polytechnic seniors. Benchmark means were compared for students from USF Polytechnic, USF Sarasota-Manatee, USF St. Petersburg, USF Tampa and the Carnegie "Master's Small" cohort. The table below provides this comparison.

	USF	Poly	USF Sa	rasota	USF St. Pete		USF T	ampa	Master	's Sm.	US	USF Poly Above/Belov		low
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Sar	S.P.	Тра	Sm. Mst.
Level of Academic Challenge	58.26	14.52	58.35	14.42	56.32	14.15	55.77	14.08	59.0	14.1	-0.10	1.94	2.49	-0.74
Active and Collaborative Learning	53.34	20.53	50.04	18.12	48.70	18.19	45.15	17.25	53.9	17.4	3.30	4.64	8.19	-0.56
Student-Faculty Interaction	36.95	21.42	36.25	17.59	34.34	18.83	34.43	19.00	46.5	21.4	0.70	2.61	2.52	-9.55
Enriching Educational Experiences	38.50	17.52	32.51	16.67	34.97	17.36	35.16	16.46	43.5	19.1	5.99	3.53	3.33	-5.00
Supportive Campus Environment	58.95	20.06	62.24	19.49	56.89	18.36	54.99	19.35	62.3	19.5	-3.29	2.07	3.96	-3.35

Comparisons	of Rosul	ts for	NSSF F	Ronc	hmark M	oanc
CUIIIparisulis	oi nesui	LS IUI	INJJE	Denic	11111ai k ivi	eans

NOTE: While means for a given benchmark are on the same scale and may be compared across institutions, the scales vary across benchmarks and do not permit comparisons between benchmarks.

Discussion of Results: Note that the mean for USF Polytechnic is below that of the Master's Small cohort on each of the five benchmarks. However, the results are much different when USF Polytechnic means are compared to the other USF campuses. In fact, the USF Polytechnic mean is above the corresponding mean for USF Tampa and USF St. Pete on <u>all five benchmarks</u> – most dramatically on the three benchmarks that most assess characteristics closely aligned with the Polytechnic mission. The USF Polytechnic mean is above USF Sarasota on three of the five benchmarks.

If one peruses the questions comprising each benchmark, one can see that the special polytechnic mission of USF Polytechnic is best measured by the items making up the benchmark labeled "Active and Collaborative Learning," followed by "Level of Academic Challenge" and "Enriching Educational Experiences." Note that for "Active and Collaborative Learning," USF Polytechnic is above all three of its local peers, as is also the case for "Enriching Educational Experiences." For "Level of Academic Challenge" USF Polytechnic is above two of its three local peers.

These results strongly support the assertion that USF Polytechnic is differentiating itself from other USF campuses in terms of delivering education consistent with its Polytechnic mission.

Use of Results: The NSSE results were reviewed with the Executive Council. As the results report was received at the end of June 2011, the report will be distributed and reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association, the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and faculty at the beginning of the fall 2011 semester.

Graduating Student Survey Results

Institutional Research administers a **Graduating Student Survey** during fall and spring semester registration for Commencement. The survey was first administered in the 2008-2009 academic year; a total of 50 students responded. In 2009-2010 one hundred twenty-four (124) students completed the survey. The following table provides data on students' views of their courses:

2008-2009 N=50 2009-2010 N=113	Strongly Disagree Disagree		Ag	ree	Strongly Agree			
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Courses in my major provided me with adequate knowledge and skills.	12%	7%	2%	4%	42%	55%	44%	34%
My writing skills improved.	12%	8%	8%	16%	54%	48%	26%	28%
My oral communication skills improved.	12%	8%	10%	11%	40%	48%	38%	33%
My critical thinking skills improved.	10%	6%	4%	8%	36%	48%	50%	37%

Graduating Student Survey

Discussion of Results. In the category of adequacy of knowledge and skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall (i.e., combined percentage in strong disagree and disagree responses) with the statement decreased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 14% to 11% while the percentage of students agreeing overall (i.e., combined percentage in agree and strongly agree responses) with the statement increased from 86% to 89%.

In the category of writing skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement increased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 20% to 24%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement decreased from 80% to 76%.

In the category of oral communication skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement decreased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 22% to 19%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement increased from 78% to 81%.

In the category of critical thinking skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement remained the same from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 at 14%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement decreased slightly from 86% to 85%.

Use of Results. The Graduating Student Survey results are shared with the Academic and Student Affairs Council. The increase in student disagreement and decrease in student agreement with the statement, "My writing skills improved," from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010, in addition to the Level 1 performance of students on the MAPP short form test (60%) in comparison to all schools in similar master's level colleges and universities (76%) suggests that writing skills is an area for improvement. Additional full-time faculty have been hired for academic year 2010-2011 to teach literature and writing exit courses, as well as technical and professional writing courses. This will reduce the number of courses that would be taught by adjunct faculty. The full-time faculty will be following the results of the 2010-2011 administration of the MAPP test to determine potential curricular changes or the need for additional common course assessments.

Level 3 proficiency in Reading on the MAPP test assesses Critical Thinking; only 2% of USF Polytechnic students and 5% of students in similar master's level colleges and universities demonstrated proficiency in Level 3 Reading/Critical Thinking. In the dimensions of Academic Challenge and Active Learning on the NSSE, both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences at USF Polytechnic as academically challenging increased positively from 2007 to 2009. In addition, USF Polytechnic students scored their institution higher on these two benchmarks than the average of all NSSE students sampled. The decrease from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 on the Graduating Student Survey in student agreement with the statement, "My critical thinking skills improved," is slight (1%); however, results in the area of critical thinking will be monitored in academic year 2010-2011 as this is a key area of value for USF Polytechnic and for student success and achievement.

■ Graduating Student Survey 2010-2011

Preliminary results of the 2010-2011 Graduating Student Survey were distributed to Executive Council at the end of July 2011. Of the 350 graduating students, 101 completed the survey.

2010-2011 N=101	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Courses in my major provided me with adequate knowledge and skills.	1%	4%	40%	55%
My writing skills improved.	2%	12%	41%	45%
My oral communication skills improved.	1%	6%	35%	58%
My critical thinking skills improved.	1%	3%	30%	66%

Preliminary Discussion of Results. In the category of adequacy of knowledge and skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 4% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 44% in 2008-2009 and 35% in 2009-2010 to 55% in 2010-2011.

In the category of writing skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 8% in 2009-2010 to 2% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 26% in 2008-2009 and 28% in 2009-2010 to 45% in 2010-2011.

In the category of adequacy of oral communication skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 10% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 38% in 2008-2009 and 33% in 2009-2010 to 58% in 2010-2011.

In the category of adequacy of critical thinking skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 10% in 2008-2009 and 6% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 50% in 2008-2009 and 37% in 2009-2010 to 66% in 2010-2011.

Use of Results: The preliminary results were reviewed with the Executive Council. As the results report was received at the end of July 2011, the report will be distributed and reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association, the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and faculty at the beginning of the fall 2011 semester.

Campus Climate/Diversity Survey Results

Institutional Research, in collaboration with the USF Polytechnic Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement, administers the **Campus Climate/Diversity Survey** every other year [see CR2.5-18 l&m]. The first administration of the survey was in spring 2008, and the next administration of the survey was fall 2010. The survey measures students' perceptions of the following factors: 1) experience with diversity, 2) academic achievement and personal development, 3) peer relationships, 4) diversity programs and policies, 5) camaraderie among groups, 6) classroom environment, 7) treatment and inter-group relations, 8) expression of insensitivity and prejudice, 9) diversity experiences impact, 10) disabled students, and 11) overall evaluation of campus experiences.

In spring 2008 the total number of USF students responding to the survey was 2,712 with 447 students who took classes at USF Polytechnic participating. In fall 2010 the total number of USF students responding to the survey was 2,395 with 319 students who took classes at USF Polytechnic participating.

The following table presents a summary of USF Polytechnic respondents' perceptions of the campus/ diversity climate:

	Spring 2008 (N=447)	Fall 2010 (N=319)
Percentage of students moderately to extremely satisfied with their overall experience at USF Polytechnic [Q167, Q169]	95.8%	86.5%
Percentage of students feeling accepted by the campus community at USF Polytechnic [Q168, Q170]	90.4%	71.1%
Percentage of students feeling the quality of academic programs at USF Polytechnic is excellent [Q169, Q171]	95.6%	82.6%
Percentage of students feeling USF Polytechnic provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs [Q170, Q172]	96.8%	83.2%
Percentage of students feeling an environment that includes diversity improves the quality of education [Q171, Q173]	96.3%	84.3%
Percentage of students who would recommend USF Polytechnic to siblings or friends as a good place to go to college [Q172, Q174]	96.2%	84.4%

Discussion of Results. In spring 2008 USF Polytechnic was USF Lakeland, a regional campus of the University of South Florida System with a newly differentiated mission of applied learning, applied research and applied technology. In fall 2008 USF Polytechnic was established with legislative charge to seek separate SACS accreditation. In fall 2010 USF Polytechnic had evidenced strategic changes to meet its distinct mission, and in faculty, staff and student populations changes occurred as individuals considered and made decisions regarding their "fit" for that mission. Decreases in students' feelings about USF Polytechnic in fall 2010 are not inconsistent with a campus identity change.

Use of Results. Results are distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council and Student Government Association. Units utilize the results to address objectives and subsequent improvements within their assessment plans. The Diversity Office was integrated into Student Affairs and restructured as the Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement to increase collaboration communication with Student Affairs units (e.g., Recruitment, Admissions, Student Activities, Student Government). Survey results data going forward will be assessed for trends and improvements through comparison with

administrations of the instrument on a two-year cycle. Fall 2010 data were received in July 2011 and were distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council at the end of July.

Development of USF Polytechnic as a Four-Year Destination Campus

In spring 2011 a General Education Committee of the Faculty Senate developed a General Education Core Curriculum and Assessment Plan for the first Freshman class anticipated in fall 2013. The plan transitions from the USF Foundations of Knowledge and Learning (FKL), providing a polytechnic philosophy of education and learning outcomes drawn from that philosophy, a rationale for course selection, a listing of and description of courses with relationship of each course to the learning outcomes indicated. An assessment plan continues use of the ETS Proficiency Profile and NSSE survey, and adds a Written Communication Rubric and a common rubric for assessment of Capstone Experiences. (See CR2.7.3-11c-d)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.7.4-1] USF System Regulation 3.008 Admission to the Graduate School

[CR2.7.4-2] USF Graduate Catalog Section 4 Graduate Admissions

[CR2.7.4-3a] USF System Regulation 3.011 Graduate School Requirements [CR2.7.4-3b] USF Graduate Catalog, Section 7 Academic Policies and Regulations

[CR2.7.4-4] Florida Statute 1007.23 Statewide Articulation Agreement

[CR2.7.4-5] Florida Statute 1007.24 Statewide Course Numbering System

[CR2.7.4-6] Board of Governors Regulation 6.004 Admission of Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Transfer Students

[CR2.7.4-7] USF System Regulation 3.018 Admission to the University of South Florida

[CR2.7.4-8] NSSE Benchmarks

[CR2.7.4-9] Climate Survey USF Poly Home Campus Students 2008

[CR2.7.4-10] Climate Survey All Students at USF Polytechnic 2008

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.8: Faculty

The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of its academic programs.

Upon application for candidacy, an applicant institution demonstrates that it meets the comprehensive standard (3.7.1) for faculty qualifications.

🗹 Compliance 🛛

Partial Compliance

□ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

The following tables provide information on the number and percent of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty and part-time faculty at each instructional site and for each degree program content area during the Spring 2010 and Fall 2010 terms.

Definitions of Terms Used in Tables

Program Content Area = Degree program or academic discipline

SCH = Student credit hours

FT Faculty = USF Polytechnic full-time regular faculty

PT Faculty = Adjuncts, graduate teaching assistants, full-time Tampa faculty on overload, fulltime Polytechnic professional staff on overload, Polytechnic full-time professional staff with inload teaching assignment, Polytechnic part-time regular faculty, Polytechnic part-time professional staff

Spring 2010

USF Polytechnic Student Credit Hours by FT and PT Faculty, Spring 2010 Form Completed: May 20, 2010

Location of	Program Content	Total Number of	% SCH by FT Faculty	%SCH by PT Faculty
Instruction	Area	SCH Generated		
UN	IDERGRADUATE COURS	ES FOR MAJORS, MINO	RS and CONCENTRATIO	NS
Avon Park, FL	Elementary Ed	496	105 (21%)	391 (79%)
Lakeland, FL	Accounting	312	108 (35%)	204 (65%)
	Tech/Prof Writing	150	150 (100%)	
	Communication	138		138 (100%)
	Criminology	123		123 (100%)
	Elementary Ed	1473	1018 (65%)	455 (35%)
	Engineering	201	126 (63%)	75 (37%)
	Finance	297		297 (100%)
	Information Tech	57	57 (100%)	
	Interdisciplinary Social Science	72	72 (100%)	

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 161

	Information Systems Decision Science	429		429 (100%)
	Leadership Studies	15		15 (100%)
	Management	696	594 (85%)	102 (15%)
	Marketing	720	498 (69%)	222 (31%)
	Psychology	805	297 (37%)	508 (63%)
	Sociology	111	66 (59%)	45 (41%)
Online	Tech/Prof Writing	63	63 (100%)	
	Criminology	1485	513 (35%)	972 (65%)
	Elementary Ed	594	72 (12%)	522 (88%)
	Engineering	72	72 (100%)	
	Information Tech	2757	2232 (81%)	525 (19%)
	Interdisciplinary Social Science	180	180 (100%)	
	Leadership Studies	138	90 (65%)	48 (35%)
	Management	99		99 (100%)
	Marketing	90	90 (100%)	
	Sociology	222		222 (100%)
SUB-TOTAL		11,795	6,403 (54%)	5,392 (46%)
	GENERAL EDUCATION	EXIT AND COMMON PR	RE-REQUISITE COURSES	
Lakeland, FL	Africana Studies	69	69 (100%)	
	Economics	63		63 (100%)
	English	42	6 (14%)	36 (86%)
	Gov/Intl Affairs	129		129 (100%)
	Religious Studies	68		68 (100%)
	Women's Studies	105	12 (14%)	93 (86%)
Online	Nutrition	570	570 (100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		1,046	657 (63%)	389 (37%)
		GRADUATE COURSES		-
Avon Park, FL	Ed Leadership	105	39 (37%)	66 (63%)
Citrus County, FL	Ed Leadership	24	24 (100%)	
Lakeland, FL	Counseling Ed	372	207 (56%)	165 (44%)
	Ed Leadership	270	213 (79%)	57 (21%)
	MBA	135	135 (100%)	
	Psychology	3	3 (100%)	
	Reading Education	96	96(100%)	
	Social Work	50		50 (100%)
SUB-TOTAL		1,055	717 (68%)	338 (32%)
TOTAL		13,896	7,777 (56%)	6,119 (44%)

In Spring 2010, 13,896 student credit hours were generated in regular, organized courses (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) with 56% taught by full-time regular faculty at USF Polytechnic and 44% taught by part-time faculty.

In Spring 2010, the percentage of undergraduate credit hours in regular, organized courses taught by full-time regular faculty was 55%. The percentage of graduate credit hours taught by full-time regular faculty was 68%.

Fall 2010 New Hires

A \$5 million increase to the base budget was approved by the State Legislature and Governor for the July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010 fiscal year. **Twenty-two new faculty** were added to the faculty roster for academic year 2010-2011:

Program Content Area	Degree Program Major, Minor, Concentration	Rank	FTE
Accounting	B.S General Business	Professor	1.0
	Administration	Instructor	1.0
Agricultural & Biological	B.S. Industrial		
Engineering	Engineering		
Criminology	B.A. Criminology	Professor	1.0
Counselor Education	M.A. Counselor Education	Assistant Professor	1.0
English Composition & Literature	General Education Exit Courses	Assistant Professor	2.0
ESOL	B.S. Elementary Education	Associate Professor	1.0
Finance	B.S General Business Administration	Instructor/Assistant Professor	1.0
Gerontology/Aging Studies	Interdisciplinary Social Science (ISS)	Assistant Professor	1.0
Industrial Engineering	B.S. Industrial	Visiting Assistant Professor	1.0
	Engineering	Visiting Instructor	1.0
Information Systems/Decision Science (ISDS)	B.S General Business Administration	Instructor/Assistant Professor	1.0
Library		Assistant Librarian	1.0
Management	B.S General Business Administration, Management Major	Assistant Professor	1.0
Mathematics Education	B.S. Elementary Education	Assistant Professor	1.0
Nutrition & Food Science	B.S.A.S.	Assistant Professor, Nutrition	1.0
		Assistant Professor, Food Science	1.0
Psychology	B.A. Psychology	Instructor	1.0
Science Education	B.S. Elementary Education	Assistant Professor	1.0
Sociology	Interdisciplinary Social Science (ISS) & Sociology Minor	Associate Professor	1.0
Technical & Professional Writing	Minor	Assistant Professor	1.0

USF Polytechnic Student Credit Hours by FT and PT Faculty, Fall 2010 Form Completed: September 4, 2010

Location of	Program Content	Total Number of SCH	% SCH by FT Faculty	%SCH by PT Faculty
Instruction	Area	Generated		
UI	NDERGRADUATE COURS	SES FOR MAJORS, MINOR	S and CONCENTRATIO	NS
Avon Park, FL	Elementary Ed	534	207(39%)	327 (61%)
Lakeland, FL	Accounting	132	132 (100%)	0 (0%)
	Tech/Prof Writing	132	132 (100%)	0 (0%)
	Communication	111	0 (0%)	111 (100%)
	Criminology	336	180(54%)	156 (46%)
	Elementary Ed	1789	976 (54%)	813 (46%)
	Engineering	246	159(65%)	87 (35%)
	Finance	255	225(88%)	30 (12%)
	General Business	114	114(100%)	
	Information Tech	27	27(100%)	
	Information	327	171(52%)	156 (48%)
	Systems Decision Science			
	Leadership Studies	51		51 (100%)
	Management	459	234 (51%)	225 (49%)
	Marketing	489	489(100%)	(,
	Psychology	699	255 (36%)	444(64%)
	Sociology	159	138(87%)	21(13%)
SUB-TOTAL	sociology	5,860	3,439(59%)	2,421(41%)
Online	Accounting	36	36 (100%)	=, ==(==/0,
	Communication	105	30 (10070)	105(100%)
	Criminology	1310	329 (25%)	981 (75%)
	Elementary Ed	168	525 (2576)	168 (100%)
	Engineering	100	90 (81%)	21(19%)
	Information Tech	1626	1356 (83%)	270 (17%)
	Interdisciplinary	165	165(100%)	270 (1770)
	Social Science		105(100%)	
	Leadership Studies	66		66 (100%)
	Management	333	222(67%)	111 (33%)
	Marketing	105	105 (100%)	
	Sociology	189		189 (100%)
SUB-TOTAL		4,214	2,303 (55%)	1,911 (45%)
		EXIT AND COMMON PRE	•	
Lakeland, FL	Economics	60		60 (100%)
	English	273	237 (87%)	36 (13%)
	Geology	39	39(100%)	
	Gov/Intl Affairs	162		162 (100%)
	Mathematics	39	39(100%)	
	Religion	32		32(100%)
	Women's Studies	66		66(100%)
SUB-TOTAL		671	315(47%)	356(53%)
Online	Nutrition	540	540 (100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		540	540 (100%)	
		GRADUATE COURSES		
Avon Park, FL	Ed Leadership	12		12 (100%)
Citrus County, FL	Ed Leadership	45	45 (100%)	
Lakeland, FL	Counseling Ed	448	372 (83%)	76 (17%)

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 164

Ed Leadership	219	171(78%)	48(22%)
MBA	271	207 (76%)	64 (23%)
Reading Education	51	51(100%)	
	1,046	846(81%)	200(19%)
Ed Leadership	102		102 (100%)
	102		102 (100%)
	7,577	4,600 (61%)	2,977 (39%)
	4,856	2,843(58%)	2,013(42%)
	12,433	7,443(60%)	4,990(40%)
	MBA Reading Education	MBA 271 Reading Education 51 Image: Image and the system 1,046 Ed Leadership 102 Image: Image and the system 102 Image and the system 102	MBA 271 207 (76%) Reading Education 51 51(100%) 1,046 846(81%) 102 Ed Leadership 102 102 7,577 4,600 (61%) 4,856 2,843(58%)

In Fall 2010, 12,433 student credit hours were generated in regular, organized courses (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) with 60% taught by full-time regular faculty at USF Polytechnic and 40% taught by part-time faculty. This represents a small improvement compared to the spring 2010 ratio.

In Fall 2010, the percentage of undergraduate credit hours in regular, organized courses taught by fulltime regular faculty was 58%. The percentage of graduate credit hours taught by full-time regular faculty was 74%. This also represents improvement as compared to spring 2010.

Academic Program	Total Course Sections	Number of Sections by FT/PT Faculty		Percer	Percentage	
		FT	РТ	FT	PT	
Applied Science	Students take courses	with other st	udents in m	ajors bel	ow.	
Criminology	19	8	11	42%	58%	
Elementary Education	24	9	15	38%	63%	
General Business Administration	21	8	13	38%	62%	
Industrial Engineering	9	4	5	44%	56%	
Information Technology	22	18	4	82%	18%	
Interdisciplinary Social Science	6	1	5	17%	83%	
Management	15	5	10	33%	67%	
Marketing	16	7	9	44%	56%	
Psychology	8	4	4	50%	50%	
Undergraduate Degrees Totals	140	64	76	46%	54%	
Business Administration, MBA	8	7	1	88%	12%	
Counselor Education, Mental Health	9	7	2	88%	12%	
Counselor Education, School Counseling	9	7	2	88%	12%	
Educational Leadership	8	4	4	50%	50%	
Reading Education	4	3	1	75%	25%	
Master's Degrees Totals	38	28	10	74%	26%	

USF Polytechnic Course Sections Taught by FT and PT Faculty, Fall 2010 Form Completed: September 14, 2010

In fall 2010, 140 undergraduate regular, organized course sections (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) were taught with 46% taught by full-time regular faculty. Thirty-eight (38) graduate regular, organized course sections (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) were taught with 74% taught by full-time regular faculty.

USF Polytechnic Student Credit Hours by FT and PT Faculty, Spring 2011 Form Completed: July 30, 2011

Location of	Program Content	Total Number of SCH	% SCH by FT Faculty	%SCH by PT Faculty
Instruction	Area	Generated		
	UNDERGRADUATE COURS	SES FOR MAJORS, MINOR	S and CONCENTRATIO	NS
Avon Park, FL	Elementary Ed	456	201(44%)	255(56%)
Lakeland, FL	Accounting	102	72 (70%)	30 (30%)
	Aging Studies	108	93 (86%)	15 (14%)
	Tech/Prof Writing	129	129 (100%)	
	Communication	165		165(100%)
	Criminology	330	138(42%)	192 (58%)
	Elementary Ed	1359	1299 (96%)	60 (4%)
	Engineering	378	195(52%)	183(48%)
	Finance	162	141(87%)	21 (13%)
	General Business	261	102(39%)	159 (61%)
	Information Tech	65	29(45%)	36 (55%)
	Information Systems Decision Science	219		219 (100%)
	Leadership Studies	27		27(100%)
	Management	616	445(72%)	171 (28%)
	Marketing	422	422(100%)	
	Psychology	774	306 (40%)	468(60%)
	Sociology	132	63(48%)	69(52%)
SUB-TOTAL		5,705	3,635(64%)	2,070(36%)
Online	Accounting	39	39 (100%)	
	Aging Studies	75	75 (100%)	
	Criminology	1659	585 (35%)	1074(65%)
	Elementary Ed	252	12 (5%)	240 (95%)
	Engineering	237	114(48%)	123(52%)
	Information Tech	1572	1033 (66%)	539 (34%)
	Interdisciplinary Social Science	172	172(100%)	
	Leadership Studies	168		168 (100%)
	Management	210	90(43%)	120 (57%)
	Marketing	87	87 (100%)	
	Sociology	105		105 (100%)
	Tech/Prof Writing	108	108 (100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		4,684	2,315 (49%)	2,369 (51%)
	GENERAL EDUCATION	EXIT AND COMMON PRE	-REQUISITE COURSES	
Lakeland, FL	African Am Studies	51		51 (100%)
	Economics	68		68 (100%)
	Education	69	69 (100%)	
	English	294	249 (85%)	45 (15%)
	Geology	30	30(100%)	
	Gov/Intl Affairs	105		105 (100%)
	Religion	48		48(100%)
	Women's Studies	54		54(100%)
SUB-TOTAL		719	348(48%)	371(52%)
Online	Education	69	69 (100%)	
	Nutrition	765	765 (100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		834	834 (100%)	

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 166

		GRADUATE COURSES		
Avon Park, FL	Ed Leadership	33	33 (100%)	
Citrus County, FL	Ed Leadership	60	30 (50%)	30 (50%)
Lakeland, FL	Counseling Ed	356	356 (100%)	
	Ed Leadership	300	141 (47%)	159(53%)
	MBA	157	93 (59%)	64 (41%)
	Reading Education	100	100(100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		1,006	753(75%)	253(25%)
Online	Ed Leadership	48	48 (100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		48	48 (100%)	
TOTAL FACE-TO-		7,430	4,736 (64%)	2,694 (36%)
FACE				
TOTAL ONLINE		5,566	3,197(57%)	2,369(43%)
TOTAL OVERALL		12,996	7,933(61%)	5,063(39%)

In spring 2011, 12,996 student credit hours were generated in regular, organized courses (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) with 61% taught by full-time regular faculty at USF Polytechnic and 39% taught by part-time faculty. This represents a slight improvement compared to the fall 2010 ratio.

In spring 2011, the percentage of undergraduate credit hours in regular, organized courses taught by full-time regular faculty was 60%. The percentage of graduate credit hours taught by full-time regular faculty was 76%. This also represents improvement as compared to fall 2010.

Academic Program	Total Course Sections	Number of Sections by FT/PT Faculty		Percen	Percentage	
		FT	РТ	FT	PT	
Applied Science	Students take courses	with other st	udents in m	ajors bel	ow.	
Criminology	18	8	10	44%	56%	
Elementary Education	24	19	5	79%	21%	
General Business Administration	32	22	10	69%	31%	
Industrial Engineering	21	10	11	48%	52%	
Information Technology	23	16	7	70%	30%	
Interdisciplinary Social Science	12	8	4	67%	33%	
Management	12	9	3	75%	25%	
Marketing	8	8		100%		
Psychology	8	4	4	50%	50%	
Undergraduate Degrees Totals	158	104	54	66%	34%	
Business Administration, MBA	7	5	2	71%	29%	
Counselor Education	10	10		100%		
Educational Leadership	6	2	4	33%	67%	
Reading Education	4	4		100%		
Master's Degrees Totals	27	21	6	78%	22%	

USF Polytechnic Course Sections Taught by FT and PT Faculty, Spring 2011 Form Completed: July 30, 2011

In spring 2011, 158 undergraduate regular, organized course sections (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) were taught with 66% taught by full-time regular faculty. This represents an

improvement compared to the fall 2010 ratio of 46%. Twenty-seven (27) graduate regular, organized course sections (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) were taught with 78% taught by full-time regular faculty. This represents a small improvement compared to the fall 2010 ratio of 74%.

Faculty Hiring Plan for 2010-2011

We recognize that we need to improve the ratio between full-time and part-time faculty, particularly in undergraduate education. A \$10 million increase to the base budget was approved by the State Legislature and Governor for the July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 fiscal year. Additional **faculty to support degree program majors, minors and concentrations** will be recruited during 2010-2011 for the 2011-2012 academic year. A preliminary hiring plan includes the following:

Program Content Area	Rank	FTE	Estimated Additional Sections to be Taught by Full-time Faculty*
Accounting	Assistant Professor	1.0	5
Allied Health Sciences	Assistant (3) and Associate Professor	4.0	21
Applied Sciences	Assistant Professor	2.0	10
Applied Statistics	Assistant Professor	1.0	5
Communication/New Media	Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor	3.0	18
Criminology	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0	12
Early Childhood Learning	Assistant Professor	1.0	5
Educational Leadership	Instructor, Associate/Assistant Professor	2.0	12-13
Educational Research & Measurement	Assistant/Associate Professor	1.0	5-6
Elementary Education	Assistant and Associate Professor	2.0	11
Finance	Assistant Professor	1.0	5
Information Science	Assistant Professor	1.0	5
Engineering & Information Technology	Open Rank	7.0	48
Library	Assistant Librarian, Education, Allied Health & Social Sciences	1.0	n/a
Management	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0	12
Marketing	Assistant Professor	1.0	5
Psychology	Assistant/Associate Professor	2.0	11
	TOTAL	34.0	190-192

*Based on an average faculty course load for fall and spring semesters combined: Instructor (7), Assistant Professor (5), Associate Professor (6), Professor (6).

USF Polytechnic Student Credit Hours by FT and PT Faculty, Fall 2011 Form to be Completed: February 1, 2012

USF Polytechnic Course Sections Taught by FT and PT Faculty, Fall 2011 Form to be Completed: February 1, 2012

Faculty Hiring for 2011-2012

A pilot freshman cohort of approximately 100 students is planned for fall 2012. A freshman class is planned for fall 2013 with a summer 2013 learning community experience. A general education core consistent with the mission of USF Polytechnic was developed by faculty in spring 2011 (see Core Requirement 2.7.3). Faculty to support increased lower-level course offerings and a pilot freshman cohort will also be recruited during 2011-2012 for the 2012-2013 academic year:

General Education	Rank	FTE
Biology	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Chemistry	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Communication	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Digital Arts & Media	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
English Composition & Literature	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Environmental Science	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Film & Visual Arts	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
French	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Global & International Affairs	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Mathematics & Statistics	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Philosophy & Ethics	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Physics & Physical Science	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Political Science	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Psychology	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Sociology	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Spanish	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
	TOTAL	32.0

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

- [CR2.8-1] Spring 2010 OASIS Class Schedule On Campus Courses
- [CR2.8-2] Spring 2010 OASIS Class Schedule Off Campus Courses
- [CR2.8-3] Fall 2010 OASIS Class Schedule On Campus Courses
- [CR2.8-4] Fall 2010 OASIS Class Schedule Off Campus Courses
- [CR2.8-5] Spring 2011 OASIS Class Schedule On Campus Courses
- [CR2.8-6] Spring 2011 OASIS Class Schedule Off Campus Courses

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.9: Learning Resources and Services

The institution, through ownership or formal arrangements or agreements, provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections and services and to other learning/information resources consistent with the degrees offered. Collections, resources, and services are sufficient to support all its educational, research, and public service programs.

🗹 Compliance 🛛 Partial Compliance 🔷 Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

Information requested in Part A relating to library resources and services. See 1-6 below.

LIBRARY/LEARNING RESOURCES

1. SPACE USAGE

Describe the Library/Learning Resources physical facilities and, of the total, indicate the amount of space devoted to each of the following:

The library/learning resources facilities on the USF Polytechnic campus are located on the first floor of the Lakeland Technology Building (LTB) in a shared space which houses the **USF Polytechnic Library [CR2.9-1]** and the Open Use Computer Lab supported by the staff of the USFP Information Technology Services (ITS). Students have access to the library and open use lab, and faculty, students and staff have access to the library's collections and learning resources. The shared space houses the Library's offices, stacks, collections and study spaces as well as the Open Use Computer Lab managed by the ITS staff. The front desk is shared by both the Library and ITS to provide services and support to students. Each unit maintains one employee at the front desk. The square footage below includes the space allocation for the entire shared room:

a. Stack areas for shelving volumes only	326 sq. ft. (1,281 linear ft.)
Total Sta	icks = 475 sq. ft. (1,383 linear ft.)
b. Seating capacity	897 sq. ft.
c. Staff offices and work areas	992 sq. ft
d. Other areas (e.g. media productions, learning labs, and listening rooms)	952 sq. ft
e. Total square feet allocated to library functions	3,729 sq. ft.

A larger space, based on the Learning Commons model, is envisioned for the new USF Polytechnic campus site on Interstate 4. The Learning Commons will be a dynamic, user-driven and collaborative space where the users – students, faculty and staff – will find the assistance and technology needed for the production of the desired product (e.g., paper, presentation, study time). Users will easily find

assistance from different units (e.g., library, information technology services, writing center, tutoring center) for accessing, gathering, evaluating, organizing and using information to produce a knowledgebased or research-based object. The Learning Commons will be developed in two stages, a temporary building with a projected square footage of approximately 12,000 sq. ft. and a final permanent building, the specific size of which is as yet unspecified.

2. LIBRARY STAFF

Library Staff	Full- time	Part- time	Qualifications
1. Librarians	3	0	MLIS degrees from ALA-accredited programs
2. Other professional staff on the library budget (media specialists, subject bibliographers, etc.)	0	0	
3. Para-professional staff (Undergraduate degree in library science)	1	0	
4. Support staff (technical, clerical) - student assistance	0	3	

Three full-time librarians provide library instruction and research assistance to students, faculty and staff at USF Polytechnic. The librarians also perform library collection development activities for the campus. The Director of the USFP Library reports directly to the Dean of the USF Libraries with a dotted-line report to the Regional Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, at USF Polytechnic.

The USFP librarians hold master's degrees in library and information science from programs accredited by the American Library Association (ALA). The USFP librarians participate with other USF Libraries' librarians in professional development workshops and training sessions, as well as overall discussions regarding development of the USF Libraries collections.

1. Number of hours of student assistance by students employed on an hourly basis charged to the library budget

Two (2) student assistants work approximately 20 hours/week each, or approximately 2080 hours over three semesters.

2. Number of hours of student assistance by students employed on an hourly basis charged to budgets other than the library

One (1) Federal Work Study student works approximately 10 hours/week, or approximately 360 hours over two semesters.

3. LIBRARY MATERIALS

<u>Directions:</u> For each of the library material descriptions listed below, please provide the following information:

a. Number held 2 years ago

b. Number held at the end of previous year

c. Number added this fiscal year

- d. Number withdrawn this fiscal year
- e. Number held at the end of this fiscal year
- A. Bound volumes (exclude bound periodicals and microfilms)
- B. Paid current periodical subscriptions
- C. Free current periodical subscriptions
- D. Current newspaper subscriptions
- E. Current serial subscriptions (include annual proceedings, etc.)
- F. Separate government documents
- G. Other

The figures that follow refer to print holdings for the USF Polytechnic Library. These figures were derived from reports provided by library online catalog systems maintained by the Florida Consortium for Library Automation (FCLA). The figures for the electronic resources were provided by the Academic Resources unit of the USF Tampa Library.

		2007-2008	2008-2009	Added	Withdrawn	Held at end of FY09-10
H)	Bound volumes	5,339	5,766	563	31	6,298
I)	Paid current periodicals	98	98	2	5	95
J)	Free current periodicals	7	6	0	0	
K)	Current newspapers subscriptions	2	2	0	0	2
L)	Current serials subscriptions	23	26	1	0	27
M)	government documents			Included in A-E		
N)	Other electronic documents					
Nu	mber of e-journals purchased	25,156	51,396	827	0	52,223
	Cost of e-journals	\$2,618,959	\$2,701,383	n/a	n/a	\$2,929,369
re	mber of electronic eference resources cluding databases)	736	787	20	0	807
re	Cost of electronic eference resources	\$1,713,097	\$1,206,236	n/a	n/a	\$1,225,509
١	Number of e-books	256,306	281,927	161,262	0	443,189
	Cost of e-books	\$285,315	\$328,731	n/a	n/a	\$582,712
N	umber of business datasets	20	21	1	0	22
	Cost of business datasets	\$171,903	\$143,663	n/a	n/a	\$169,645

4. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

Describe all learning resources provided by electronic means.

The **USF Libraries [CR2.9-2]** provide an extensive collection of online resources to which all USF Polytechnic students, faculty and staff have access. All USF libraries contribute financially to the funding of these resources based on a formula that allocates cost by academic programs delivered by each campus and student FTE. The resources include 51,396 journals acquired through subscriptions and database aggregators; over 780 databases that include significant reference resources; and over 281,000 e-books from the latest imprint to historical texts. Beginning in 2009, faculty and students gained online access to the entire publication output of Springer e-books with a substantial collection in Computer Science and Information Technology. The USF Libraries have recently acquired over twenty business datasets (e.g., COMPUTSTAT, CRSP, Audit Analytics) that are accessed through Wharton Research Data Services (WRDS) to facilitate research in business and the social sciences. Additional electronic collections include access to USF theses and dissertations, image and digitized collections, oral histories and multi-media resources. The USF Libraries is one of 19 libraries nationally that provide access to the University of Southern California Shoah Foundation Institute's Visual History Archive containing over 52,000 Holocaust testimonies.

The USF Libraries also hold membership in the Center for Research Libraries (CRL), providing students and faculty access to over four million rarely-held books, journals and other primary-source materials from all over the world. These resources are listed in the USF online catalog. USF Polytechnic students and faculty can search either the USF Libraries catalog or the CRL catalog and request materials through interlibrary loan.

To assist learners further, the USF Polytechnic Library uses social media tools (blog, Facebook, Twitter, FriendFeed, Flickr, Foursquare) for outreach and to communicate information. It also provides videocasts to demonstrate research techniques. Users also have access to the blogs, videocasts, podcasts and other online tools as prepared by the other USF libraries. Online research assistance is available via forms, e-mail or, with the collaboration of the USF libraries, online chat and text messaging.

Describe the computer resources dedicated to library/learning resources.

The application of innovative technology is foundational to USF Polytechnic's mission. Three units at USFP share responsibility for computer services that support library/learning resources:

- USFP Information Technology Services (ITS) [CR2.9-3] provides and maintains the software and hardware for academic, administrative and office computing as well as the campus' computer networks and network security. ITS also provides the staff supporting the Open Use Computer Lab in the Library shared space and the campus IT Help Desk.
- **Classroom Technology and Media Services [CR2.9-4]** provides AV-media technology, Instructional TV, webcasting and videoconferencing services. The unit also provides smart podium training and troubleshooting for the use of all campus classroom technology.
- **Teaching and Learning Innovation (TLI) [CR2.9-5]** provides faculty training and support for the use of innovative instructional technologies and teaching pedagogies. Assistance is also provided for students and faculty with technology issues involving Blackboard, Chalk & Wire and Elluminate, as well as most Windows-based application programs used for course activities or assessments.

At the USF Polytechnic Library, students have access to six (6) computer workstations. One workstation is also accessible to alumni and community users. One workstation serves as a microfilm/fiche reader/scanner station and also as a backup to the open access workstation. (23 other seats are available in the shared space; they are not computer workstations.) Inside the same room in the Open Use Lab, students have access to forty-one (41) workstations. One of these is a multimedia workstation with a color scanner and specialized image and video editing software. Some workstations also provide assistive software and hardware for students with disabilities. An instructor podium, equipped with a projector and similar to the smart podium found in campus classrooms, permits students to practice presentations. Students have access to two printers and a photocopier/scanner. A high-speed wireless network is available throughout the room to use with laptops and other handheld devices.

5. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

List cooperative agreements with other libraries and agencies.

For each agreement, provide a signed copy of the cooperative agreement which includes, but is not limited to, provision for student access, provision for review, provision for assistance to students, and provision for enhancing the collections.

For each cooperative agreement, describe how the resources of the other library or agency support specifically the programs offered by the institution.

Memorandum of Understanding with the USF Libraries

The USF System manages its libraries centrally through USF Tampa. A **USF Libraries and USF Polytechnic Library Memorandum of Understanding [CR2.9-6]** details the relationship between the USF Libraries and the USF Polytechnic Library.

The services provided by the Tampa Library to USF Polytechnic include the following categories/subcategories:

- A. Recruitment and development of employees
- B. Information services
 - 1. Website administration (including the USF Libraries Intranet)
 - 2. Online reference assistance
- C. Collection services
 - 1. Cataloging
 - 2. Acquisitions
 - 3. Serials management
 - 4. Electronic collections management
 - 5. Fiscal processes
 - 6. Budget-tracking and reporting
 - 7. Miscellaneous services

USF Polytechnic students, faculty, and staff are eligible to access the electronic collections shared among the members of the USF Library System and maintained by Tampa Library personnel. Costs associated with access to these collections are calculated annually using a formula accepted by all parties.

USF Polytechnic is responsible for adequately funding the terms of the agreement and all library collections and services needed to support their academic programs and to meet accreditation goals, including all services outsourced to the Tampa Library.

Other agreements and cooperative arrangements

USF Polytechnic students and faculty benefit from agreements, memberships in cooperative consortia and cooperative agreements established by the USF Libraries to extend access to important research collections beyond the USF Libraries. For example, through the USF Libraries, faculty and students of USF Polytechnic obtain access to state-funded resources accessed by an online catalog created by the Florida Library Center for Automation (FCLA).

As a member of the State of Florida's Division of Universities and Colleges, the USF Libraries are signatories to and active participants in the **State University System of Florida and the Community College System of Florida Library Borrowing Privileges Agreement (1998)** [CR2.9-7], which guarantees that current USF Polytechnic students, faculty and staff have borrowing privileges at other state university and community college libraries. The relationship with FCLA ensures that USF Polytechnic students and faculty have access to state-provided resources, such as online databases, e-journals and e-books. In addition, USF Polytechnic students and faculty have access to library holdings worldwide through a comprehensive interlibrary loan network. USF Polytechnic has an active, individual membership in the OCLC Bibliographic Network [CR2.9-8] for interlibrary loan purposes [CR2.9-9, OCLC Resource Sharing Terms]. Other collaborative bibliographic networks in which USF Polytechnic maintains membership for interlibrary loan purposes include the Tampa Bay Library Cooperative (TBLC), the Florida Library Information Network (FLIN), SOLINET and Libraries Very Interested in Sharing (LVIS).

6. ANALYSIS OF LIBRARY RESOURCES

<u>Directions:</u> The two columns "percent of total collection" and "percent of total acquisitions" refer to the number of bound volumes - excluding bound periodicals and microfilms.

Area	L.C. Classification	% of Total Collection	% of Total Acquisitions FY09-10
Humanities & General Works	A, B, M, N, P, Z	26.08%	18.82%
Social Sciences	C, D, E, F, G, H, J, K, L	57.09%	52.04%
Physical Sciences, including Mathematics	Q - QE	6.55%	12.25%
Biomedical Sciences	QH - QR, R, S	4.03%	6.21%
Technology (Engineering)	T, U, V	6.22%	10.65%
Unclassified materials		0%	0%

USF Polytechnic Library Resources as of June 30, 2010

7. PROVISION OF STUDENT INSTRUCTION

Evidence that the institution provides instruction to students, both on campus and at a distance (if applicable), concerning how to access and use learning resources provided by the institution.

Students at USF Polytechnic can easily access both the USF Polytechnic Library website [CR2.9-10, see link below] and the USF Libraries website [CR2.9-11, see link below] online, and can remotely search catalogs [CR2.9-11a] and electronic resources [CR2.9-11b] such as databases, newspapers, E-journals, E-books and reference resources; get information on accessing collections and electronic reserves [CR2.9-11c] through Blackboard; or submit an interlibrary loan request form [CR2.9-11d].

Students can also access online **research help [CR2.9-11e]** such as information about citing sources, directions for using Refworks, resources on plagiarism, and copyright resources, and access online **tutorials [CR2.9-11f]** through the **USF Polytechnic Library website**.

Two full-time librarians provide library instruction and research assistance to students, faculty and staff. The library offers information/training sessions and **Open Door Seminars [CR2.9-12]** for faculty, staff and students. During academic year 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 fifteen to twenty information and training sessions were provided for students, and nine open door workshops were provided each year to faculty and students. Faculty can request classroom **library instruction [CR2.9-13]** on how to use the Libraries resources and services; instruction is also available for online courses through Elluminate. In both cases instruction can be customized for the instructor's needs for specific course research and projects. In calendar year 2009, 46 instructional sessions were provided, a 4.5% increase, to 354 participants.

Both students and faculty can get additional information about Libraries services and events through the USF Polytechnic Library Blog [CR2.9-14, see link below].

8. Assessment of Student Satisfaction with Learning Resources and Services

Assessment of Student Satisfaction with Learning Resources and Services

The **2009-2010** and **2010-2011** Graduating Student Survey indicates that students are for the most part satisfied to highly satisfied with learning resources and services provided by the Library and computer services that support library functions. Survey data are provided in the following table.

	Highly Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied		Satisfied		Highly Satisfied		Not Applicable	
	2009-	2010-	2009-	2010-	2009-	2010-	2009-	2010-	2009-	2010-
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Library	1%	2%	3%	6%	41%	35%	39%	45%	16%	9%
Library Electronic	1%	0	6%	6%	37%	43%	41%	44%	16%	5%
Resources										
Open Use	1%	2%	4%	1%	34%	36%	36%	44%	24%	13%
Computer Lab										
Classroom	2%	2%	3%	6%	49%	51%	41%	35%	7%	5%
Technology										

2009-2010 and 2010-2011 Graduating Student Survey

The **2009-2010 Client Survey** indicates that faculty and staff are also for the most part satisfied to highly satisfied with learning resources and services provided by the Library and computer services that support library functions. Results of the survey are provided below:

	Highly	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly	Not
	Dissatisfied			Satisfied	Applicable
Print Collections	0%	8%	32%	26%	34%
Electronic Collections	0%	6%	20%	48%	26%
Library instruction & information	0%	2%	29%	45%	24%
literacy					
Reference & research assistance	0%	2%	29%	45%	24%
Circulation/reserves services	0%	2%	26%	43%	29%
Inter-library loan	0%	4%	24%	40%	32%
Facilities, physical space	0%	12%	44%	24%	20%

2009-2010 Client/Faculty & Staff Survey

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.9-1] USF Polytechnic Library

[CR2.9-2] USF Libraries

[CR2.9-3] USFP Information Technology Services (ITS) website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/x898.xml

[CR2.9-4] USFP Classroom Technology and Media Services website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/x904.xml

[CR2.9-5] Teaching and Learning Innovation (TLI) website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/x910.xml

[CR2.9-6] USF Libraries and USF Polytechnic Library Memorandum of Understanding

[CR2.9-7] State University System of Florida and the Community College System of Florida Library Borrowing Privileges Agreement (1998)

[CR2.9-8] OCLC Bibliographic Network website http://www.oclc.org/us/en/default.htm

[CR2.9-9] OCLC Bibliographic Network Resource Sharing Terms

[CR2.9-10] USF Polytechnic Library website: http://poly.usf.edu/Offices/Library.html

[CR2.9-11] USF Libraries website: http://www.lib.usf.edu/

[CR2.9-11a] Catalogs
[CR2.9-11b] Electronic resources
[CR2.9-11c] Accessing collections and electronic reserves
[CR2.9-11d] Interlibrary Ioan
[CR2.9-11e] Research help
[CR2.9-11f] Tutorials

[CR2.9-12] Open Door Seminars [CR2.9-13] Library instruction [CR2.9-14] USF Polytechnic Library Blog: http://catherin.blog.usf.edu/

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 178

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.10: Student Support Services

The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that promote student learning and enhance the development of its students.

Compliance Deartial Compliance Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. A list and description of academic support programs for all students regardless of where the students are located or how they access courses offered by the institution.

Student Advising

Students at USF Polytechnic are served by both Admissions/Pre-Major Advisors and Academic Major Advisors. **Admissions/Pre-Major Advisors** assist students prior to and during the admissions application process. Admissions/Pre-Major Advisors help students determine if they have met the requirements for admission to the university and to the degree program in which they are interested. The advisor assists with evaluation of transfer credits, particularly in relation to the completion of general education requirements or completion of pre-requisite courses prior to admission into the major. Admissions/Pre-Major Advisors help student determine if they should take courses in non-degree status, pursue a baccalaureate, post-baccalaureate certificate or graduate certificate. The advisors also assist international students in connecting with the USF System Office of International Affairs for important information about foreign transcript evaluation services, TOEFL requirements, and visa information.

Academic Major Advisors established their unit vision, mission and goals [CR2.10-1] consistent with the values of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) [CR2.10-2]. The Academic Major Advisors assist in the evaluation of transfer of credits; create a program plan of study for the academic major; assist students with course selection and the registration process; help students understand university regulations, policies and procedures; conduct a degree audit; and help students stay on track with degree completion. Academic Major Advisors can also help students estimate the time to degree completion and cost. Academic Major Advisors can assist students who have not yet been admitted to USF Polytechnic to pre-plan for the right degree "fit" for the student's career goals.

Both Admissions/Pre-Major Advisors and Academic Major Advisors receive training for all majors and programs offered at USF Polytechnic and can assist both prospective and current students. Both advisors make appropriate referrals to resources at USF Tampa, USF St. Petersburg or USF Sarasota-Manatee. Both advisors are available by appointment, walk-in, telephone and e-mail. **Appointments can be made on-line [CR2.10-3]** 24-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week.

Academic Major Advisors serve as a resource to faculty and academic divisions on course scheduling, student referrals, and program planning. They serve on various campus committees and serve as advocates for students. They collaborate with other units within Student Affairs to provide a student-centered environment with a focus on admission, retention, and degree completion.

Orientation

Orientation for undergraduate students [CR2.10-4] consists of two types, an online orientation and a semester start workshop. The **online orientation** is designed for students who are enrolled in online majors and is to be completed at a time that is convenient for the student. In the online orientation students learn about academic policies and requirements, completing the financial aid application and the aid distribution process, ordering textbooks through the USF online bookstore, opportunities to participate in Campus Life, and access student resources and services.

Students who are enrolled in grounded majors are required to attend a **semester start workshop** where students:

- Interact with faculty and staff in their academic department
- Connect with representative from campus services, resources and student groups
- Review degree requirements and identify a course schedule
- Register for classes
- Explore student technology resources including Blackboard, OASIS, Degree Works and activate their USF student email
- Meet other new USF Poly students in their major

Orientation for graduate students is not mandatory but recommended. Graduate students attend a semester start workshop and have the same opportunities for information and participation as noted above, except designed for students in graduate degree programs.

In 2004-2005 the yield percentages of enrolled students to admitted students was 64%; it has increased steadily to 72% in 2009-2010. The combination of services for students from two different but complementary advising approaches, the addition of online orientation for students, and the addition of semester start workshops has contributed to increased enrollments after admission.

Career Center

The **Career Center [CR2.10-5]** provides a full range of career development services from career assessments to assistance in attaining professional employment. The Career Center provides multiple resources for students:

- Job and internship searches can be conducted at the Career Center or on Websites. The Career Center also keeps a current list of internships and potential job openings by major and a current listing of Lakeland area employers.
- The Career Center offers resume workshops and individual assistance. Students can use the Optimal Resume Builder and Tutorial on their home computers.
- Perfect Interview Software allows students to practice interview answers to questions asked by the on screen "employer." The program has a built in "coach" who offers advice on answering each question and also includes a short video of a student giving a sample answer to each question. Students can view this software in a private room in the Career Center.
- Students can complete career assessments using MyPlan.com, a FREE online career guidance tool provided exclusively for USFP students. The tool has assessments for Personality, Interests, Work Values and Skills. Results yield a wealth of information and videos on different
occupations based on the student's answers. Other career assessments are also available at the Career Center as well as guidance on online resources.

• Students can schedule free workshops on demand and get additional guidance on options if the student is an undecided major.

The Career Center hosts an annual Career and Networking Fair where employers can post job availabilities, conduct on-campus interviews, distribute company literature, and get listed on the Career Center website.

Transfer Success Course

The Transfer Success course (LDR 3930) taught by Student Affairs staff promotes academic success and persistence by developing academic success skills, encouraging student engagement on campus, and providing strategies for students to develop self-directed learning and responsibility.

Students Disability Services

The USF Polytechnic Office of Student Disability Services coordinates accommodations for all eligible students to ensure equal access to and rewarding experiences in USF Polytechnic academic programs and activities. The coordinator develops an accommodation plan specific to each student's needs that may include accommodations for class examinations such as extended time, quiet environment, or use of computer; Braille embosser (for translating electronic copy to Braille hard copy); Jaws screen reader; Open Book scanner and screen reader; CCTV book image enlarger; books on tape or electronic format; permission to tape record lectures; note takers; ASL interpreters; or course substitutions for language requirement if eligible.

Information regarding services and eligibility standards are available through the USF Polytechnic **Student Disability Services website [CR2.10-6]** or can be provided by the Student Disability Services Coordinator.

Writing Center

At the **Writing Center [CR2.10-7]**, students receive assistance in targeted areas of writing. The Writing Center counselor provides one-to-one attention for a particular writing assignment and addresses global and local paper concerns. Students receive assistance in areas such as focusing on topics, organizing ideas, strengthening arguments, documenting research, revising style, revising grammar, revising for second language issues, etc. Students can also take advantage of the Online Writing Lab by sending their work via e-mail to the Writing Center and making an appointment to discuss the assignment via telephone.

Library Services

Students at USF Polytechnic can easily access both the USF Polytechnic Library website [see CR2.9-1] and the USF Libraries website [see CR2.9-2] online, and can remotely search catalogs and electronic resources such as databases, newspapers, E-journals, E-books and reference resources; get information on accessing collections and electronic reserves through Blackboard; or submit an interlibrary loan request.

Students can also access online research help such as information about citing sources, directions for using Refworks, resources on plagiarism, and copyright resources, and access online tutorials through the USF Polytechnic Library website.

Three full-time librarians based at USF Polytechnic provide library instruction and research assistance to students, faculty and staff. The library offers Open Door Seminars for faculty, staff and students, and both faculty and students can get additional information about Library services and events through the USF Polytechnic Library Blog [see CR2.9-11].

2. A list and description of other student support programs and services provided to students regardless of where the students are located or how they access courses offered by the institution.

Student Affairs

Student Affairs is a comprehensive unit providing integrative services designed to enhance student learning and engagement. Student Affairs is comprised of Enrollment Management which includes Recruitment, Admissions, Pre-Major Advising, and Orientation; Records and Financial Aid which includes Registration and Records, and Financial Aid; Multicultural Education and Engagement Programs; Campus Life and Engagement Programs; Health and Wellness Center which include the Student Counseling Center, Student Disabilities Services, Student Health Services and Health Promotion; and Student Rights and Responsibilities.

The Dean of Students reports to the Interim Regional Chancellor and serves on the campus Executive Council. The position provides overall leadership and direction for the development, administration, evaluation and continuous improvement of all student services and programs. The Dean of Students is responsible for strategic planning and collaborative leadership with administration, faculty, staff and students focused on a well-balanced and wholistic academic and co-curricular approach to student learning, community, engagement and success. A variety of events are offered throughout the academic year to integrate and engage students into the USFP community. A weekly e-mail is to sent to students to keep them informed about upcoming events and programs as well as to provide reminders about various academic deadlines or announcements.

Records and Financial Aid

The staff of Records and Financial Aid provides students with assistance on registration and financial aid information and consultation services. The Director of Records and Financial Aid provides coordination and problem solving support for Admissions/Pre-Major Advisors and Financial Aid Specialists.

The **Director of Records and Financial Aid [CR2.10-8]** provides assistance to faculty and staff with questions related to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and serves as a training resource for staff on use of the student information system (SCT Banner). The Enrollment Management Specialist works with academic divisions in the development of the campus course schedule, registration dates and deadlines. Students register on-line through the Online Access Student Information System (OASIS), and the registrar provides assistance for students with grade change, add/drop, registration holds, and registration through permit requests.

A **Financial Aid Specialist [CR2.10-9]** help students understand the availability of financial aid resources and navigate policies and procedures in the financial aid eligibility, award, distribution, and academic progress processes. Financial Aid Specialists promote financial aid opportunities and requirements information sessions, and student contacts via telephone, e-mail, personal appointment, and the **Office of Financial Aid website [see CR2.10-10 below].** The Financial Aid website provides information on a variety of topics, including state, campus-based **scholarships [CR2.10-11]**.

Multicultural Education and Engagement Programs

The **Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement [CR2.10-12]** provides services and programs for multicultural students as well as training and education for faculty and staff to understand this distinct population. The **Multicultural Leadership Program** is a leadership development program that focuses on mentoring incoming students. The MLP enhances the awareness and acceptance of diverse cultural groups within the university. Students are trained to serve as mentors who work with incoming students. The **STARS Leadership Corps** increases students' knowledge and interest in computing careers; builds students' leadership, team work, presentation, time management and work/life balance skills; and develops students' sense of belonging within the USF Polytechnic and broader community.

Campus Life and Engagement Programs

The **Student Government Association (SGA) [CR2.10-13]** represents the interest of all students on campus. Student elected officers coordinate student events on campus, represent students at various campus committees, and provide input to administration regarding student needs and interests.

A variety of student activities and organizations are also available to students. USF Polytechnic believes that student activities provide opportunities for students to build leadership skills, get connected to the campus, and network with other students on campus. Students' experiences with student organizations and activities can be recorded in the campus **co-curricular portfolio [CR2.10-14]**. The portfolio documents verifiable student involvement in activities that occur outside the classroom, including applied learning through community-based involvement, community service, leadership development activities and programs, non-academic credit performances, recreation activities, student activities and programs, and student organizations. Students can use the portfolio to demonstrate to employers and graduate schools the leadership, communication and management skills developed through participation in these activities.

The **Polytechnic Leadership Society [CR2.10-15]** provides service as official hosts and goodwill representatives at all functions where students' welcoming guests and visitors in desired.

Several student organizations and activities are growing on the campus:

• The **Black and Hispanic Alliance** supports Black and Hispanic students through their transition into USF Polytechnic and their development and involvement in the campus.

- **Delta Sigma Pi** is a professional business fraternity. The organization provides leadership opportunities, networking, financial planning seminars, time management workshops, professional etiquette training, and other activities.
- The **Psychology Club** provides support for psychology majors and students interested in psychology. The club holds regular meetings and hosts guest speakers.
- Association of Information Technology Professionals is a student organization that focuses on information technology and new initiatives in the technology field. Students work collaboratively with the national organization for mentoring, professional development opportunities, and networking.
- An International Alternative Service Spring Break [CR2.10-16] was held for the first time at USF Polytechnic. Ten students and a staff advisor traveled to El Salvador to live and learn about current social issues and to work with a partner organization, Un Techo Para Mi Pais (A Roof for My Country) that builds transitional housing for families in extreme poverty.

Health and Wellness Center

The **Counseling Center [CR2.10-17]** provides a variety of emotional health services to enrolled USF Polytechnic students. Additional services include substance abuse counseling, crisis counseling, group counseling, and advocacy. The mental health counselors are able to work with students to help them address obstacles to their personal and academic success.

A Student of Concern Assistance Team (SOCAT) recognizes and assists students in distress through supportive intervention when there is a concern that a student poses a danger to self or others. This proactive team meets to discuss and review at-risk students who may need additional support to be a successful student.

A Health Promotion Coordinator provides educational awareness opportunities for issues related to alcohol and drug abuse, suicide prevention, HIV/STD, and overall physical health. A partnership with a local YMCA provides fitness options, which enhances students' physical and mental development. Through aerobic classes, intramural sports, weight lifting, and other activities, students can keep in good physical health.

Student Health Services provides health related assessments and diagnosis for all registered students at USF Polytechnic. Through a partnership with the Polk County Health Department, part-time registered nurse practitioners assist students with health related issues and provide basic care and referrals.

Student Rights and Responsibilities

USF Polytechnic values a community based on the principles of integrity, civility, and respect. As such, our university expects students to behave in a manner that supports these principles, upheld through the Student Rights and Responsibilities function of Student Affairs and the Dean of Students. The **Student Code of Conduct [CR2.10-18]** is a document, which describes behavior that is counteractive to these principles and how the USF System will hold students accountable for those inappropriate behaviors.

Student Success Services

Several departments have collaborated to coordinate the **eXcellence Factor Student Success workshop series** for our students which focus on tips for being a successful student such as understanding faculty expectations, note taking, time management, and health living. Students who attend 5 out of 6 workshops receive an X Factor certificate of completion.

Through our online Hobson's communication software, we will utilize a survey tool that helps instructors and advisors quickly identify students at risk for attrition due to academic, financial and social challenges. This **Early Alert System** sends notifications to faculty who can complete a quick and easy survey on their students to inform us regarding any potential issues so that we can proactively assist our students and help them be successful.

General Student Support Services

Cash Course is an online service provided to strengthen students' financial life by educating students on topics such as budgeting overview, credit card use, paying for college, and the world of work.

Commuter Services is a part of the Florida Department of Transportation and is formal partner with USFP. This service provides alternative transportation options for students who may need assistance getting to campus including a free online ridematch database where students can connect with other commuters to share rides.

Don't Stop Don't Drop is service for students who are having a difficult time with the current economy. Students who are questioning whether they can afford to stay in college are referred to the Dean of Students who assists in identifying potential resources or referrals that would help keep students in enrolled.

Veterans Services is offered through a part-time student veterans affairs benefits advisor. Working collaboratively with the financial aid specialist, the advisor provides advice and guidance to incoming and current veterans students regarding their veteran benefits and status.

3. A list of student activities available to students, including athletic programs.

USF Polytechnic Student Activities [CR2.10-19]

4. Student Handbook

USF Polytechnic Student Code of Conduct [CR2.10-18]

USF Polytechnic Student Organizations Handbook [CR2.10-20]

5. Organizational Chart for Student Development or (Support) Services.

USF Polytechnic Student Affairs Organizational Chart [OC4]

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.10-1] Academic Major Advisors unit vision, mission and goals

[CR2.10-2] Values of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA)

[CR2.10-3] eScheduler Online Appointment Scheduling

[CR2.10-4] Orientation Manual

[CR2.10-5] Career Center, website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/CampusLife/StudentAffairs/Career-Center.html

[CR2.10-6] Student Disability Services, website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/Offices/DisabilityServices.html

[CR2.10-7] Writing Center

[CR2.10-8] Campus Registrar

[CR2.10-9] Financial Aid Specialists

[CR2.10-10] Office of Financial Aid website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/Apply-USFP/FinancialAid.html

[CR2.10-11] Scholarships

[CR2.10-12] Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement

[CR2.10-13] Student Government Association (SGA)

[CR2.10-14] Co-curricular portfolio

[CR2.10-15] Polytechnic Leadership Society

[CR2.10-16] International Alternative Service Spring Break

[CR2.10-17] Counseling Center

[CR2.10-18] Student Code of Conduct

[CR2.10-19] USF Polytechnic Student Activities List

[CR2.10-20] USF Polytechnic Student Organization Handbook

[OC4] USF Polytechnic Student Affairs Organizational Chart

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.11.1: Financial Resources

The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrates financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

Audit and other requirements for applicant institutions are found in the Commission policy "Accreditation Procedures for Applicant Institutions." These audit requirements are as follows:

As part of its demonstration of compliance with Core Requirement 2.11.1, an institution must include in its application separate institutional audits and management letters for its three most recent fiscal years, including that for the fiscal year ending immediately prior to the date of submission of the application. The institution also must provide with the application an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal procedures, and is approved by the governing board, and a schedule of changes in unrestricted net assets, excluding plant and plant related debt (short and long term debt attached to physical assets). Further, the institution must provide a separate audit and management letter for the most recent fiscal year ending prior to any committee visit for Candidacy, Candidacy renewal, or initial Membership. All audits must be conducted by independent certified public accountants or an appropriate governmental auditing agency.

An applicant or Candidate institution must not show an annual or cumulative operating deficit at any time during the application process or at any time during Candidacy.

Compliance Partial Compliance Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Audits and management letters for the three most recent fiscal years, including that for the fiscal year ending immediately prior to the date of the submission of the application. If the institution is a part of a system, the most recent of the three audits must be a separate audit for the institution itself.

The Auditor General of the State of Florida is appointed by a majority vote of the members of the Legislative Auditing Committee, subject to confirmation by both houses of the Legislature [CR2.11.1-1 FS 11.42 The Auditor General]. In accordance with Florida Statute 11.45(2)(c) [CR2.11.1-2, FS 11.45 Definitions; duties; authorities; reports; rules], all universities are audited annually.

The following financial audits are provided:

[FR1] University of South Florida Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008 [FR2] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009 [FR4] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010

The USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011 is in the process of being completed by the State Auditors, USF System Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance, and

the USF Polytechnic Executive Director for Administration and Finance. Completion is expected end of January 2012.

Prior to the financial audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009, USF Polytechnic was included in the University of South Florida audit. USF audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008 found 1) the University's financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with prescribed financial reporting standards; and 2) no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. See University of South Florida Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008 [see FR1, Executive Summary, p. i].

The separate financial audit for USF Polytechnic for fiscal year ended June 30, 2009 also found 1) the University's basic financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with prescribed financial reporting standards; and 2) no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. In addition the audit did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that would be considered material weaknesses. See University of South Florida Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009 [see FR2, Executive Summary, p. i].

The separate financial audit for USF Polytechnic for fiscal year ended June 30, 2010 found again 1) the University's basic financial statements presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with prescribed financial reporting standards; and 2) no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under Government Auditing Standards. In addition the audit did not identify any deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that would be considered material weaknesses. See University of South Florida Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009 [see FR3, Executive Summary, p. i].

2. Information requested in Part A (sources and percentages of revenues during the past three years and operating expenses during the past three years, including expenditures in auxiliary and other operations).

REVENUES BY SOURCE FOR THE PAST THREE YEARS

Source of Funds	Line	2007-2008 Amount [%]*	2008-2009 Amount [%]*	2009-2010 Amount [%]*
Tuition and Fees	1	\$2,738,903 [20.4%]	\$3,894,542 [25.9%]	\$4,421,562 [22.1%]
Government Appropriati	ons**			
Federal (Financial Aid)	2	\$	\$1,589,284 [10.5%]	\$1,979,830 [9.9%]
State	3	\$10,276,671 [76.7%]	\$8,620,957 [57.2%]	\$12,995,407 [65.0%]
Local	4	\$	\$	\$
Government Grants & Co	ontracts**			
Federal unrestricted	5	\$	\$	\$
Federal restricted	6	\$	\$538,589 [3.6%]	\$323,952 [1.6%]
State unrestricted	7	\$	\$41,333 [0.3%]	\$13,931 [0.1%]
State restricted	8	\$	\$	\$
Local unrestricted	9	\$	\$	\$
Local restricted	10	\$	\$	\$
Private Gifts, Grants and	Contracts**			
Unrestricted	11	\$	\$	\$
Restricted	12	\$	\$221,320 [1.5%]	\$18,152 [0.1%]
Endowment Income**				
Unrestricted	13	\$	\$	\$
Restricted	14	\$	\$	\$
Sales and Services**				
Educational Activities	15	\$	\$	\$
Auxiliary Enterprises	16	\$386,768 [2.9%]	\$37,688 [0.3%]	\$23,753 [0.1%]
Hospitals***	17	\$	\$	\$
Borrowed Funds	18	\$	\$	\$
Other Sources**	19	\$	\$121,192 [0.8%]	\$204,999 [1.0%]
Independent Operations	20	\$	\$	\$
TOTAL (sum of lines 1-2	0)	\$13,402,342 [100%]	\$15,064,905 [100%]	\$19,981,586 [100%]

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 189

EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS FOR PAST THREE YEARS

Function of Expenditures	Line	2007-2008(1) Amount [%]*	2008-2009 Amount [%]*	2009-2010 Amount [%]*
Education & General				
Instruction	1	\$5,302,221 [39.6%]	\$4,896,364 [32.5%]	\$6,679,743 [33.4%]
Research	2	\$	\$551,913 [3.7%]	\$346,077 [1.7%]
Public Service	3	\$	\$	\$
Academic Support	4	\$1,892,956 [14.1%]	\$1,815,798 [12.1%]	\$1,885,622 [9.4%]
Libraries	5	\$	\$	\$
Student Services	6	\$1,141,341 [8.5%]	\$1,213,295 [8.1%]	\$1,232,881 [6.2%]
Institutional Support	7	\$3,680,876 [27.5%]	\$3,360,136 [22.3%]	\$3,334,108 [16.7%]
Operation & Maintenance	8	\$210,359 [1.6%]	\$201,254 [1.3%]	\$243,770 [1.2%]
Scholarships & Fellowships				
From unrestricted funds	9	\$	\$1,338,218 [8.9%]	\$1,495,588 [7.5%]
From restricted funds	10	\$	\$	\$
Mandatory Transfers	11	\$	\$	\$
Non-mandatory Transfers	12	\$	\$	\$
Total Education & General Expenditures & Transfers (sum of lines 1 - 12)	13	\$12,227,753 [91.2%]	\$13,376,978 [88.8%]	\$15,217,789 [76.2%]
Auxiliary Enterprises				
Mandatory transfers	14	\$2,240 [0.0%]	\$6,939 [0.0%]	\$8,916 [0.0%]
Non-mandatory transfers	15	\$	\$	\$
Hospitals				
Mandatory transfers	16	\$	\$	\$
Non-mandatory transfers	17	\$	\$	\$
Independent Operations				
Mandatory transfers	18	\$	\$	\$
Non-mandatory transfers	19	\$	\$	\$
Other (specify)(2)	20	\$	\$12,269 [0.1%]	\$21,169 [0.1%]
TOTAL Expenditures & Trans (sum of lines 13-20)		\$12,229,993 [91.3%]	\$13,396,186 [88.9%]	\$15,247,874 [76.3%]

(1)FY2007-2008 USF Polytechnic is included in the USF System Financial Audit. Reported amounts are based on FAST financial system queries, excluding contracts and grants, interests and financial aid.

*Percentage of total current funds revenues within same FY reporting period.

**Excludes appropriations, gifts, endowment, sales and services for hospitals (not medical schools)

***Amounts relating to hospitals only. Medical school revenues should be reported on lines 2 through14, as appropriate (2)FY2008-2009 Expenditure-Loan Operations, USF Polytechnic Financial Audit, p. 28 Functional Classification Schedule

3. Assets and liabilities of the institution for the past three years.

A Statement of Net Assets is included in the financial audit each year. Prior to the financial audit for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009, USF Polytechnic was included in the University of South Florida audit. See University of South Florida Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008 [see FR1, Statement of Net Assets, pp. 12-13].

The separate financial audit for USF Polytechnic for fiscal year ended June 30, 2009 also included a Statement of Net Assets. See University of South Florida Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009 [see FR2, Statement of Net Assets, pp. 8-9].

The financial audit for USF Polytechnic for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010 provides a condensed Statement of Net Assets on p. 4 and a full statement on pp. 12-13 [see FR3, Statement of Net Assets].

4. A schedule of fund balances for the past three years.

USF Polytechnic General Revenue Fund balances by fiscal year were as follows:

FY 2007-2008	\$1,172,349
FY 2008-2009	\$1,668,719
FY 2009-2010	\$4,733,712

In the 2009 Legislative Session, USF Polytechnic received \$5,000,000 in recurring funds appropriation to be applied to the campus budget in July, 2009. In the 2010 Legislative Session, USF Polytechnic received an additional \$10,000 in recurring funds appropriation to be applied to the campus budget in July, 2010. These additional appropriations were allocated in recognition of the unique mission of USF Polytechnic.

5. If a proprietary institution, statements describing the amount of net worth or equity and the amount of net income for the past three years.

Not applicable

6. Narrative establishing the financial health and stability of the institution with reference to its ability to provide adequate faculty, learning resources, student support, and physical facilities for the programs and services it offers.

USF Polytechnic has a sound financial base, increased financial stability, and access to a variety of resources to support the mission, vision, goals and values USF Polytechnic.

Recent economic downturn in the State has reduced state appropriations. However, the Florida Legislature has authorized tuition increases, distance learning fees, technology fees and increases in activities and services fees. USF Polytechnic maintains a 10% reserve, and USF Polytechnic weathered budget reductions, operated in the black and without lay-offs of faculty or staff. Fundable student credit hours have increased as indicated in the following table:

Fundable Student Credit Hours by Academic Year

2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
23,258	27,853	35,421	35,609

Also, over the last five years USF Polytechnic has increased the number of summer course sections offered and the number of fundable credit hours from 101 sections in 2006 to 125 sections in 2010, and from 4,774 fundable credit hours in 2006 to 7,441 fundable credit hours in 2010.

USF Polytechnic has been able to meet student needs for courses to fulfill their degree requirements. Course completion rates for Undergraduate (Upper Level) students have ranged from 86% to 91% with the average across semesters of 88%. Course completion rates for Graduate Students have ranged from 83% to 97% with the average across semesters of 95%. [See Federal Requirement 4.1] In addition, the mean time to degree for bachelor's degree students is 2.12 years and for master's degree students is 1.86 years. [See Federal Requirement 4.1]

New Recurring Funds

In the 2009 Legislative Session, USF Polytechnic received \$5,000,000 in recurring funds appropriation to be applied to the campus budget in July, 2009. In the 2010 Legislative Session, USF Polytechnic received an additional \$10,000,000 in recurring funds appropriation to be applied to the campus budget in July, 2010. These additional appropriations were allocated in recognition of the unique mission of USF Polytechnic.

In AY2009-2010 funds enabled hiring 22 new faculty for AY2010-2011 in targeted disciplines to reduce the use of part-time faculty. Funds also enabled hiring additional staff to support student services. The 2010-2011 faculty hiring plan for AY2011-2012 seeks 33 additional faculty.

Facilities Funding

Construction of Phase I facilities in USF Polytechnic's Campus Master Plan for the new I-4 campus site is scheduled to begin in fall 2010. Both public and private funding sources have been identified to support development of the infrastructure on this green field site (including access and internal roads, water, electricity, sewers, waste removal, etc.) and construction of the first academic building. Polk County has invested \$11.7 million to design and construct a four-lane access road, creating a gateway entrance to the campus site. The State of Florida Turnpike Authority has invested \$31.9 million to create a new interchange on the Polk Parkway. The Florida Department of Transportation invested \$28 million to develop an east-west connecting road.

The estimated cost of the first academic building is \$62 million; \$31.2 million has been received from PECO State funding. Additional funds were appropriated in the 2010 Legislative Session but were vetoed by the Governor. The funds are anticipated to be appropriated again in the 2011 Legislative Session.

The extraordinary partnership among city, county, state and private funding sources demonstrates local and state commitment to the development of USF Polytechnic.

Budget Planning Process

Effective July 1, 2008 Florida Statute 1004.345 The University of South Florida Polytechnic [CR2.11.1-3] established the Lakeland campus of the University of South Florida as the University of South Florida Polytechnic, to be operated and maintained as a separate organizational and budget entity of the University of South Florida with all legislative appropriations for the University of South Florida Polytechnic to be set as separate line items in the annual General Appropriations Act (1)(a).

The Statute further requires that USF Polytechnic to have a Campus Board (1)(c) and a Campus Executive Officer (1)(b). The Campus Board has authority to (a) review and approve an annual legislative budget request to be submitted to the USF Board of Trustees; (b) approve and submit an annual operating plan and budget for review and consultation by the USF Board of Trustees; (c) enter into central support services contracts with the USF Board of Trustees for any services that the Polytechnic campus cannot provide more economically, including payroll processing, accounting, technology, construction administration, and other desired services. All legal services, however, must be provided by a central services contract with the university. The Campus Executive Officer has authority to recommend to the Campus Board an annual legislative budget request that includes funding for campus operations and fixed capital outlay and an annual campus operating budget.

Board of Governors Regulation 9.007 State University Operating Budgets [CR2.11.1-4] establishes that each university president prepares an operating budget for approval by the University Board of Trustees, in accordance with instructions, guidelines, and standard formulas provided by the Board of Governors. Furthermore, each university Board of Trustees adopts an operating budget for the general operation of the university as prescribed by the regulations of the Board of Governors.

USF System Policy 0-513 USF System Budgets [CR2.11.1-5] establishes that the President of the USF System has delegated primary responsibility for detailed planning and budgeting to each of the vice presidents and central administrative offices who have line authority for the major organizational units of the USF System. The USF Vice President for Business and Finance has been delegated responsibility for USF System-wide coordination and administration of the budgeting process, including implementation, oversight and accountability for budget management. The USF System's annual budget is prepared by Budget & Policy Analysis under the direction of the USF Vice President for Business and Finance.

The USFP Regional Chancellor has delegated primary responsibility for detailed planning and budgeting to the regional vice chancellors and central administrative offices with line authority for the major organizational units of USF Polytechnic. The Executive Director, Finance and Administration, has been delegated responsibility for 1) coordination with the USF System Vice President for Business and Finance in the USF System budgeting process; and 2) coordination with USF Polytechnic organizational units, administration, implementation, oversight and accountability for budget management at USF Polytechnic.

A general timeline for budget planning, review, approval and submission follows:

January – March

The USFP Executive Director, Finance and Administration, meets with organizational unit leadership to review budget allocations and expenditures for the previous fiscal year, Quarters 1 and 2 of the current fiscal year and projected expenditures for Quarters 3 and 4 of the current fiscal year. Organizational unit

leaders develop preliminary operating budget requests, other capital outlay (OCO) projects requests, Foundation funding requests and faculty and/or staff recruitment plans for the new fiscal year. Unit directors must align their budget requests with the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan and the unit's annual action plan, derived from assessment data and annual progress report.

April – June

Organizational unit leaders finalize campus operating budget requests, other capital outlay (OCO) projects requests, Foundation funding requests and faculty and/or staff recruitment plans for the new fiscal year and submit required forms to the USFP Executive Director, Finance and Administration. The Executive Director prepares the draft Campus Operating Budget, Campus OCO Project Requests, Campus Foundation funding requests and campus faculty and/or staff hiring plans for review by the campus Executive Council.

The Florida Legislative Session ends early May, and the state operating budget is forwarded to the Governor for approval and signature. The USF Board of Trustees sets the tuition rate for new academic year.

A USF System Budget Planning Cover Memo and Process Guidelines, **together with Budget Planning Forms** are distributed by the University Budget Director. The USFP Executive Director, Finance and Administration, completes the USF System budget worksheets and submits them to the University Budget Director for review by the USF System Vice President for Business and Finance and the USF System Finance & Budget Management Council.

The USFP Executive Director for Finance and Administration prepares the final Campus Operating Budget, Campus OCO Project Requests, Campus Foundation funding requests and campus faculty and/or staff hiring plans for review and approval by the Campus Executive Council, Regional Vice Chancellors, and Campus Board; approval by the USF System Executive Management Council; approval by the USF Board of Trustees Finance & Audit Work Group; and approval by the USF Board of Trustees. The final USF System operating budget is submitted to the Board of Governors.

June – July

The Board of Governors prepares the legislative budget request for the State University System and submits it to the Legislature.

July – August

USF Polytechnic receives legislative allocation.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.11.1-1] FS 11.42 The Auditor General

[CR2.11.1-2] FS 11.45 Definitions; duties; authorities; reports; rules

[FR1] University of South Florida Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

[FR2] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2009

[FR4] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2010

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 194

[CR2.11.1-3] Florida Statute 1004.345 The University of South Florida Polytechnic

[CR2.11.1-4] Board of Governors Regulation 9.007 State University Operating Budgets

[CR2.11.1-5] USF System Policy 0-513 USF System Budgets

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Core Requirement 2.11.2: Physical Resources

The institution has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance

□ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Provide information as requested in Part A.

USF Polytechnic-Polk State College Joint-Use Campus						
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction
Lakeland Academic Center	LAC	1	Good	25,336	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Lakeland Learning Center	LLC	2	Good	28,728	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Lakeland Technology Building	LTB	3	Excellent	53,978	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Modular Building A	LMA	4	Good	2,204	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Modular Building B	LMB	5	Good	2,204	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Modular Building C	LMC	6	Good	2,149	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Modular Building D	LMD	7	Good	2,204	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
	1		1	pplied Learnin	ng Labs	
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction
Blue Sky East Business Incubator & Applied Learning Lab	BSE	8	Good	7,160	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Blue Sky West Business Incubator & Applied Learning Lab	BSW	9	Good	6,428	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
			Research	Lab(s)		
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction
BecKryger Properties Research	BPR	10	Good	13,139	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 196

South Florida Community College						
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction
University Center, Room 108	UC	11	Good	899	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
University Center, Room 109	UC	11	Good	905	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
University Center, Room 204	UC	11	Good	835	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
University Center, Room 209	UC	11	Good	1,048	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
			Citrus High	School		
Building Name	Bldg Prefix	Bldg No	General Adequacy	Size Gross Square Feet	Fireproof Quality	Present State of Repair/Construction
Citrus High School, Room 543	CHS	12	Fair	1,176	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

2. Provide narrative describing the adequacy of the physical resources to support its programs and services.

<u>Context</u>

Florida Statute 1013.30 University Campus Master Plans and Campus Development Agreements [CR2.11.2-1] requires each university board of trustees to prepare and adopt a campus master plan for the university and maintain a copy of the plan on the university's website. The master plan must identify general land uses and address the need for and plans for provision of roads, parking, public transportation, solid waste, drainage, sewer, potable water, and recreation and open space during the coming 10 to 20 years. The plans must also contain elements relating to future land use, intergovernmental coordination, capital improvements, recreation and open space, general infrastructure, housing, and conservation. Each element must address compatibility with the surrounding community.

In addition Florida Statute 1013.31 Educational Plan Survey, Localized Need Assessment; PECO Project Funding [CR2.11.2-2] requires at least every five years that each Board of Trustees arranges for an educational plant survey, to aid in formulating plans for housing the educational program and student population, faculty, administrators, staff, and auxiliary and ancillary services of the campus, including consideration of the local comprehensive plan.

Campus Master Plan

In August, 2003, the USF Lakeland Campus Board accepted the Williams Company proposal for development of a new campus site at the intersection of Interstate 4 and the eastern terminus of the Polk Parkway. The proposal included a donation of a 530+ acre site, a large, open, natural landscape. The USF Lakeland Final Campus Master Plan (August 2006) [CR2.11.2-3] provided a structure for initial construction on the I-4 new campus site of a comprehensive regional campus of the University of South Florida.

This **Master Plan Update, completed in October 2009 [CR2.11.2-4]**, is a revision of the USF Lakeland Final Campus Master Plan, and provides a framework of goals, objectives and policies that will guide development of the USF Polytechnic Campus 2010-2020 as a unique "bioscape," designed by world-renowned architect, Dr. Santiago Calatrava. The campus will emerge as an unprecedented synthesis of

architecture, design, engineering, agriculture and sustainability – a living example of the research, academic and social missions of USF Polytechnic. Several key revisions in the Master Plan Update included:

- Emphasis on the polytechnic model of an applied learning-centered campus environment, including interactive, problem- and solution-based learning and applications of innovative research and technology; multi-disciplinary thinking; dynamic learning communities and collaborative learning labs; graduated field experiences and professional internships.
- Establishment of interdisciplinary colleges and a vision of building program planning that will enhance connectivity and collaboration, challenging traditional models of colleges and academic divisions as disciplinary silos.
- Growth toward a four-year, residential destination campus, offering baccalaureate and master's degrees.
- Re-framing the positioning of structures on the campus to establish a central axis within a large, open natural landscape and design of a large central body of water or lake, creating an axial core of the campus as well as opportunity for storm water treatment and conveyance and capacity for site irrigation.
- A phased plan for development of future buildings and their relationship to each other, as well as to visual axes, internal open spaces, pedestrian walkways and paths (e.g., residence halls, a recreation and wellness center, a research and innovation incubator, campus perimeter parking).

Campus Planning and Facilities Operations

USF Polytechnic currently shares a joint-use campus with Polk State College, the primary owner of the site and facilities. Polk State College is responsible for the maintenance and security of the campus. USF Polytechnic's Regional Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning and Facilities Operations, as well as the Facilities Manager, meets with Polk State College's Facilities Department monthly to review Polk State College's plans for construction, maintenance or repair and potential impact on USF Polytechnic's programs, services, personnel, activities and events.

USF Polytechnic's **Office of Campus Planning and Facilities Operations [CR2.11.2-5]** provides leadership for planning and development of campus facilities, oversight of campus facilities operations, and leadership and compliance oversight for campus safety and security.

The Regional Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning and Facilities Operations provides planning facilitation and oversight for development and implementation of the Campus Development Agreement, Educational Plan Survey, Campus Master Plan, architecture and construction services selection processes, application and permit processes, and investor/developer selection processes.

The Facilities Manager coordinates a variety of maintenance support services in coordination with the Facilities Department of Polk State College and/or through cooperative service contracts with outside agencies.

Both the Regional Vice Chancellor and Facilities Manager are responsible for oversight of **Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness [CR2.11.2-6]**. USF Polytechnic's Campus Safety and Planning Committee develops guidelines and procedures to further ensure safety and collaborates routinely with local law enforcement on emergency response. Security Officers are employed by Polk State College. They are on duty 24 hours-a-day, 7 days a week. Security Officers perform primarily information and advisory duties, rather than regulatory duties. They patrol and monitor activity throughout the campus and coordinate with PSC and USFP facilities staff for inspection and maintenance of locks, doors, lights and alarms. Security officers are also available to escort students, faculty and staff to their vehicles at night if requested. While Security Officers cannot make arrests, they work closely with local law enforcement agencies when needed. The Polk County Sherriff's Office Sub-Station is located adjacent to campus, less than one minute away. An annual security report is posted by Polk State College on their website **[CR2.11.2-7, Annual Security Report 2010 Polk State College].**

On-Campus Facilities

In 1982 the Florida Legislature authorized funds to begin planning for a USF campus in Lakeland, after demand for a new educational facility in the region had been established. The presidents of Polk Community College (PCC) and USF sent a letter to Florida's Post-Secondary Education Planning Commission recommending a joint PCC-USF facility. A 130-acre orange grove at the southeast corner of US 98 and Winter Lake Rd. was selected for the site, and groundbreaking occurred in 1986.

The USF Lakeland Center opened in 1988, providing a limited range of instructional programs or courses to citizens of Polk, Highlands, Hardee and eastern Hillsborough counties. USF Lakeland began offering classes on January 6, 1988 in the first building, the Curtis Peterson Academic Center, named in honor of the state senator who was instrumental in obtaining funding for the joint PCC/USF Lakeland campus. The campus was officially dedicated on January 24, 1988.

Today USF Polytechnic has space allocated in seven (7) on-campus facilities: the Lakeland Academic Center (LAC), the Lakeland Learning Center (LLC), the Lakeland Technology Building (LTB), and four modular buildings (LMA-LMD). On-campus facilities have wireless technology throughout the campus, including outdoor public spaces, and instructional spaces have advanced technology (e.g., SmartPodium, projection and recording capabilities) with several capable of accommodating distance learning (e.g., videoconference and studio classrooms).

On-campus food service is provided by Polk State College. Currently, a modular building houses this service while the cafeteria undergoes renovation that will provide enhanced interior seating and a pleasant outdoor dining and social area. The interior courtyards and exterior spaces on the campus provide places for passive and active event and recreational use. Landscaping, lighting, shade features and seating spaces provide many opportunities for individual quiet space and informal gatherings. Four parking lots provide adequate spaces for day-to-day and event parking. Physical facilities meet ADA minimum requirements for accessibility by the physically challenged.

The Lakeland Academic Center (LAC) houses on the first floor the following units and instructional spaces: 1) the Office of the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; 2) the Office of the Executive Director for Finance and Administration; 3) staff in Business and Finance; 4) staff in Human Resources; 5) the Office of the Director of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning; 6) staff in IREP; 7) the Office of the Director of Information Services; 8) staff in Information Services; and 9) two classrooms, one of which is also a computer lab. Faculty and staff have easy access to centrally located business services such as business and finance, human resources, institutional research and Information Services.

The second floor of the LAC houses the following units and instructional spaces: 1) the Office of the Director of Classroom Technologies and Media Services; 2) CTMS staff; 3) the Office of the USF Polytechnic Facilities Manager and staff; 4) the Information Services Help Desk and Computer Store staff; 5) a videoconference classroom; 6) two studio classrooms, and 7) two general classrooms.

In 1991 a second joint-use academic building opened. The **Lakeland Learning Center (LLC)** featured a library, learning labs, general classrooms, computer classrooms and faculty offices. At the December 3, 1993 meeting of the Florida Board of Regents, the Lakeland Center was officially reclassified as a Branch Campus. Terry Fulcher, Coordinator of SUS Space Utilization and Analysis, notified Loyce Farr, DOE Office of Educational Facilities, in a letter dated March 16, 1994.

The **Lakeland Learning Center (LLC)** houses on the first floor the following units and instructional spaces: 1) Division Director, faculty offices and advisor in the Social Sciences; 2) the Office of the Assistant Director for Distance Learning and staff offices in Teaching and Learning Innovation; 3) two large multifunctional classrooms; 4) three general classrooms; and 5) a classroom and counseling laboratory room.

The second floor of the LLC houses the Office of the Regional Associate Vice Chancellor for Extended University and staff, and four general classrooms.

By fall 2000 USF Lakeland was serving 709 home campus students, and in 2003 the Florida Legislature approved funding for a third joint-use academic building, sponsored by State Senator J.D. Alexander. In 2004 ground was broken for the \$32 million joint-use **Lakeland Technology Building (LTB)**. Despite four named hurricanes making landfall in south central Florida in 2004 and affecting availability of construction materials and manpower in their aftermath, the Lakeland Technology Building opened on schedule for classes in spring 2007. The LTB provides USF Polytechnic with 40,000 square feet of space, including a partial auditorium, 9 classrooms with built-in, state-of-the-art instructional technology, 5 special use labs, first-floor student affairs and student services offices, a library and open-use computer lab, faculty and staff offices.

Renovations were also completed on the USF Lakeland allocated classrooms in the two other academic buildings to ensure that state-of-the art classroom technology built into the design of the LTB was also available for classes assigned to the LLC and LAC buildings.

The **Lakeland Technology Building (LTB)** houses on the first floor the following units and instructional spaces: 1) the Office of the Acting Regional Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and staff in Admissions, Financial Aid, Enrollment Management, Recruitment and Admissions Advising, Multicultural Education and Engagement, Career Counseling Center, Student Life and Student Government; 2) the Library and Office of the Director of the USF Polytechnic Library and library staff; 3) the Open Use Computer Lab; 4) eight general classrooms; and 5) the Auditorium which can be configured to accommodate a variety of functions with multiple seating arrangements and which also has two classroom spaces allocated to USF Polytechnic for instructional use.

The Library serves as an Information Commons with an Open Use Computer Lab and study and research space for students. Terminals are linked electronically to the USF Libraries System. The Student Affairs area is prominently-located and provides easy access to common student services areas, including admissions and records, registration, recruitment and admissions advising, financial aid, career counseling and disabilities accommodations services. In addition, students have access to Multicultural

Education and Engagement, Student Life, Student Judicial Services and Student Government offices in the same area.

The second floor of the LTB houses the following: 1) the Office of the Regional Chancellor and staff; 2) the Office of the Regional Vice Chancellor for Campus Planning and Facilities Operations and staff; 3) the Office of the Director of External Affairs and staff; 4) the Office of the Director of Advancement and staff; 5) Public Relations staff offices; 6) the Office of the Dean of Technology and Innovation and staff; 7) twelve faculty offices in Innovation Management; 8) fifteen faculty offices in Information Technology and Engineering; 9) offices of two academic advisors; 10) a large tiered classroom; and 11) five IT and Engineering learning labs.

Four **Modular Buildings (LMA-LMD)** complete the on-campus facilities. The **LMA** Building houses the Rath Senior ConNEXTions Center, the faculty of Gerontology/Aging Studies and staff. The **LMB** Building houses offices of the faculty and staff of the Division of Education. The **LMC** Building houses offices of additional Division of Education faculty and the academic advisor, as well as office space leased to the Small Business Development Council. The **LMD** Building also houses additional Division of Education faculty, as well as the Student Counseling Center.

With the new faculty and staff hires completed for the 2010-2011 academic year, planning for reassignment of office/unit space is underway. It is anticipated that off-campus office space will be needed so that on-campus instructional space can be maximized while we are in transition through construction of the new campus site.

Off-Campus Facilities

Two off-campus sites provide instructional space. The University Center at the South Florida Community College enables USF Polytechnic to provide access to baccalaureate degrees to students in Avon Park and surrounding municipalities in Highlands County through the Statewide Articulation Agreement. USF Polytechnic offers the B.S. in Elementary Education, the M.A. in Reading Education and the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership. In collaboration with SFCC four classrooms have been outfitted with the same instructional technology that faculty and students use on the USF Polytechnic campus, including wireless technology SmartPodiums and videoconferencing capabilities. The Citrus County School District began a partnership with USF Polytechnic in 2005 when they were seeking opportunity for building the leadership capacity of the district through the master's degree. When other Florida public and private institutions turned them down, USF Polytechnic responded to their needs, offering the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership in a cohort model. Classes meet in all-day Saturday sessions in a regular classroom at Citrus High School which is equipped with wireless capability and presentation/audiovisual hardware.

Three additional off-campus sites provide space for faculty and staff. The **BlueSky East and West Business Incubators and Applied Learning Labs** house the offices of the BlueSky Director and staff; the leased offices of the BlueSky tenants; and seminar/conference room meeting space. The BecKryger Properties Research Lab is under development with occupancy expected in October 2010. The facility will house the research labs of the Dean of Technology and Innovation and staff. Research on nutrition, food science, technology and safety will be the focus of the labs.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CR2.11.2-1] Florida Statute 1013.30 University Campus Master Plans and Campus Development Agreements

[CR2.11.2-2] Florida Statute 1013.31 Educational Plan Survey, Localized Need Assessment; PECO Project Funding

[CR2.11.2-3] USF Lakeland Final Campus Master Plan (August 2006)

[CR2.11.2-4] Master Plan Update 2010-2020 (October 2009)

[CR2.11.2-5] Office of Campus Planning and Facilities Operations

[CR2.11.2-6] Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness website

[CR2.11.2-7] 2010 Annual Security Report, Polk State College

[CR2.11.2-8] USF Polytechnic Emergency Action Plan, in hard copy only

[CR2.11.2-9a-] USF Polytechnic Campus Floor Plans

[CR2.11.2-9a] LAC first floor

[CR2.11.2-9b] LAC second floor

[CR2.11.2-9c] LLC first floor

[CR2.11.2-9d] LLC second floor

[CR2.11.2-9e] LTB first floor

[CR2.11.2-9f] LTB second floor

[CR2.11.2-9g] Modular buildings LMA-LMD, location on Campus Map

USF POLYTECHNIC

PART B. DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE

Comprehensive Standards 3.3.1, 3.5.1 and 3.7.1

Adobe Acrobat Reader may be required to view supporting documents.



WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 203

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1: Institutional Effectiveness

The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvements based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

- **3.3.1.1** education programs, to include student learning outcomes
- 3.3.1.2 administrative support services
- 3.3.1.3 educational support services
- 3.3.1.4 research within its educational mission, if appropriate
- 3.3.1.5 community/public service within its educational mission, if appropriate

Compliance

nce 🛛 Partial Compliance

□ Non-compliance

CAMPUS COORDINATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

With the approval of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan by the Board of Trustees on September 6, 2007, the campus Office of the Sr. Associate Vice President and Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning established several planning, assessment and reporting strategies to ensure implementation of the strategic plan, including annual unit action planning and summary reporting. Unit action plans for each of the strategic plan goals, identified strategic plan objectives appropriate to the unit, actions to be taken by the unit, person(s) responsible, resources needed, target completion dates and achievement benchmarks. The achievement benchmarks required units to identify assessment measures and benchmark (target) outcomes. Annual unit action plans and summary reports are completed by all academic and administrative units.

To support planning, assessment and reporting functions, monthly workshops on SACS policies, guidelines and procedures were provided for all faculty, staff and administrators in AY 2007-2008 to assist in developing the campus' understanding of SACS accreditation and the role of assessment in accreditation. Concurrently, the USF System began its consideration of mission differentiation and separate IPEDS numbers for each of the USF campuses, in addition to the development of Board of Governors required Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs). ALCs were developed by Tampa departments with expectation that the ALCs would be implemented system-wide.

On July 1, 2008 USF Polytechnic was established by the Legislature, with expectation that the campus would seek separate SACS accreditation. In AY 2008-2009 the campus, with support of the System President and Provost, took responsibility for its own assessment system while participating in system-wide discussions and assessment guidelines. For example, benefits of using MAPP, NSSE and FETPIP data were discussed system-wide. Benefits of a graduating student survey, client satisfaction survey for administrative and academic support units were similarly discussed. However, USF Polytechnic made its own decisions regarding assessments to be used or developed, set its own assessment cycle, provided its own human and fiscal resources to implement campus assessment, and made its own commitment to review regularly and act on results.

3.3.1.1. Education Programs, including Student Learning Outcomes

Board of Governors Regulation 8.016 Academic Learning Compacts [FR4.1-15] requires universities to develop "Academic Learning Compacts" and related assessment processes to define and demonstrate student achievement in baccalaureate degree programs in the State University System. The Academic Learning Compacts must clearly articulate core student learning expectations in content/discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills.

The regulation further requires each university to construct clearly defined policies and procedures, aligned with the BOG regulation, for developing, implementing, and reviewing Academic Learning Compacts and related assessment activities. The **USF System Statement of Policy on Academic Learning Compacts [FR4.1-16]** requires the development and implementation of Academic Learning Compacts for each baccalaureate degree program. **USF System Guidelines for Development and Implementation of Academic Learning Compacts [FR4.1-17]** provide additional procedural guidelines for the implementation of the BOG regulation. Also, while the BOG regulation and USF System policy statement require Academic Learning Compacts for bachelor's degrees only, most master's degree programs have adopted the ALC process as well.

The USF System tracks assessment through a database displayed on the **USF System Academic Learning Compact website [FR4.1-18, see link below]** which currently organizes the ALCs by degree program within the USF Tampa Campus college structure.

In 2005 the Board of Governors began the process of establishing policy guidelines and procedures for universities through their boards of trustees to develop and implement Academic Learning Compacts to account for student achievement in baccalaureate degree programs in the State University System. In September 2005 USF Academic Affairs distributed a memorandum directing academic departments to develop ALCs by the end of fall 2005 and review and update student learning outcomes assessment plans in spring 2006 to reflect the outcome and assessment statements in the ALCs. In 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 academic programs on the regional campuses were controlled and administered by the academic departments on the main campus in Tampa. ALC assessment results were reported by academic department, not by campus. Board of Governors regulation 8.016 Academic Learning Compacts was approved March 27, 2007.

In 2007-2008 the USF System began its consideration of mission differentiation and separate IPEDS numbers for each of the USF campuses, in addition to the development of Board of Governors required Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs). ALCs were developed by Tampa departments with expectation that the ALCs would be implemented system-wide.

By July 1, 2008 the USF System had implemented mission differentiation, and USF Polytechnic was established by the Legislature, with expectation that the campus would seek separate SACS accreditation. In AY 2008-2009 the campus, with support of the System President and Provost, took responsibility for its own assessment system while participating in system-wide discussions and assessment guidelines. USF Polytechnic degree program faculty reviewed the ALCs and assessments developed by the Tampa departments and continue to refine/revise assessments to align with the USF Polytechnic campus mission and core values, and used results of ALC assessments to guide changes and improvements in curriculum delivery and/or assessments as needed for the campus.

Academic Learning Compacts are required for each baccalaureate degree major and for each master's degree at USF Polytechnic. Academic Program Coordinators are responsible for ensuring that program assessments required in the ALC are implemented and results gathered and reviewed by program faculty. Assessment results and changes and/or improvements made to the program are submitted to USFP's Office of Assessment and Accountability. Academic Program Coordinators are listed below:

Baccalaureate Degrees		
BS Applied Science	Criminal Justice Early Childhood Industrial Operations Information Technology Leadership Studies (fall 2009)	Kim Lersch, Ph.D. Smita Mathur, Ph.D. JoAnne Larsen, Ph.D. Dave Armitage, Ph.D. Jan Lloyd, Ph.D.
BA Criminology BS Elementary Education BS General Business Administration Concentration in Management Concentration in Marketing (be BS Industrial Engineering BS Information Technology BA Interdisciplinary Social Science		Kim Lersch, Ph.D. Georgann Wyatt, Ph.D. Richard Plank, Ph.D. John Selsky, Ph.D. Richard Plank, Ph.D. JoAnne Larsen, Ph.D. Dave Armitage, Ph.D. Scot Boeringer, Ph.D. Rosemarie Lamm, Ph.D. Jan Lloyd, Ph.D. James Epps, Ph.D. Cecil Greek, Ph.D.
BA Psychology		James Epps, Ph.D.
Graduate Degrees MBA (began fall 2010) MA Counselor Education MEd Educational Leadership MS Information Technology (began fall MA Reading Education	2011)	Andy Artis, Ph.D. Marylou Taylor, Ph.D. Jennifer Reeves, Ed.D. Dave Armitage, Ph.D. Sherry Kragler, Ph.D.

OVERVIEW of 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 Assessment Results Baccalaureate Degree Programs

B.S. Applied Science – Criminal Justice Concentration

The <u>B.S.A.S. Criminal Justice concentration</u> supplements the technical skills learned in study for the AS degree. Students complete two core courses and select four courses in a variety of topics (e.g., criminal justice administration, crime mapping and analysis, corrections, ethics for criminal justice practitioners, juvenile justice, cybercrime, etc.). Students in the B.S.A.S. Criminal Justice concentration take the achievement test administered in CCJ 4934, the required capstone course for both the B.S.A.S. concentration and the B.A. Criminology. The degree programs are taught online; the USF Student Information System does not code or identify students in the B.S.A.S. program, thus student

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 206

performance is not, at this time, able to be disaggregated. All student performance – B.S.A.S. and B.A. – are reported in the B.A. Criminology ALC.

B.S. Applied Science – Early Childhood Development Concentration

The Early Childhood Development concentration is intended to extend the program of study completed by students with an A.S. degree in early childhood development or associated fields. The concentration does not lead to professional certification in early childhood education. The concentration extends students' knowledge in a) child growth and learning, b) health and nutrition for the young child, c) safety and motor skills for the young child, d) personnel and supervision of early childhood programs, e) creative and affective experiences for young children, and f) young children with special needs.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance Expectation	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
<u> </u>				. (2000
Knowledge & Skills -	Child Observation	80% of students will	Mean= 41.5/50	Course for 2009-
Outcome 1.	Paper written in EDG	receive a grade of	Median 41/50	2010 not offered
Students will	4909 (Young	"B" or better.	A or B = 80%	
demonstrate	Children With Special		C = 13.5%	
competence in	Needs)		F = 6.5%	
recognizing the				
uniqueness of a				
young child with a				
developmental				
delay or disability				
and subsequently				
develop a working				
knowledge of				
methods to include				
children with				
disabilities in regular				
EC programs.				
Critical Thinking	The Early Language	80% of students will	100% of students	Course for 2009-
Skills - Outcome 2.	and Literacy	achieve a 3 or	received a rating of	2010 not offered
Students will	Classroom	higher in all areas in	3 or higher.	
demonstrate the	Observation (ELLCO)	the ELLCO: 1) Design	_	
ability to design a	focuses on assessing	a literacy rich and		
thematic play	literacy instruction	developmentally		
environment for 4-5	within a learning	appropriate		
year old children	environment, using a	classroom		
, that meets/exceeds	5-point rating scale	environment for		
Florida State	with a total possible	preschool aged		
Standards as	score of 60.	children, 2) pilot		
measured by ELLCO.		the plan for one		
		week and study the		
		impact of the		
		classroom		
		environment, 3)		
		interview teachers		
		to understand areas		
		of improvement.,		
		or improvement.,		l

B.S. Applied Science – Early Childhood Development Concentration Academic Learning Compact Results

and 4) present plan	
and implementation	
experiences to	
peers through a	
formal presentation.	

USE OF RESULTS. In 2008-2009 80% of students met Outcome 1, and 100% of student met Outcome 2. A detailed rubric for project presentation will be developed to assistant students with formal presentations. The concentration attracts students with different career emphases. To address students' career needs additional courses will be included in the courses choices in the concentration to provide for advised areas of emphasis: a) Leadership in Early Childhood Development, aimed at students who plan to manage early childhood programs; b) Special Education in Early Childhood Education; c) and Childhood Development. These emphases are appropriate for the polytechnic mission and for changes in state-level competencies in Early Childhood Education.

In 2009-2010 the concentration was modified to define advised tracks in the concentration: 1) Leadership in Early Childhood Development, to meet the needs of Center Directors and other administrators in non-teaching positions in Early Childhood Education; 2) Special Education in Early Childhood Education, to meet the needs of early identified special needs children in Early Childhood programs; and 3) Childhood Development, to meet the needs of teaching staff aids in Early Childhood programs. A new faculty member will be recruited for 2010-2011, and scheduling will be reviewed to ensure that courses are schedule to enable student completion of the concentration.

Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Industrial Operations Concentration

The <u>B.S.A.S. Industrial Operations concentration</u> supplements the technical skills learned in study for the AS degree and extends students' knowledge in a) operations management, b) principles of management, c) cost analysis, d) work design and ergonomics, e) quality control, f) industrial statistics, and g) programming concepts. Engineering courses are taught on a two-year rotation. Students in the B.S.A.S. Industrial Operations concentration take the assessments in required courses offered to both B.S.A.S. concentration and the B.S. Industrial Engineering students. The USF Student Information System does not code or identify students in the B.S.A.S. program, thus student performance is not, at this time, able to be disaggregated. All student performance – B.S.A.S. and B.S. – are reported in the B.S. Industrial Engineering ALC.

Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Information Technology Concentration

The <u>B.S.A.S. Information Technology concentration</u> supplements the technical skills learned in study for the AS degree. Students in the B.S.A.S. Information

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation	N=4	N=3
Knowledge & Skills -	Exit Interview	Students will score	Excellent: 0	Excellent: 0
Outcome 1.	conducted at	Adequate or higher.	Solid: 3	Solid: 3
Students will	completion of all		Adequate: 1	Adequate: 0
demonstrate strong	course requirements		Deficient: 0	Deficient: 0
skills for elaborating	and assessed by a 5-		Minimal: 0	Minimal: 0
solutions to	point rubric			
practical IT	patterned after a job			
problems that show	interview			
mastery of content				
and discipline				

Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Information Technology Concentration Academic Learning Compact Results

specific knowledge.				
Critical Thinking -	Exit Interview	Students will score	Excellent: 1	Excellent: 1
Outcome 2.	conducted at	Adequate or higher.	Solid: 2	Solid: 2
Students will	completion of all		Adequate: 1	Adequate: 0
demonstrate the	course requirements		Deficient: 0	Deficient: 0
ability to consider	and assessed by a 5-		Minimal: 0	Minimal: 0
alternative	point rubric			
approaches to	patterned after a job			
solving a practical IT	interview			
problem				
Communication	Exit Interview	Students will score	Excellent: 1	Excellent: 1
Skills- Outcome 3.	conducted at	Adequate or higher.	Solid: 1	Solid: 2
Students will	completion of all		Adequate: 2	Adequate: 0
demonstrate ability	course requirements		Deficient: 0	Deficient: 0
to provide well-	and assessed by a 5-		Minimal: 0	Minimal: 0
formulated answers	point rubric			
to questions about	patterned after a job			
practical IT	interview			
problems.				

USE OF RESULTS. The IT department faculty consider that if at least 50% of students are assessed at a high (Excellent) or Satisfactory (Adequate) level of performance in a given outcome, that outcome has been achieved. In 2008-2009 students achieved all three outcomes; however, student performance in Communication Skills was not as strong. Faculty reviewed the questions used to assess communication skills for reliability and validity. In 2009-2010 students achieve all three outcomes with improvement in student performance in Communication Skills. Faculty have continued to add to the catalog of questions in each skill area and have maintained a complete record of students' programs of study over these two academic years. Faculty are exploring if there is a relationship between student goals and performance in assessment outcomes.

Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Leadership Studies Concentration

[INSERT NEW PROGRAM DESCRIPTION]

Bachelor of Arts in Criminology

The <u>B.A. in Criminology</u> provides students with general study of crime and the legal system. Students examine issues of law enforcement, victimology, systems of punishment, development and history of the criminal law, and the organizations that work to enforce our criminal statutes. Students also explore sociological factors (economics, politics, education, etc.) that influence criminality. Both students in the B.A. in Criminology and in the B.S.A.S. Criminal Justice concentration take an achievement test administered in CCJ 4934, the required capstone course.

Bachelor of Arts in Criminology and Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Criminal Justice Concentration Academic Learning Compact Results

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Achievement test	A score of 60%	Mean Student	45% of students
Outcome 1.	administered in the	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 54%	achieved a passing
Knowledge of	required senior-level	higher	Range of Scores:	score.
research methods	capstone course, CCJ		20%-80%	
used in the fields of	4934.			

criminology and				
criminal justice.				
Knowledge & Skills -	Achievement test	A score of 60%	Mean Student	45% of students
Outcome 2.	administered in the	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 47%	achieved a passing
Knowledge of	required senior-level	higher	Range of Scores:	score.
theoretical	capstone course, CCJ 4934.		10%-80%	
explanations of crime and	4934.			
delinquency. Knowledge & Skills -	Achievement test	A score of 60%	Mean Student	45% of students
Outcome 3.	administered in the		Score: 56%	
Knowledge of the	required senior-level	(Satisfactory) or higher	Range of Scores:	achieved a passing score.
criminal justice	capstone course, CCJ	Inglief	30%-90%	score.
response to crime.	4934.		50%-90%	
Critical Thinking	Assessment of in-	A score of 2	68% of students	100% of students
Skills - Outcome 4.	class presentations	(Satisfactory) or	scored Satisfactory	scored at or above
Students will	in senior-level	higher on each	or above.	Satisfactory; 20% of
demonstrate	capstone course, CCJ	critical thinking		students scored
inductive and	4934, using a rubric	rating sheet.		Outstanding.
deductive thinking,	based on a 3-point	Tating sheet.		Outstanding.
quantitative	scale.			
reasoning, and	scale.			
construct ion of				
sound arguments.				
Communication	Assessment of in-	A score of 2	Mean Student	No data – the
Skills - Outcome 5.	class presentations	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 100% of	assessment is being
Effective oral	in senior-level	higher on each	students scored	re-evaluated in
communication	capstone course, CCJ	critical thinking	Satisfactory or	terms of its
skills.	4934, using a rubric	rating sheet.	above.	applicability to an
	based on a 3-point			online course
	scale.			environment.
Communication	Assessment of	A score of 2	Mean Student	100% of students
Skills - Outcome 6.	writing exercises in	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 59% of	scored at or above
Effective written	senior-level capstone	higher on each	students scored	Satisfactory; 30% of
communication	course, CCJ 4934,	critical thinking	Satisfactory or	students scored
skills.	using a rubric based	rating sheet.	above.	Outstanding.
	on a 3-point scale.			

USE OF RESULTS. In 2008-2009 curriculum was reviewed to determine whether changes were needed in course material or course schedules. Assessment method was reviewed to determine revisions needed as the assessment instrument used in 2008-2009 was an early version. Critical thinking elements in courses were reviewed and strengthened. Changes were made in the writing elements of required courses and greater emphasis on conforming to stated ALC expectations in written work.

In 2009-2010 scheduling of CCJ 4934 was reviewed and a scheduling issue identified in that USFP students can take CCJ 4934 prior to taking the research methods course. Scheduling of the research course or CCJ 4934 may need to be addressed. A similar issue was identified in reviewing scheduling for CCJ 4934 and the Theory course. As many students may come to USFP having completed the requirements for Survey of the CJ System at another campus or institution, the assessment may need to be reviewed/revised to account for this. Also, identifying a means of disaggregating assessment scores for BSAS students from scores for BA students is a priority for 2010-2011.

Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education

The B.S. in Elementary Education is designed for students wishing to obtain the skills and certification to teach elementary education (grades K-6) in Florida schools. Studies include both coursework and extensive field experience in elementary school settings to enable students to integrate theory with teaching practice. The program includes a total of three internships, beginning the first semester, and numerous service learning projects. The elementary education program is a State of Florida-approved program leading to certification by the State as a teacher in grades K - 6, and includes an English as a Second Language (ESOL) endorsement. Students in the B.S. in Elementary Education are required to pass the FTCE certification exam as a prerequisite for enrollment in the final internship.

Academic Learning Compact Results					
Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results	
		Expectation			
Knowledge & Skills -	Florida Teacher	All students will	All students (61)	FTCE score reports	
Outcome 1.	Certification Exams –	receive a PASS on	received a PASS	from the State not	
Students will	Professional	the Elementary	score on both	received as yet.	
demonstrate	Education and	Education and	sections of the FTCE.		
Knowledge of	Elementary	Professional			
subject matter	Education	Education subtests	Final Internship	Final Internship	
related to		of the Florida	Evaluation Form	Evaluation Form	
Elementary		Teacher	<u>Results</u>	<u>Results</u>	
Education, teaching		Certification Test.	Assessment (AP1):	Assessment (AP1):	
skills to assist			Cooperating	Cooperating	
student acquisition			Teacher = 4.3,	Teacher = 4.02,	
of new knowledge			University	University	
and skills.			Supervisor =	Supervisor =	
			4.2; Continuous	3.38; Continuous	
			Improvement (AP3):	Improvement (AP3):	
			Cooperating	Cooperating	
			Teacher = 4.6,	Teacher = 4.32,	
			University	University	
			Supervisor = 4.7;	Supervisor = 4.03;	
			Critical Thinking	Critical Thinking	
			(AP4): Cooperating	(AP4): Cooperating	
			Teacher = 4.3,	Teacher = 4.2,	
			University	University	
			Supervisor = 4.4;	Supervisor = 3.84;	
			Diversity (AP5):	Diversity (AP5):	
			Cooperating	Cooperating	
			Teacher = 4.6,	Teacher = 4.29,	
			University	University	
			Supervisor =	Supervisor =	
			4.7; Ethics (AP6):	3.73; Ethics (AP6):	
			Cooperating	Cooperating	
			Teacher = 4.8,	Teacher = 4.6,	
			University	University	
			Supervisor = 4.9;	Supervisor = 4.26;	
			Human	Human	
			Development and	Development and	
			Learning (AP 7):	Learning (AP 7):	

Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Academic Learning Compact Results

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 211

			Cooperating Teacher = 4.4, University Supervisor = 4.4; Knowledge of Subject Matter (AP8): Cooperating Teacher = 4.5, University Supervisor = 4.5; Learning Environments (AP9): Cooperating Teacher = 4.5, University Supervisor = 4.5; Planning (AP 10): Cooperating Teacher = 4.5, University Supervisor = 4.5; Role of Teacher (AP11): Cooperating Teacher = 4.6, University Supervisor = 4.6; Technology (AP12): Cooperating Teacher = 4.5,	Cooperating Teacher = 4.3, University Supervisor = 3.98; Knowledge of Subject Matter (AP8): Cooperating Teacher = 4.34, University Supervisor = 3.99; Learning Environments (AP9): Cooperating Teacher = 4.36, University Supervisor = 3.99; Planning (AP 10): Cooperating Teacher = 4.28, University Supervisor = 3.98; Role of Teacher (AP11): Cooperating Teacher = 4.34, University Supervisor = 3.97; Technology (AP12): Cooperating Teacher = 4.36,
Critical Thinking - Outcome 2. Students will apply subject matter knowledge to real- world situations: data collection and use; instructional plans for students' cognitive, social, linguistic, cultural, emotional, and physical needs; realistic projects and problem solving activities; planning instructional activities;	Final Internship Evaluation Form, aligned to Pre- Professional Level of Florida Accomplished Practices (AP) and Domains from the Florida Performance Measurement System. Completed by Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor, using a 5- point rubric.	All students receive a 3 or above on the Final Internship Evaluation Form.	University Supervisor = 4.5 4.3 out of 5 mean score from the cooperating teacher; 4.4 mean score from the university supervisor. 54 students.	University Supervisor = 4.02 Mean Student Score: 4.2 out of 5 mean score from the cooperating teacher; 3.84 mean score from the university supervisor. 80 students.

Communication	Final Internship	All students receive	Mean Student	Mean Student
Skills - Outcome 3.	Evaluation, aligned	a 3 or above on the	Score: 4.6 out of 5	Score: 4.4 out of 5
Students will	to Pre-Professional	Final Internship	mean score from	mean score from
demonstrate oral	Level of Florida	Evaluation Form.	the cooperating	the cooperating
communication	Accomplished		teacher; 4.6 mean	teacher; 3.98 mean
skills, effective	Practices (AP) and		score from the	score from the
writing techniques.	Domains from the		university	university
	Florida Performance		supervisor. 54	supervisor. 80
	Measurement		students.	students.
	System, completed			
	by Cooperating			
	Teacher & University			
	Supervisor, using a 5-			
	point rubric.			

USE OF RESULTS. Students must take and pass the FTCE prior to graduation from the elementary education program. The Polk County School district requires that students take and pass the test prior to the Level III internship. Test result reports from the State only indicate pass or fail. No data are available on number of times a student takes the test. While scores are good, critical thinking and assessment areas had slightly lower mean scores than other areas. Students need to become more proficient in asking higher order questions and engaging students in activities that require problem-solving skills. This will be more specifically addressed in courses in 2010-2011. Better maintenance of data is needed as USFP takes over data management for its students. Data needs to be collected and maintained on students who receive a 2 or below on any section of the Internship evaluation form used in three formal observations. Data will be reviewed for trends and determination of programmatic changes if needed. Scores on the Final Internship Form were reviewed for 2009-2010 as university supervisors tended to rate students lower than cooperating teachers. Inter-rater reliability may need to be examined.

Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration

The <u>B.S. in General Business Administration</u> provides students with general knowledge in all business disciplines but allows students to tailor the program to fit their interests and gain more in-depth knowledge by selecting two concentrations. The concentrations available at USF Polytechnic are accounting, finance, management, and marketing.

Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration Academic Learning Compact Results

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009	Data on final exams	
Knowledge & Skills -	Final exams in ACG	Students will pass	were not available	
Outcome 1.	2021, ACG 2071, FIN	the final exams with	from Tampa data	
Students will	4443, MAN 3025,	a score of 60% or	base. Student scores	
demonstrate	MAR 3823	higher on each	were not parsed by	
knowledge of key		exam.	campus.	
concepts in				
accounting, finance,	2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009	
management and	Modification	Modification	Modification	
marketing.	Final grades in FIN	Students will receive	Results	
	3403, MAR 3023 and	a final grade of C	FIN 3403 – 77% of	
	MAN 3025 summer	(75%) or better in	students received a	
	2008, fall 2008 and	FIN 3403, MAR 3023	final grade of C	
	spring 2009; these	and MAN 3025	(75%) or better	
	three courses are	summer 2008, fall		

-				
	common to the BS	2008 and spring	MAN 3025 – 91% of	
	and the BSAS	2009	students received a	
	degrees offered by		final grade of C	
	USFP.		(75%) or better	
			MAR 3023 – 89% of	
			students received a	
2009-2010	2009-2010	2009-2010	final grade of C	2009-2010
Knowledge & Skills -	Final grades in FIN	Modification	(75%) or better	Modification
Outcome 1.	-		(75%) 01 Detter	
	3403, MAR 3023 and	75% of students will		Results
Students will	MAN 3025 summer	complete FIN 3403,		FIN 3403 - The mean
demonstrate	2009, fall 2009 and	MAR 3023 and MAN		final grade average
understanding of	spring 2010.	3025 with a final		was 79% with 67%
the basic tenets of		course average of		of students
operating a business		75% or higher.		completing the
and using the tools				course with a final
and techniques of a				average of 75% or
business.				higher.
				MAN 3025 - The
				mean final grade
				average was 88.2%
				with 100% of
				students completing
				the course with a
				final average of 75%
				or higher.
				or higher.
				MAR 3023 - The
				mean final grade
				average was 82.5%
				with 88% of
				students completing
				the course with a
				final average of 75% or higher.
Knowledge & Skills -	Final exams in ACG	Students will pass	Data on final exams	
Outcome 2.	3103, FIN 4443, MAN	the final exams with	were not available	
Students will	3301, MAR 3823	a score of 60% or	from Tampa data	
	5501, WAR 5625		base. Student scores	
demonstrate ability		higher on each		
to apply knowledge		exam.	were not parsed by	
of key concepts in	2000 2000	2000 2000	campus.	2000 2010 Damilia
accounting, finance,	2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
management and	Modification	Modification	MAR 3823 – 87% of	MAR 3823 – 98% of
marketing to	Final grades in MAR	Students will receive	students received a	students received a
business problems	3823 as only the	a final grade of C	final grade of C	final grade of C
and situations.	Marketing major was	(75%) or better in	(75%) or better.	(75%) or better.
2008 2000 Critical	offered at USFP.	MAR 3823.		
2008-2009 Critical	2008-2009	Students will receive		
Thinking - Outcome 3. Students will	Case study analysis in ACG XXXX, FIN	a score of satisfactory/meets		
		I SAUSIACION/MEETS	1	
demonstrate critical	4443, and MAN	expectations on the		

		-	r	1
thinking and	3240; final exam in	case study and		
analytical abilities,	MAR 3823.	presentation rubric;		
including the		students will pass		
capability to engage	2008-2009	the final exam with		
in inductive,	Modification	a score of 60% or		
deductive, and	Final grades in MAR	higher.		
quantitative	3823; the final exam			
reasoning and to	accounts for 50% of	2008-2009	2008-2009 Results	
construct sound	the grade. Only the	Modification	MAR 3823 – 87% of	
	• ·			
arguments.	Marketing major was	Students will receive	students received a	
	offered at USFP.	a final grade of C	final grade of C	
		(75%) or better in	(75%) or better.	
		MAR 3823.		
2009-2010 Critical	2009-2010	2009-2010		2009-2010 Results
Thinking - Outcome	Case study evaluated	At least 70% of		The mean score was
3. Based on student	by a common rubric	students will score a		10.1, with a range of
submission of a case	of 12 items in GEB	2 (Moderate Critical		9.5 to 10.6. 100% of
study or project,	4890 or MAR 4824.	Thinking Skill) on a		students received a
students		scale of 1-3.		score of 2 or better.
demonstrate critical				
thinking and				
analytical abilities.				
Communication	Case study analysis	Students will receive	Data were not	
Skills - Outcome 4.	and presentation in	a score of	available from	
Students will	ACG 3103, FIN 4443,	satisfactory/meets	Tampa data base.	
demonstrate	and MAN XXXX; final	expectations on the	Student scores were	
effective	exam in MAR 3823.	case study and	reported in ALC in	
communication in		presentation rubric;	total rather than	
discussion,		students will pass	parsed by campus.	
presentation, and		the final exam with		
written analysis and		a score of 60% or		
recommendation.		higher.		
	2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
	Modification	Modification	MAR 3823 – 87% of	MAR 3823 – 98% of
	Final grades in MAR	Students will receive	students received a	students received a
	3823; the final exam	a final grade of C	final grade of C	final grade of C
	accounts for 50% of	(75%) or better in	(75%) or better.	(75%) or better.
			(75%) 01 better.	(75%) OF DELLET.
	the grade. Only the	MAR 3823.		
	Marketing major was			
	offered at USFP.			
2000 2010	2000 2010	2000 2010		2000 2010 Damilia
2009-2010	2009-2010	2009-2010		2009-2010 Results
Communication -	Students' case study	At least 70% of		90% of students
Outcome 4. Based	analyses and oral	students will score a		scored a 2
on student	presentation skills	2 (Moderate Skills)		(Moderate Skills) on
submission of a case	will be assessed by a	on a scale of 1-3.		a scale of 1-3, with a
study project and	rubric in GEB 4890 or			mean score of 2.3.
presentation to the	MAR 4824.			
class, students will				
demonstrate				
acmonstrate		1		

effective oral/verbal communication and use of presentation skills.			
2009-2010	Students' case study	At least 70% of	70% of students
Communication -	project writing skills	students will score a	scored a 2
Outcome 5. Based	will be assessed by a	2 (Moderate Skills)	(Moderate Skills) on
on student	rubric in GEB 4890 or	on a scale of 1-3.	a scale of 1-3, with a
submission of a case	MAR 4824.		mean score of 1.8.
study project,			
students will			
demonstrate			
effective writing			
skills.			

USE OF RESULTS. Assessment outcomes and measurements were developed by the Tampa department. USF Polytechnic faculty were required to use them but had minimal input in development or access to data. Because final exam data had not been parsed by campus for 2008-2009 by the Tampa department, the **Outcome 1** assessment method was modified to enable data collection at the campus, using final grades in FIN 3403, MAR 3023 and MAN 3025 for summer 2008, fall 2008 and spring 2009. The expectation was modified in 2009-2010 to set a benchmark of 75% of students completing FIN 3403, MAR 3023 and MAN 3025 with a final course average of 75% or higher. The use of final grades in the absence of final exam score reports from the Tampa department is not the best measure of student performance but provided at least some baseline information regarding student success. Adding a benchmark of 75% of student completing the three courses with a final course average of 75% or higher was a somewhat better measure, but still insufficient. Both measures, however, helped to identify the Finance course as an area for improvement. The assessment method for Outcome 1 will be revised. Tutorials will be added for students in the Finance course.

Outcome 2 uses the final grades from MAR 3823, as the Marketing major was the only discipline-specific major offered at USFP. While students do well, the use of final grades is not sufficient for assessment, and the program will move to the ETS Marketing major exam for the assessment of the major.

The use of a case study evaluated by a common rubric of 12 items in GEB 4890 or MAR 4824 was an acceptable assessment for **Outcome 3.** The rubric was reviewed and enhanced for 2009-2010. Faculty intend to move to using a capstone project in MAR 4824 and GEB 4890, evaluated through the use of a rubric in 2010-2011. Students are expected to demonstrate more integrative skills through the capstone project.

Communication **Outcomes 4 and 5** indicated that students' oral communication skills were stronger than their written communication skills. Use of the rubric and assessment results will be monitored in 2010-2011, and possible writing assistance explored through collaboration with the English faculty.

ALCs have been revised for 2010-2011 as USFP assumes responsibility for its own assessments and assessment data management. In AY 2010-2011 the ETS Examination for Business Administration will be given at the undergraduate level as well as the comprehensive examination for the MBA. The ETS exam at the undergraduate level includes disaggregation of results by field as well (e.g., management, marketing).

Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration (Marketing Concentration)

The B.S. in General Business Administration – Marketing concentration focuses on advocacy for consumers, understanding their needs, and developing meaningful relationships with them. Students pay particular attention to the marketing mix (product, price, place, promotion) and how marketers create value for individuals and organizations. Students address topics in marketing ethics throughout
their coursework, covering the societal marketing concept and best practices in advertising, pricing, product quality, and more. The program provides students with real world skills that will greatly increase their ability to succeed in our rapidly evolving knowledge-based economy. USF Polytechnic began offering the Marketing major in Fall 2008.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 1. Students will demonstrate ability to collect, analyze and use information about customers, competitors and the environment (develop and use primary and secondary research data).	Students will work in teams to analyze and present case analyses in the capstone course (MAR 4824 Marketing Management Problems); assessed using a rubric, based on a 5-point scale.	At least 60% of students will demonstrate a Satisfactory (3) level of performance.	MAR 4824 not offered until AY 2009-2010.	Mean score 2.1 with 2% of students scoring 1.
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate ability to develop marketing plans, including strategies designed to achieve specific goals.	Students will work in teams to analyze cases and present marketing plans in the capstone course (MAR 4824 Marketing Management Problems); assessed using a rubric, based on a 5-point scale.	At least 60% of students will demonstrate a Satisfactory (3) level of performance.	MAR 4824 not offered until AY 2009-2010.	Mean score 2.3 with no student scoring 1.
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate ability to apply marketing concepts and skills, including relationship marketing, market segmentation and targeting, competitor analysis and selling skills.	A random selection of items in a program test bank of questions will be embedded in exams in MAR 3823 Marketing Management.	At least 60% of students will achieve a score of 70%.	87% of students scored 70% or higher, based on final grades for the course.	98% of students scored 70% or higher, based on final grades for the course.
Critical Thinking – Outcome 4. Students will demonstrate ability to develop effective,	Students complete oral presentations in the capstone course (MAR 4824 Marketing	At least 60% of students will demonstrate a Satisfactory (2) level of performance.	MAR 4824 not offered until AY 2009-2010.	Mean score 2.25 with no students scoring 1 (Low).

Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration (Marketing Concentration) Academic Learning Compact Results

	1	1	1	1		
persuasive oral	Management					
presentations of	Problems); assessed					
complex concepts	using a rubric, based					
including the ability	on a 3-point scale.					
to analyze and						
organize data, draw						
and support						
conclusions, and						
make appropriate						
recommendations.						
Communication	Students complete	At least 60% of	MAR 4824 not	Mean score 2.5 with		
Skills – Outcome 5.	oral presentations in	students will	offered until AY	no students scoring		
Students will	the capstone course	demonstrate a	2009-2010.	1 (Low).		
demonstrate ability	(MAR 4824	Satisfactory (2) level				
to develop effective,	Marketing	of performance.				
persuasive oral	Management					
presentations of	Problems); assessed					
complex concepts,	using a rubric, based					
including the ability	on a 3-point scale.					
to organize ideas						
and data, use						
presentation						
software and other						
audiovisual aids,						
and respond						
incisively to						
questions.						
USE OF RESULTS. U	SF Polytechnic began o	offering the Marketing	major in Fall 2008.	Faculty reviewed the		
assessments, student	performance data and	rubrics to determine ap	propriateness for outco	omes assessment. The		
ETS Major Field test in	n Marketing was planned	d to be piloted in AY201	0-2011 as the assessme	ent for knowledge and		
skills.						

Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering

The <u>B.S. in Industrial Engineering</u> provides students with designated, specialized coursework in industrial processes, work analysis, production control, facilities design, operations research, human factors, computer simulation, quality control, and robotics and automation. Engineering courses are taught on a two-year rotation. Both students in the B.S. in Industrial Engineering and in the B.S.A.S. Industrial Operations concentration take the same required assessments.

Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering and Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Industrial Operations Concentration

neudenne zeunnig compuet nesults					
Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results	
		Expectation			
Knowledge & Skills -	Case study solutions,	100% of students	ETG 3612 was	ETG 3612 was	
Outcome 1.	assessed by rubric, in	will achieve 180	taught in Fall 2007.	taught in Fall 2009.	
Students will	ETG 3612 Operations	points out of 240	5 students (100%)	Mean score: 201.2	
demonstrate ability	Management	possible points	scored at 75% or	9 students (67%) at	

Academic Learning Compact Results

				1 100 11
to evaluate and		(75%) in solutions	above.	or above 180 points;
propose solutions		for six (6) out of		3 students (33%)
for a management		thirteen (13) case		below 180 points.
problem.		studies.		
Knowledge & Skills -	Three project	100% of students	No data in	ETI 4116 was taught
-	ventures, assessed	will achieve 275	INFOCENTER for	in Spring 2010.
	by rubric, in ETI 4116	(91%) points out of	Spring 2008.	Mean score: 251.7
	Industrial Quality	300 possible points.	5pmg 2000.	50% of students at
	Control			or above 275
different quality				01 00010 270
systems to manage				
a manufacturing				
process effectively.				
	Work design project,	100% of students	EIN 3241 was taught	Course will be
-	assessed by rubric, in	will achieve 150	in Fall 2008. 7	taught in Fall 2010.
	EIN 3241 Work	points out of 200	students (58%)	Ŭ
	Design & Ergonomics	possible points	scored at 75% or	
		(75%).	above.	
pose ergonomically				
and economically				
feasible solutions in				
work station design.				
Critical Thinking	Project report,	100% of students	ETG 3612 was	ETG 3612 was
Skills - Outcome 4.	assessed by rubric, in	will achieve 113	taught in Fall 2007.	taught in Fall 2009.
Students will	ETG 3612 Operations	points out of 150	5 students (62%)	Mean 115.44; 6
demonstrate the	Management	possible points	scored at 75% or	students (75%)
ability to select an		(75%).	above.	scored 113 points or
appropriate				higher.
quantitative model				
for the analysis of				
an industrial				
operations problem				
and obtain a				
solution.	Thursday	1000(of students	Nia alata ta	
=	Three project	100% of students will achieve 275	No data in INFOCENTER for	ETI 4116 was taught
	ventures, assessed by rubric, in ETI 4116	points out of 300		in Spring 2010. Mean score: 251.7
	Industrial Quality	points out of 300	Spring 2008.	50% of students at
	Control (BSIE)	(91%).		or above 275
basic process data		(51/0).		
using an appropriate				
statistical testing				
method.				
Communication		100% of students	EIN 3241 was taught	Course will be
communication	Work design project,	100/0 OF Students		
	Work design project, assessed by rubric, in	will achieve 150	in Fall 2008. 8	taught in Fall 2010.
Skills - Outcome 6.			-	taught in Fall 2010.
Skills - Outcome 6.aStudents willI	assessed by rubric, in	will achieve 150	in Fall 2008. 8	taught in Fall 2010.
Skills - Outcome 6.aStudents willI	assessed by rubric, in EIN 3241 Work	will achieve 150 points out of 200	in Fall 2008. 8 students (80%)	taught in Fall 2010.

analysis of real- world problems in a				
business style				
report.				
Communication	Group project,	100% of students	EIN 4242 was taught	Course will be
Skills - Outcome 7.	assessed by rubric, in	will achieve 150	in Spring 2009. 7	taught in Spring
Students will	EIN 4242 Work	points out of 200	students (88%)	2011.
demonstrate the	Design & Ergonomics	possible points	scored 75% or	
ability to work	11	(75%).	above.	
successfully in a				
team and produce a				
written report.				
USE OF RESULTS. Th	e venture projects in E	TI 4116 indicated stud	ents needed additional	practice in statistics.
	review and practice Sta			•

Elluminate sessions to review and practice Statistics problems will be added in 2010-2011. It was noted that some students had difficulty adjusting to a fully online course environment. Technical supports for students will be increased during the first few weeks of the course in 2010-2011, as well as support for making presentations online.

Bachelor of Science in Information Technology

The <u>B.S. in Information Technology</u> is designed to bridge the gap between computer science and management information systems, providing students with knowledge of rapidly changing technology. The BSIT program emphasizes knowledge-based computer and information technology, traditional computer science concepts, as well as more practical topics including programming, applications, networking, systems administration and the management of a variety of computing environments.

Bachelor of Science in Information Technology Academic Learning Compact Results

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Discipline-specific	Students will score a	89% of students (8	56% of students (5
Outcome 1.	skills rubric used to	2 (Proficiency) or	out of 9) scored	out of 6) scored
Students will solve	assess student IT	higher.	High Proficiency (3);	High Proficiency (3);
practical problems	colloquium		11% (1 out of 9)	11% (1 out of 9)
by designing and	presentations, using		scored Satisfactory	scored Satisfactory
developing tailored	a 3-point rating		Proficiency (2).	Proficiency (2); 33%
IT solutions that	scale.			of students (3 out of
demonstrate the				9) scored Limited
student mastery of				Proficiency (1).
content/discipline				
skills.				
Knowledge & Skills -	Two questions in	Students will score a	77% of students (20	100% of students (4
Outcome 2.	exams in COP 4610	2 (Acceptable	out of 26) scored	out of 4) scored
Students will	IT Operating	Proficiency) or	High Proficiency (3);	High Proficiency (3).
demonstrate an	Systems, assessed	higher.	15% of students	
understanding of	using a rubric on a 3-		scored Satisfactory	
fundamental	point scale.		Proficiency (2); and	
knowledge about			8% of students (2	
operating systems			out of 26) scored	
concepts and			Limited Proficiency	

algorithms.			(1).	
Critical Thinking -	Student	Students will score a	33% of students (3	33% of students (3
Outcome 3.	performance in the	2 (Proficiency) or	out of 9) scored	out of 9) scored
Students will	IT Colloquium	higher.	High Proficiency (3);	High Proficiency (3);
demonstrate ability	presentation will be		67% of students (6	22% of students (2
to consider	assessed using a		out of 9) scored	out of 9) scored
alternative	critical thinking		Satisfactory	between
approaches and/or	rubric based on a 3-		Proficiency (2).	Satisfactory and
technologies in the	point rating scale.			High Proficiency;
design of an				44% of students (4
application, and				out of 9) scored
choose an				Limited Proficiency
appropriate				(1).
approach.				
Critical Thinking -	A case study analysis	Students will score a	63% of students (32	13% of students (28
Outcome 4.	in CIS 4253 IT Ethics	2 (Satisfactory) or	out of 51) scored	out of 223) scored
Students will	will be assessed for	higher.	Outstanding (3); 8%	Outstanding (3);
demonstrate ability	students'		(4 out of 51) scored	58% (129 out of
to identify ethical	understanding of		Satisfactory (2); and	223) scored
questions and	ethical dilemmas and		29% of students (15	Satisfactory (2); and
dilemmas in the	social impact of		out of 51) scored	30% of students (66
information	information		Unsatisfactory (1).	out of 223) scored
technology field.	technology, using a			Unsatisfactory (1).
	rubric based on a 3-			
Communication	point rating scale. Student	Students will score a	89% of students (8	56% of students (5
Skills- Outcome 5.	performance in the		out of 9) scored	out of 9) scored
Students will	IT Colloquium	2 (Proficiency) or higher.	High Proficiency (3);	High Proficiency (3);
demonstrate ability	presentation will be		11% of students (1	33% of students (3
to organize and	assessed using a		out of 9) scored	out of 9) scored
deliver effective	rubric based on a 3-		Satisfactory	Satisfactory
presentations to	point rating scale.		Proficiency (2).	Proficiency (2); 11%
convey technical	point ruting scale.			of students (1 out of
information to an				9) scored Limited
audience.				Proficiency (1).

USE OF RESULTS. The IT department faculty consider that if at least 50% of students are assessed at a high (Outstanding) or Satisfactory (Acceptable) level of performance in a given outcome, that outcome has been achieved. In 2008-2009 Outcomes 1, 2 and 5 were achieved. Outcome 3 was achieved overall, but only 33% of students scored at High Proficiency. Outcome 4 was achieved overall, but 29% of students scored Unsatisfactory. Faculty will examine the assessment questions and ratings for inter-rater reliability and validity of the two questions used in Outcome 2. A training workshop will be provided to the faculty assessing outcomes. Assistance will be requested from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to organize the workshop and assist in monitoring and measuring inter-rater reliability. Assessment rubrics will be refined, and validity of the assessment questions will be examined. While Outcome 4 was achieved overall, faculty will continue to monitor results in Outcome 4 and examine factors that may contribute to students' perspectives on ethics and performance on the assessment.

In 2009-2010 all Outcomes were achieved. For Outcome 3 raters were in disagreement 33% of the time. The department will provide a small training workshop for faculty assessing Outcome 3. In addition all assessment rubrics will be reviewed and refined where needed.

Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Social Science

The B.A. in Interdisciplinary Social Science gives students a variety of options within the social sciences. It allows students to tailor the program to suit their interests by selecting courses to develop two areas of focus (cognates). Students select four courses from each of the two cognates they select. USF Polytechnic offers cognates in aging studies-gerontology, criminology, psychology and sociology. All cognates are assessed through the three common core courses: STA 2122 Social Sciences Statistics (or PSY 3204 Psychological Statistics), ISS 3010 Introduction to Social Sciences, and ISS 4935 Seminar in the Social Sciences.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Students will	Students will score	89% of students	83% of students
Outcome 1.	complete a research	Satisfactory (3) or	scored Satisfactory	scored Satisfactory
Students will	project in the	better.	or better.	or better.
demonstrate ability	capstone course (ISS			
to employ	4935) assessed using			
principles, methods	a rubric, based on a			
and theories behind	4-point scale.			
interdisciplinary				
inquiry.	Students will rate the	85% of students will	100% of students in	97% of students in
	degree to which the	rate the degree to	ISS 3010 rated the	ISS 3010 and ISS
	outcome has been	which the outcome	achievement of	4935 rated the
	met in two courses:	has been met in	Outcome 1 as met	achievement of
	ISS 3010	both courses as Met	somewhat	Outcome 1 as Met
	Introduction to	(3) or higher.	successfully or	Successfully.
	Social Sciences and		better with 60%	
	ISS 4935 Seminar in		indicating met very	
	Social Sciences		successfully or	
	(capstone course),		completely	
	using a rubric based		successfully.	
	on a 4-point scale		93% of students in	
	and compared		ISS 4935 rated the	
			achievement of	
			Outcome 1 as met	
			very or completely	
		<u></u>	successfully.	4000/ ())
Knowledge & Skills -	Students will	Students will score	89% of students	100% of students
Outcome 2.	complete a research	Satisfactory (3) or	scored Satisfactory	scored Satisfactory
Students will	project in the	better.	or better.	or better.
identify and	capstone course (ISS			
articulate principles, methods and	4935) assessed using			
	a rubric, based on a			
theories the Social Sciences.	4-point scale.			
Sciences.	Students will rate the	Students will rate	100% of students in	97% of students in
	degree to which the	the degree to which	ISS 3010 rated the	ISS 3010 and ISS
	outcome has been	the outcome has	achievement of	4935 rated the
	met in two courses:	been met in both	Outcome 2 as met	achievement of
	ISS 3010	courses as Met (3)	somewhat	Outcome 2 as Met
	122 2010	courses as wet (5)	somewhat	Outcome z as wet

Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Social Science Academic Learning Compact Results

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 222

Critical Thinking -	Introduction to Social Sciences and ISS 4935 Seminar in Social Sciences (capstone course), using a rubric based on a 4-point scale and compared	or higher. Students will score	successfully or better with 70% indicating met very successfully or completely successfully. 100% of students in ISS 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 2 as met somewhat successfully or better with 93% of students indicating very or completely successfully. 89% of students	somewhat successfully or better with 88% indicating met very successfully or extremely successfully.
Critical Thinking – Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate ability to analyze information relating to social issues.	complete a research project in the capstone course (ISS 4935) assessed using a rubric, based on a 4-point scale.	Satisfactory (3) or better.	scored Satisfactory or better.	scored Satisfactory or better; 67% scored Outstanding.
	Students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been met in two courses: ISS 3010 Introduction to Social Sciences and ISS 4935 Seminar in Social Sciences (capstone course), using a rubric based on a 4 point coolo	Students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been met in both courses as Met (3) or higher.	100% of students in ISS 3010 rated the achievement of Outcome 3 as met somewhat successfully or better with 80% indicating met very successfully or completely successfully.	97% of students in ISS 3010 and 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 3 as met successfully or better with 86% indicating met very successfully or extremely successfully.
	on a 4-point scale and compared		100% of students in ISS 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 3 as met very or completely successfully.	
Critical Thinking – Outcome 4. Students will demonstrate ability to employ qualitative or quantitative social science	Students will complete a research project in the capstone course (ISS 4935) assessed using a rubric, based on a 4-point scale.	Students will score Satisfactory (3) or better.	89% of students scored Satisfactory or better.	73% of students scored Satisfactory or better; 40% scored Outstanding.
methodology.	Students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been	85% of students will rate the degree to which the outcome	100% of students in ISS 3010 rated the achievement of	91% of students in ISS 3010 and 4935 rated the

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 223

	met in two courses: ISS 3010 Introduction to Social Sciences and ISS 4935 Seminar in Social Sciences (capstone course), using a rubric based on a 4-point scale and compared	has been met in both courses as Met (3) or higher.	Outcome 4 as met somewhat successfully or better with 78% indicating met very successfully or completely successfully. 100% of students in ISS 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 4 as met very or completely successfully.	achievement of Outcome 4 as met successfully or better with 58% indicating met very successfully or extremely successfully.
Communication Skills – Outcome 5. Students will communicate analytical skills in written form.	Students will complete a research paper in the capstone course (ISS 4935) assessed using a rubric, based on a 4-point scale.	Students will score Satisfactory (3) or better.	89% of students scored Satisfactory or better.	100% of students scored Satisfactory or better; 65% scored Outstanding.
	Students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been met in two courses: ISS 3010 Introduction to Social Sciences and ISS 4935 Seminar in Social Sciences (capstone course), using a rubric based on a 4-point scale and compared	85% of students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been met in both courses as Met (3) or higher.	100% of students in ISS 3010 rated the achievement of Outcome 1 as met somewhat successfully or better with 60% indicating met very successfully or completely successfully. 100% of students in ISS 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 1 as met very or completely successfully.	97% of students in ISS 3010 and 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 4 as met successfully or better with 79% indicating met very successfully or extremely successfully.

the Tampa Department. It is not closely aligned with the course research project and paper (155 4555) was designed by needs to be redesigned. Overall student assessment of the degree to which ISS 3010 and 4935 achieved its outcomes was positive. Student scores in Outcome 4 were lower than the other outcomes. Faculty have discussed a more integrated approach to presenting information on social science methodology to improve student performance in this area. Faculty will work to continue to improve the courses so more students rate their experiences as very or extremely successful.

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

Psychology prepares students to better understand human behavior and mental processing and develop scientific applications that improve the overall human condition. A bachelor's degree in psychology at

USF Polytechnic emphasizes critical thinking skills and knowing how to formulate effective questions and research the answers. The program content focuses on abnormal, social, developmental, clinical and industrial psychology along with courses in cognition, perception, learning motivation and physiological psychology.

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology Academic Learning Compact Results

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	A pool of multiple	Students will	No data obtained	Students averaged
Outcome 1.	choice items from	average 75% correct	from Tampa	51% correct on the
Students will	which five common	on the set of	department.	set of common
demonstrate	items each semester	common items.	However, 75% of	items. However,
knowledge of	will be chosen and		students averaged	74% of students
descriptive	administered to all		75% or better in	averaged 75% or
statistics, including	students taking PSY		final grades for the	better in final
definitions,	3204 (Psychological		course.	grades for the
computation, and	Statistics).			course.
application.				
Knowledge & Skills -	A pool of multiple	Students will	No data obtained	Students averaged
Outcome 2.	choice items from	average 75% correct	from Tampa	51% correct on the
Students will	which five common	on the set of	department.	set of common
demonstrate	items each semester	common items.	However, 75% of	items. However,
knowledge of	will be chosen and		students averaged	74% of students
inferential statistics,	administered to all		75% or better in	averaged 75% or
Including	students taking PSY		final grades for the	better in final
definitions,	3204 (Psychological		course.	grades for the
computation, and	Statistics).			course.
application.				
Knowledge & Skills -	A pool of multiple	Students will	No data obtained	Students averaged
Outcome 3.	choice items from	average 75% correct	from Tampa	37% correct on the
Students will	which five common	on the set of	department.	set of common
demonstrate the	items each semester	common items.	However, 76% of	items. However,
ability to apply	will be chosen and		students averaged	66% of students
knowledge the	administered to all		75% or better in	averaged 75% or
accepted ethical	students taking PSY		final grades for the	better in final
principles and	3213 (Research		course.	grades for the
practices in the use	Methods in			course.
of humans and	Psychology).			
nonhuman animals				
in research.				
Critical Thinking -	Students in PSY 3213	The student mean	No data obtained	66% of students
Outcome 4.	(Research Methods)	will be at least 75	from Tampa	averaged 75% or
Students will	will collect data,	percent of the	department.	better in final
demonstrate the	analyze the data, and	points possible in	However, 76% of	grades for the
ability to choose a	write a research	the rubric.	students averaged	course.
method appropriate	report, assessed by a		75% or better in	
to answering a	rubric based on a 5-		final grades for the	
research question,	point scale.		course.	
apply the chosen				

		1	1	
method properly to				
data collected, and				
reason soundly				
about the inference				
based upon the				
data collection and				
analysis as it relates				
to the research				
question.				
Additionally,				
students will be able				
to display an				
awareness of				
internal and				
external validity of				
psychological				
studies.				
Communication	Students' final	The student mean	No data obtained	66% of students
Skills - Outcome 5.	research projects	will be at least 75	from Tampa	averaged 75% or
Students will	from the Research	percent of the	department.	better in final
demonstrate writing	Methods course	points possible in	However, 76% of	grades for the
skills by producing	(PSY 3213) will be	the rubric.	students averaged	course.
research reports	assessed using a		75% or better in	
in APA style	departmental rubric		final grades for the	
containing all	based on APA		course.	
components of a	format and clarity of			
scholarly research	written expression.			
manuscript.				
	no data woro obtainablo	from the Tompe donor	tmont the Devehology	faculty daysland and

USE OF RESULTS. As no data were obtainable from the Tampa department, the Psychology faculty developed and started implementation of a standardized procedure for collection and evaluation of student results, and moved forward during 2009-2010 to analyze assessment data. Common test items were piloted in 2009-2010. Analysis of student performance on the Psychological Statistics tests indicated problems with several items in relation to item discrimination index and item difficulty indices. These items will be revised for the test's next administration in 2010-2011. Analysis of student performance on the Research Methods test indicated problems with several items in relation to item discrimination index and item difficulty indices. Again, these items will be revised for the test's next administration in 2010-2011. In addition, faculty are examining the degree curriculum, noting, for example, that ethics is addressed in multiple courses but not assessed. Items should be developed to do so. Also, assessments should be given in the courses that address the content, rather than in a single exam. Faculty will continue to work on developing and refining assessments.

OVERVIEW of 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 Assessment Results Graduate Programs

Master of Arts in Counselor Education

The M. A. in Counselor Education prepares professional counselors to facilitate the development of individuals and assist in enriching the quality of their lives. The major goals of the program are to train practitioners who:

- Provide helping interventions for individuals, groups and organizations.
- Serve as effective counselors in schools and community agencies.
- Provide leadership in educational and human service settings.

• Use the resources of the family, school and the community to meet the developmental needs of the client.

The **Community/Mental Health Plan** adheres to the curriculum requirements for licensure as a Mental Health Counselor (LMHC) in the State of Florida and to the standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The plan's curriculum emphasizes: the helping relationship; human growth and development; group dynamics, processing and counseling; lifestyle and career development; social and cultural foundations; appraisal of individuals; research and evaluation; and professional orientation.

Students who complete the Community/Mental Health Plan may, if they elect to do so, take the State LMHC exam. The licensure process takes 24 months following completion of all curriculum requirements and application to the State of Florida as an LMHC intern. All licenses are public on the Florida Department of Health licensure verification website. A review of the most recent postings of students graduating from USF Polytechnic in years 2005 and 2007 (the 2006 cohort did not have a graduating class) indicate that of the fourteen (14) graduates:

- 9 graduates have a documented State of Florida License
- 2 graduates are employed at a facility where licensure is not encouraged
- 1 graduate changed his/her name and is unknown
- 1 graduate with a terminal illness is not seeking licensure
- 1 graduate took a job in Georgia immediately following graduation

In the **Professional School Counseling Plan** students gain general counseling skills plus specialized knowledge about school counseling. This program provides course work and knowledge necessary to pass the Florida Guidance Counseling Certification exam. Students must pass the FGCC exam administered through The Florida Department of Education prior to being allowed to intern. Since the internship and subsequent graduation is predicated on the student passing this exam, 100% of the graduates from the Professional School Counseling Plan achieve this certification. The Professional School Counseling plan at USFP exceeds the requirements of State of Florida and adheres to the standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Counselor	90% of Counselor	88% of students (8	94% of students (16
Outcome 1.	Preparation	Education students	out of 9) passed the	out of 17) passed
Students will	Comprehensive	will pass the	comprehensive	the comprehensive
demonstrate	Examination(CPCE), a	comprehensive	exam.	exam. Two re-takes
knowledge of key	national	exam on the first		from 2008-2009 also
counseling	standardized exam	administration.		passed.
concepts.				
Critical Thinking	Field supervisor/	90% of Counselor	100% of students	100% of students
Skills - Outcome 2.	practicum advisor	Education students	received a rating of	received a rating of
Practicum students	rating of student's	will receive a rating	3 or higher.	3 or higher.

Master of Arts in Counselor Education Academic Learning Compact Results

will demonstrate competence with respect to specific clinical counseling skills.	competence, using a multi-criterion rubric based on a 5-point scale.	of 3 or higher.		
Critical Thinking	Field supervisor/	90% of Counselor	100% of students	100% of students
Skills - Outcome 3.	Internship advisor	Education students	received a rating of	received a rating of
Students will	rating of student's	will receive a rating	3 or higher.	3 or higher.
demonstrate the successful	application of classroom learning in	of 3 or above on a 4- point scale from		
application of	their specialized	their field supervisor		
classroom learning	subject matter	and internship		
to work.	during final	advisor.		
	practicum, using a			
	multi-criterion rubric			
	based on a 4-point			
	scale.			

USE OF RESULTS. Weakest scores on the **comprehensive exam** were in areas of career guidance and educational research. Courses in both areas were online. In summer 2009 both courses were offered in traditional on campus format to see if there is a difference in test performance. Scores improved. Results will continue to be monitored. Results confirm that the pre-service **clinical training** sequence produces the desired outcome in counselor skill development. Two students in 2008-2009 had failed to complete the practicum due to poor attendance in seminars and tardiness in the work environment. More emphasis was placed on professional responsibility in the Ethics course and Practicum seminar. Anecdotal evidence suggests that **employers** are very satisfied with graduates. An assessment to get feedback from employers on specific strengths and limitations would be helpful for program adjustments, and program faculty will explore the development of an employer satisfaction assessment.

Master of Education in Educational Leadership

The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership focuses on the development, implementation, and generation of outcomes in the organization and management of K-12 education. At USF Polytechnic, the M.Ed. is designed to provide educational leaders, policy makers, and researchers the skills needed to design and implement strategies that improve practice and outcomes in educational organizations. Courses required in the program address the Florida Principal Leadership Standards specified by the Florida Department of Education and prepare students to take and pass the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) prior to applying for graduation from the program.

Acquernic Learning					
Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results	
		Expectation			
Knowledge & Skills -	An electronic	90% of students will	54 students	55 students	
Outcome 1.	Comprehensive	earn an overall	Median Scores	Median Scores	
Students will	Program EPortfolio,	(median)	Domain 1 Vision 2.8	Domain 1 Vision	
demonstrate	assessed by	assessment rating of	Domain 2 Student	2.98	
knowledge and	program faculty	2 (Meets	Performance 2.2	Domain 2 Student	
competence in 7	relative using a	Requirements) or	Domain 3	Performance 2.84	
domains aligned	multi-criterion rubric	higher	Organization	Domain 3	
with state and	on a 3-point rating		Management 2.5	Organization	

Master of Education in Educational Leadership Academic Learning Compact Results

	1			
national standards	scale.		Domain 4	Management 2.74
for educational			Collaboration 2.7	Domain 4
leadership.			Domain 5 Ethics 2.2	Collaboration 2.96
			Domain 6 Law &	Domain 5 Ethics
			Policy 2.6	2.73
			Domain 7	Domain 6 Law &
			Technology 2.5	Policy 2.81
			Synthesis of Theory,	Domain 7
			Research & Practice	Technology 2.95
			2.5	Synthesis of Theory,
				Research & Practice
				2.89
Knowledge & Skills -	Florida Educational	90% of students	All students passed	All students passed
Outcome 2.	Leadership	will pass each of the	the FELE with scores	the FELE with scores
Students will pass	Examination (FELE)	three Subtests of	above the state	above the state
the three		the FELE on the first	required passing	required passing
Subtests of the		administration	scale scores on each	scale scores on each
Florida Educational		scoring above	subtest.	subtest.
Leadership		the state required		USF Polytechnic
Examination (FELE)		mean in each of the		students must pass
on the first		three subtests.		the FELE in order to
administration.		In January 2009, the		graduate from the
		state of Florida		university; two
		implemented the		students did not
		revised FELE with		graduate due to
		three new Subtests.		incompletion of
		three new Sublests.		course work.
Critical Thinking -	Field supervisor/	90% of students will	100% of students	96% of students
Outcome 3.	Internship advisor	earn an overall	received a rating of	received a rating of
Students will	rating of student's	performance rating	3 or higher.	3 or higher. Two
	_		s or higher.	-
demonstrate	application of	of Satisfactory (3) or		students (4%) did
knowledge,	classroom learning in	higher from their site-based K-12		not complete
dispositions and	their specialized			internship
performance of	subject matter	supervisor and the		requirements.
the seven (7)	during final	university		
Leadership Domains	practicum, using a	supervisor.		
in a supervised	multi-criterion rubric			
internship.	based on a 4-point			
	scale.			

USE OF RESULTS. Faculty are assessing the validity of having one instructor assess each domain per the instructor's expertise and/or the content area of assigned teaching responsibilities. Consideration is being given to assigning two assessors per domain to ensure inter-rater reliability. Additionally, the areas below the 2.0 overall average will be addressed regarding the objectives, criteria and content in the course/s correlated to the specific domains to ascertain whether the course objectives, criteria and content are relevant to the established Educational Leadership domains. Faculty will reexamine course syllabi to ensure that that the FELE competencies are being taught for mastery. The new FELE Subtest Passing Scale Scores starting in 2009-2010 will be evaluated to see if pass rates change from historical scores of students. Consideration will be given to change to a final assessment of letter grade (A, B, C, D, F, I) determined by the assessment of each individual Administrative Internship activity with a weighted score value for each. Such an assessment will provide more validity to the final internship assessment, as well as provide a more accurate analysis of student performance ranging from A = Excellent Performance; B = Strong Performance; C = Satisfactory Performance; D = Unsatisfactory Performance; F = Unacceptable Performance.

The USF Polytechnic Educational Leadership faculty has reexamined the objectives, criteria, and content of each course syllabi to determine that each graduate course has been fully developed to assure that the Florida Principal Standards, which are the content of the FELE, are being taught for mastery. Course critical tasks have been determined and have been made a part of the course syllabi.

The USF Polytechnic Educational Leadership faculty will continue to review the internship for its completeness in better preparing students for future administrative assignments. Discussions will continue regarding expanding the internship to a six semester hour course covering a two semester period. Implementation of such a change will have to focus on the timing of accreditation and cooperation with the county school system.

Master of Arts in Reading Education

The M.A. in Reading Education is designed to prepare students with the appropriate skills to become reading specialists, teachers and supervisors and may lead to a Florida reading certificate in grades K-12. This program is designed for those that already have a Florida teaching certificate.

Graduates in the M.A. in Reading Education are required to pass the certification examination as a prerequisite for enrollment in the practicum in reading.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	State of Florida K-12	Students will pass	100 % of candidates	Score reports from
Outcome 1.	certification exam	the state	for the Reading	the State until
Students will		certification exam.	Masters Program in	August 2010.
demonstrate a			2007-2008 and	
broad and working			2008-2009 passed	
knowledge of the			the K-12	
foundations of			certification test on	
reading and writing			their first attempt.	
processes and				
instruction.	An action research	Students will	In 2007-2008, 20	Scores are not
	project in a	achieve a score of 3	students completed	received until end of
	Classroom, assessed	or higher.	the action research	June 2010.
	by a rubric based on		project with a mean	
	a 5-point scale.		score of 3.5; in	
			2008-2009, 15	
			students completed	
			the project with a	
			mean score of 3.62.	
Critical Thinking	Students complete a	Students will	In 2007-2008, 21	Scores are not
Skills - Outcome 2.	case study of a	achieve a score of 3	students completed	received until end of
Students will	student who is	or higher.	the case study with	June 2010.
demonstrate the	having problems in		a mean score of	
knowledge and skills	reading and writing,		4.42; in 2008-2009,	
necessary for	assessed by a rubric		11 students	
implementing	based on a 5-point		completed the case	
effective literacy	scale.		study with a mean	
assessments in			score of 4.54.	

Master of Arts in Reading Education Academic Learning Compact Results

educational settings and provide				
effective literacy				
interventions and				
recommendations				
that are based on				
the assessment				
results.				
Communication	Candidates will	Students will	In 2007 2008 24	In 2000 20010 7
			In 2007-2008, 24	In 2009-20010, 7
Skills - Outcome 3.	display their written	achieve a score of 3	students completed	students completed
Students will use	competence by	or higher.	the professional	the professional
appropriate verbal	completing a		development plan	development plan
and written	professional		with a mean score	with a mean score
communication	development plan		of 3.75; in 2008-	of 4.14.
skills.	for in-service		2009, 15 students	
	teachers, and their		completed the	
	verbal competence		professional	
	through class		development plan	
	presentations on a		with a mean score	
	literacy topic. Both		of 4.57.	
	will be assessed by a		The rubric to assess	
	rubric, based on a 5-		students' oral	
	point rating scale.		presentation will be	
			field tested in fall	
			2009.	

USE OF RESULTS. Candidates' results on the K-12 state certification test will continued to be monitored. In analyzing the rubrics used to assess the action research projects, the candidates provide a clear rationale and relevant and seminal research related to their project. However, the analysis of the rubrics indicates some areas where the candidates need to provide more details of their methodology, especially their data collection and data analysis. Finally, some candidates need more support with the APA format. The candidate who did not meet the passing criteria was provided individual guidance and support with the organization of the candidate's paper. Candidates were referred to library workshops to better understand scientific writing.

Students' case study reports indicate the students can analyze the informal and formal assessments to determine instructional goals for their tutees. However, the candidates need more support in providing detailed descriptions of their instructional program and more specific information about changes in their tutees' reading and writing development.

Analysis of the 2008-2009 professional development rubric scores indicates students include a clear rationale and clearly stated purpose for the professional development project. They provide a well-written body of knowledge that supports their plan. Generally, students also provide a clear presentation that incorporates technology throughout their professional development sessions. However, in some cases, the students need additional support in clarifying details that outline the procedures for completing their plan. Students usually attempt to either include too much information for each planned session or the sessions do not provide enough variety of activity nor provide enough audience participation. This will be addressed in course work. Analysis of the 2009-2010 professional development rubric scores indicates three areas to be addressed: a) encouraging students to incorporate more and varied technological experiences in their plans; b) developing more realistic plans, e.g., too much material to be covered; and c) providing additional support with APA style and other writing conventions.

The rubric for assessing oral presentations was developed, reviewed and revised for pilot implementation in fall 2009. Two faculty used the rubric in spring 2010, but analysis of the rubric has not been completed.

SUMMARY OF 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The following two tables provide a summary of assessment results and improvement actions for AY 2010-2011:

Degree Program	Student Performance Trends
Criminology, B.A.	Only 45% of student received a passing score (60%) on the comprehensive exam. 100% of students scored satisfactory or above in critical thinking and communication skills.
Elementary Education, B.S.	Student scores overall meet the performance expectation. Critical thinking and assessment areas had slightly lower mean scores than other areas. Scores on the Final Internship Form will be reviewed for 2009-2010 as university supervisors tended to rate students lower than cooperating teachers. Inter-rater reliability may need to be examined.
General Business Administration, B.S.	Students met benchmark scores in management and marketing; student performance in finance was below the benchmark. 70% of students scored a 2 (Moderate Skills) on a scale of 1-3, with a mean score of 1.8 on Writing Skills.
General Business Administration, B.S. (concentration in Marketing)	Mean scores on knowledge assessments was less than benchmark score (2, rather than 3). Students exceeded benchmark for application of concepts and skills. Students met benchmarks for Critical Thinking and Communication.
Industrial Engineering, B.S.I.E.	Student performance was less than expected on all measures with an average of 60% of students meeting benchmarks.
Information Technology, B.S.I.T.	All Outcomes were achieved. For Outcome 3 raters were in disagreement 33% of the time.
Interdisciplinary Social Sciences	Overall student assessment of the degree to which ISS 3010 and 4935 achieved its outcomes was positive. Student scores in Outcome 4 (Research Methods) were lower than the other outcomes.
Psychology, B.A.	Student performance on all measures was less than expected. The assessments themselves had problems in the areas of item discrimination index and item difficulty indices.
Counselor Education, M.A.	Students met all performance benchmarks.
Reading Education, M.A.	Students met performance benchmarks. Analysis of the 2009-2010 professional development rubric scores indicates three areas to be addressed: a) encouraging students to incorporate more and varied technological experiences in their plans; b) developing more realistic plans, e.g., too much material to be covered; and c) providing additional support with APA style and other writing conventions.

Summary of Student Performance Trends

Summary of Actions to Be Taken to Improve Performance

Degree Program	Actions to be Taken to Improve Assessments
Criminology, B.A.	Students can take CCJ 4934 prior to taking the research methods course.
	Scheduling of the research course or CCJ 4934 may need to be addressed.
	Many students may come to USFP having completed the requirements for
	Survey of the CJ System at another campus or institution; the assessment
	may need to be reviewed/revised to account for this.
Elementary Education, B.S.	Students need to become more proficient in asking higher order questions

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 232

	and engaging students in activities that require problem-solving skills. This will be more specifically addressed in courses in 2010-2011. Scores on the Final Internship Form will be reviewed for 2009-2010 as university supervisors tended to rate students lower than cooperating teachers. Interrater reliability may need to be examined.
General Business Administration, B.S.	Finance is an area for improvement. The assessment method for Outcome 1 will be revised. Tutorials will be added for students in the Finance course. Writing assistance will be explored through collaboration with the English faculty.
General Business Administration, B.S. (concentration in Marketing)	ETS Major Field test in Marketing will be used in AY2010-2011 as the assessment for knowledge and skills.
Industrial Engineering, B.S.I.E.	Students need additional practice in statistics. Tutorial sessions to review and practice Statistics problems will be added in 2010-2011. Some students had difficulty adjusting to a fully online course environment. Technical supports for students will be increased during the first few weeks of the course in 2010-2011, as well as support for making presentations online.
Information Technology, B.S.I.T.	The department will provide a small training workshop for faculty assessing Outcome 3. In addition all assessment rubrics will be reviewed and refined where needed.
Interdisciplinary Social Studies	Faculty will take a more integrated approach to presenting information on social science methodology in courses to improve student performance in this area.
Psychology, B.A.	Items will be revised for the test's next administration in 2010-2011. Assessments should be given in the courses that address the content, rather than in a single exam. Faculty will continue to work on developing and refining assessments.
Counselor Education, M.A.	Anecdotal evidence suggests that employers are very satisfied with graduates. An assessment to get feedback from employers on specific strengths and limitations would be helpful for program adjustments, and program faculty will explore the development of an employer satisfaction assessment.
Reading Education, M.A.	Faculty will continue to review and refine rubrics used to assess student performance.

[INSERT OVERVIEW of 2010-2011 Assessment Results Baccalaureate Degree Programs]

[INSERT OVERVIEW of 2010-2011 Assessment Results Graduate Degree Programs]

Academic and Student Affairs Council (ASAC)

The Academic and Student Affairs Council (ASAC) meets monthly and provides academic and student affairs units with a venue for discussion, review and recommendation regarding campus-wide academic and student affairs issues. The ASAC ensures, through consensus, consistency in academic and student affairs procedures and practices across units, and provides advice and recommendation to the chief academic officer of USF Polytechnic with respect to academic and student affairs matters. The ASAC may appoint ad hoc or subcommittees to address specific issues and report outcomes as appropriate. Areas within the scope of the ASAC include, but are not limited to:

- Academic policy issues—undergraduate and graduate
- Degree program planning and development—undergraduate and graduate
- Enrollment planning and management
- Faculty well-being and development
- Student affairs programs and services
- Strategic planning
- Assessment and accountability reporting
- Coordination of implementation of campus-wide or system-wide policies and procedures

In AY 2008-2009 when USF Polytechnic, with support of the System President and Provost, took responsibility for its own assessment system, the ASAC was regularly updated on system-wide discussions and assessment guidelines, including benefits of using MAPP, NSSE and FETPIP data; a graduating student survey and a client satisfaction survey for administrative and academic support units. ASAC discussions contributed to USF Polytechnic's decisions regarding assessments to be used or developed.

The ASAC reviews student learning outcomes assessment data, particularly campus-wide data, annually throughout the academic year as assessments are completed and results analyzed. Degree program-specific data may be identified for discussion as well, particularly if program results appear to be related to campus-wide data which provide an indirect measure of students' perceptions of their learning experiences. Student success data, e.g., enrollment trends, degree completion, trends, course completion and term-to-term retention data, may also be discussed in relation to degree program learning outcomes assessment results for implications for academic and student affairs units **[CS3.3.1.1-8, ASAC Meeting Notes, see document list at end of CS3.3.1]**.

Academic Division Directors also prepare calendar year annual reports and concurrent action plans by the end of February of the next year. Examples of Academic Division annual reports and action plans follow:

	2008 Annual Report	2009 Action Plan
Arts & Sciences	[CS3.3.1.1-9a]	[CS3.3.1.1-9b]
Business	[CS3.3.1.1-9c]	[CS3.3.1.1-9d]
Education	[CS3.3.1.1-9e]	[CS3.3.1.1-9f]
Engineering	[CS3.3.1.1-9g]	[CS3.3.1.1-9h]
Information Technology	[CS3.3.1.1-9i]	[CS3.3.1.1-9j]

3.3.1.2 Administrative Support Services

Administrative support services unit directors are responsible for completing academic year assessment plans, calendar year action plans, and calendar year annual reports. In addition, a **client satisfaction survey** is completed by faculty, staff and administration to assess the level of satisfaction with the services of these units that provide foundational infrastructure support for the academic and service missions of the campus.

Assessment plans identify the unit's mission and primary responsibilities, target outcome objectives, methods of assessment, expectations for performance, assessment results and use of results for an academic year (summer, fall and spring). Assessment plans complement academic year Action Plans. **Action plans** identify strategic plan objectives appropriate to the unit, actions to be taken by the unit, person(s) responsible, resources needed, target completion dates and achievement benchmarks. Action plans are prepared concurrently with the unit's annual report. **Annual reports** identify the unit's purpose, appropriate unit facts and figures, progress toward development of the campus' core values in the unit, progress toward strategic plan goals, highlights of notable events, and primary goals for the next calendar year.

	Assessment Plan	Action Plan	Annual Report
Budget & Finance	[CS3.3.1.2-1a, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1b1, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1c, 2009]
	[CS3.3.1.2-1d, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1b2, 2009-2010]	
Campus Planning & Facilities	[CS3.3.1.2-1e, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1f1, 2009-2010]	
		[CS3.3.1.2-1f2, 2009-2010]	
Human Resources	[CS3.3.1.2-1g, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1h, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1i, 2009]
	[CS3.3.1.2-1j, 2009-2010]		
IREP	[CS3.3.1.2-1l, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1m, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1k, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.2-10, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1p, 2010-2011]	[CS3.3.1.2-1n, 2009]
IT/ERDC Services	[CS3.3.1.2-1r, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1s, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1q, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.2-1u, 2009-2010]		[CS3.3.1.2-1t, 2009]

Examples of Administrative Support Services assessment plans, action plans and annual reports follow:

Administrative Support Services assessment plans, action plans and annual reports are reviewed by the Regional Chancellor, Assessment and Accountability, and the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning. Relevant data from these reports and assessments are reviewed with unit directors, standing councils, Executive Council and the Campus Board as needed to inform campus planning, decision making and resource allocation. Restructuring of campus administration, establishing the Regional Chancellor for Assessment and Accountability position and approving two staff hires, in addition to a staff position reconfiguration in IREP should better position USF Polytechnic to build a stronger culture of assessment and planning.

Client Satisfaction Survey [2010-2011 SURVEY RESULTS RECEIVED 1-10-2012; UPDATE TABLES TO PROVIDE COMPARATIVE DATA]

The **Client Satisfaction Survey [CS3.3.1.2-2]** was administered in spring 2010 for AY2009-2010 and in spring 2011 for AY2010-2011. The survey was completed by faculty, staff and administration. Respondents were asked to rate items on a 4-point scale from Highly Satisfied to Highly Dissatisfied and included an additional Not Applicable response category. Results of the survey for administrative units follow:

Business, Finance and Budget

ltem	% Highly Satisfied + Satisfied	% Highly Dissatisfied + Dissatisfied	% Not Applicable
Overall customer service	71%	15%	14%
Workshops	55%	10%	35%
Timeliness/effectiveness	60%	21%	19%
of response to inquiries or			
requests			
Accuracy of information	67%	14%	19%

Human Resources

Item	Item % Highly Satisfied + Satisfied		% Not Applicable		
Timeliness of response to HR related questions	90%	8%	2%		
New hire process services	65%	13%	22%		
Benefits enrollment or questions services	76%	10%	14%		
Payroll accuracy and timeliness	92%	6%	2%		
Opportunity to request and receive training	76%	2%	22%		
Accuracy of HR information	84%	12%	4%		
Understanding and response to request for assistance	85%	11%	4%		

Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning

ltem	% Highly Satisfied + Satisfied	% Highly Dissatisfied + Dissatisfied	% Not Applicable
Enrollment planning and management	64%	2%	34%
Faculty credentialing	48%	2%	50%
Faculty activity reporting	47%	10%	43%
Assessment/institutional effectiveness	67%	0%	33%
Decision support, e.g., surveys, data analysis, etc.	67%	0%	33%

Information Technology Services

Item % Highly Satisfied + Satisfied		% Highly Dissatisfied + Dissatisfied	% Not Applicable		
IT Holpdock rosponso			00/		
IT Helpdesk response	88%	12%	0%		
Data storage and network	88%	10%	2%		
access					
Information security	96%	2%	2%		
Telecommunications	100%	0%	0%		
Desktop management	69%	8%	23%		

Use of Results. Initial review of results of the client survey was conducted by the Regional Chancellor, Assessment and Accountability, and the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning in mid-June 2010. Results were distributed in July. Relevant data from these reports and assessments will be reviewed with unit directors, standing councils and Executive Council as needed during academic year 2010-2011 to inform campus planning, decision making and resource allocation.

3.3.1.3 Educational Support Services

Academic support services unit directors are responsible for completing academic year assessment plans, calendar year action plans, and calendar year annual reports. In addition, a **client satisfaction survey** is completed by faculty, staff and administration to assess the level of satisfaction with the services of these units that provide foundational infrastructure support for the academic and service missions of the campus.

Assessment plans identify the unit's mission and primary responsibilities, target outcome objectives, methods of assessment, expectations for performance, assessment results and use of results for an academic year (summer, fall and spring). Assessment plans complement academic year Action Plans. **Action plans** identify strategic plan objectives appropriate to the unit, actions to be taken by the unit, person(s) responsible, resources needed, target completion dates and achievement benchmarks. Action plans are prepared concurrently with the unit's annual report. **Annual reports** identify the unit's purpose, appropriate unit facts and figures, progress toward development of the campus' core values in the unit, progress toward strategic plan goals, highlights of notable events, and primary goals for the next calendar year.

	Assessment Plan	Action Plan	Annual Report
Academic Advising	[CS3.3.1.3-1 b, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 c, 2010-2011]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 a, 2008]
Admissions & Financial Aid	[CS3.3.1.3-1 e, 2008-2009] [CS3.3.1.3-1 g, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 f, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 d, 2008]
Diversity	[CS3.3.1.3-1 i, 2008-2009] [CS3.3.1.3-1 l, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 j, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 h, 2008] [CS3.3.1.3-1 k, 2009]
Extended University	[CS3.3.1.3-1 n, 2008-2009] [CS3.3.1.3-1 q, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 o, 2009-2010] [CS3.3.1.3-1 r, 2010-2011]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 m, 2008] [CS3.3.1.3-1 p, 2009]
Library	[CS3.3.1.3-1 t, 2008-2009] [CS3.3.1.3-1 w, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 u, 2009-2010] [CS3.3.1.3-1 x, 2010-2011]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 s, 2008] [CS3.3.1.3-1 v, 2009]
Student Affairs	[CS3.3.1.3-1 z, 2008-2009] [CS3.3.1.3-1 cc, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 aa, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 y, 2008] [CS3.3.1.3-1 bb,2009]

Examples of Academic Support Services assessment plans, action plans and annual reports follow:

Client Satisfaction Survey

The **Client Satisfaction Survey [see CS3.3.1.2-2]** administered in spring 2010 for AY2009-2010 and in spring 2011 for AY2010-2011 also included three Academic Support Services units: Extended University, Library and Media Services. The survey was completed by faculty, staff and administration. Respondents were asked to rate items on a 4-point scale from Highly Satisfied to Highly Dissatisfied and included an additional Not Applicable response category. Results of the survey for educational support services units follow:

Extended University

Item	% Highly Satisfied + Satisfied	% Highly Dissatisfied + Dissatisfied	% Not Applicable
Support for the	61%	4%	35%
development of online			
experiences.			
Support for the use of	60%	2%	38%
technology in the teaching			
and learning process.			
Delivery of faculty	55%	2%	43%
development programs.			
Facilitation of	47%	4%	49%
international activities.			
Support for development	61%	4%	35%
and delivery of continuing			
education programs.			

Library

Item	% Highly Satisfied + Satisfied	% Highly Dissatisfied + Dissatisfied	% Not Applicable
Print collections	58%	8%	34%
Electronic collections	68%	6%	26%
Library instructions and information literacy	73%	3%	24%
Reference and research assistance	69%	2%	29%
Circulation/reserves services	63%	2%	35%
Inter-library loan services	64%	4%	32%
Facilities/physical space	68%	12%	20%

Media Services (housed in Extended University)

Item	% Highly Satisfied + Satisfied	% Highly Dissatisfied + Dissatisfied	% Not Applicable
Training tools to use	63%	4%	33%
classroom technology			
effectively			
Classroom technology	67%	4%	29%
Helpdesk response			
Production of quality	50%	6%	44%
academic TV, video-			
conference and/or Webcast			

Use of Results. Initial review of results of the client survey was conducted by the Regional Chancellor, Assessment and Accountability, and the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning in mid-June 2010. Results were distributed in July. Relevant data from these reports and assessments will be reviewed with unit directors, standing councils and Executive Council as needed during academic year 2010-2011 to inform campus planning, decision making and resource allocation.

Graduating Student Survey

The Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning, in collaboration with the Dean of Students, also administered the **Graduating Student Survey [CS3.3.1.3-3]** during fall and spring semester registration for Commencement. The survey was first administered in the 2008-2009 academic year; a total of 50 students responded. In 2009-2010 one hundred twenty-four (124) students completed the survey. In 2010-2011 one hundred one (101) students completed the survey.

One component of the Graduating Student Survey asked students to indicate the degree to which they are satisfied with Academic Support Services provided by USF Polytechnic. In 2008-2009 50 students responded to this question set, and 110 students responded in the 2009-2010 survey. The table that follows provides a comparison of students' responses in both years regarding their satisfaction with several areas in Academic Support Services (Academic Advising, Admissions, Cashier Services, Course Registration, Financial Aid); in Student Support Services (Career Center, Disability Services and Counseling Center); Library; Campus Technology and Campus Safety. Results of the Graduating Student Survey for Academic Support Services units follow:

2008-2009 N=50 2009-2010 N=110	Highly Dis	ssatisfied	Dissa	tisfied	Satis	sfied	Highly S	atisfied
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Student Academic Services								
Academic Advising	12%	10%	2%	22%	42%	37%	44%	27%
Admissions	12%	1%	8%	6%	54%	42%	26%	45%
Cashier Services		0%		0%		33%		42%
Course Registration	10%	2%	4%	4%	36%	44%	50%	50%
Financial Aid	12%	3%	10%	3%	40%	30%	38%	36%
Student Support Services								
Career Center		1%		4%		22%		40%
Disability Services		0%		0%		13%		9%
Counseling Center		0%		1%		16%		12%
Library								
Library Services		1%		3%		41%		40%
Library Electronic Resources		1%		6%		37%		41%
Campus Technology	•							

Graduating Student Survey, USF Polytechnic

Classroom Technology	2%	3%		49%	39%
Open Use Computer Lab	1%	4%		34%	36%
Campus Climate					
Campus Safety	1%	4%		43%	41%
USF Polytechnic Campus OVERALL	1%	6%		47%	45%

Use of Results. Initial review of results of the graduate student survey was conducted by the Regional Chancellor, Assessment and Accountability; Acting Regional Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students; and Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning in mid-June 2010. Results were distributed in July. Relevant data from these reports and assessments will be reviewed with unit directors, standing councils and Executive Council as needed during academic year 2010-2011 to inform campus planning, decision making and resource allocation.

Graduating Student Survey 2010-2011

Preliminary results of the 2010-2011 Graduating Student Survey were distributed to the Executive Council late July 2011.

2010-2011 N=101	Highly Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Highly Satisfied
Student Academic Services				
Academic Advising	14%	20%	43%	21%
Admissions	1%	3%	61%	32%
Cashier Services	0%	3%	43%	41%
Course Registration	0	7%	49%	43%
Financial Aid	6%	4%	40%	27%
Student Support Services				
Career Center	2%	3%	39%	14%
Disability Services	1%	1%	21%	8%
Counseling Center	1%	3%	26%	20%
Library	•			
Library Services	2%	6%	35%	45%

Library Electronic Resources	0%	6%		43%	44%	
Campus Technology						
Classroom Technology	2%	6%		51%	35%	
Open Use Computer Lab	2%	1%		36%	44%	
Campus Climate	Campus Climate					
Campus Safety	0%	2%		43%	42%	
USF Polytechnic Campus OVERALL	2%	4%		50%	41%	

Preliminary Discussion of Results. The following student support services units showed noticeable changes in student satisfaction or dissatisfaction in 2010-2011 in comparison with 2009-2010:

Admissions	Satisfaction increased 87% to 93%
Cashier Services	Satisfaction increased 75% to 84%
Counseling Center	Satisfaction increased 28% to 46%
Disability Services	Satisfaction increased 22% to 29%
Library Electronic Resources	Satisfaction increased 78% to 87%
Open Use Computer Lab	Satisfaction increased 70% to 80%

The following student support services units showed noticeable increased student dissatisfaction in 2010-2011 in comparison with 2009-2010, without noticeable increased satisfaction:

Academic Advising	Dissatisfaction increased 32% to 34%
Classroom Technology	Dissatisfaction increased 5% to 8%
Financial Aid	Dissatisfaction increased 6% to 10%
Library Services	Dissatisfaction increased 4% to 8%

Use of Results. Preliminary results were distributed to the Executive Council in late July 2011. Results will be provided to unit directors for review with staff in August 2011.

3.3.1.4 Research within Educational Mission

USF Polytechnic's mission states, "The University of South Florida Polytechnic is committed to excellence in interdisciplinary and applied learning; to the application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs; and to collaborative partnerships that support economic, social, and community development." Academic Division Directors assign all tenure-earning and most tenured faculty to a research assignment that is either a) departmental (i.e., budgeted and accounted for by the institution under an internal application of institutional funds); or b) sponsored (i.e., budgeted and accounted for by the institution under application of external funds). Over the last five years research assignments have averaged from 9% to 21% for departmental research and 1% to 4% for sponsored research.

Average Percentage of Faculty Effort Assigned to Research

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
% Assignment	21.4%	20.8%	16.3%	13.4%	9.3%

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 241

departmental research					
% Assignment sponsored	2%	2.4%	1%	3.75%	1.5%
research	270	2.470	170	5.7570	1.576

Data Source: FAIR Data Marts

The USF Faculty Academic Information Reporting (FAIR) system tracks faculty research assignments and activity. Faculty members enter their research activity into the Scholarly Activity and Vita Entry (SAVE) vita bank, where the Division Directors, deans and Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs annually review faculty journal article, book and book chapter, and other publications, as well as grant submissions and conference presentations. Faculty members include a listing of this information in their annual review reports, and an **Annual Listing of Faculty Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity** is maintained in the Office of the Regional Vice Chancellor, Assessment and Accountability **[CS3.3.1.4-1, Faculty Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity CY2009]**.

The USF Office of Research and Innovation publishes a report of sponsored research activities each fiscal year for the USF System. The most recent report is the **Report of Research Activities FY 2008-2009 [CS3.3.1.4-2]** which is accessible through the **Office of the Research and Innovation website [CS3.3.1.4-3, see link below].** In addition current fiscal year Research Activity Reports can be accessed through the same source.

The Regional Vice Chancellor, Assessment and Accountability, annually reviews faculty sponsored research activity and maintains a **Sponsored Research Activity History** for the campus **[CS3.3.1.4-4, USF Polytechnic Research Grant History FY 2001-2002 to FY2009-2010]**. The table that follows provides an overview of research grant activity for the last five years.

	FY2005-2006	FY2006-2007	FY2007-2008	FY2008-2009	FY 2009-2010
Federal Awards		\$113,307		\$646,954	\$43,850
Other External Awards	\$251,588	\$105,056	\$56,717	\$245,170	\$197,531
Total External Awards	\$251,588	\$218,363	\$56,717	\$892,124	\$241,381
Internal Awards			\$5,000		
Proposals Submitted	5 \$330,957	5 \$2,679,039	3 \$1,060,647	7 \$2,107,192	7 \$4,935,036
F&A (Indirect Costs) Earned	\$28,700	\$39,176	\$61,267	\$166,663	\$101,496

USF Polytechnic Research Grant History FY 2005-2010

Data Source: USF Office of Research and Innovation FY Reports of Research Activities and Crystal Report Listing of Project Awards Received for FY 2009-2010

Use of Results. Stimulating faculty interest in sponsored research activity is appropriate for a polytechnic model. Workshops on grant management and human subjects compliance were offered at USF Polytechnic in 2008. To assist faculty with grant management, a Faculty Services Administrator was added to Institutional Research in 2007-2008 to assist with PERT certification and research assignment tracking. An Assistant Director, Finance and Budgets, was also added with expertise in grant budget

preparation and management. A search is currently underway for an Accounting Specialist with experience in grants and contract management.

With 22 new faculty appointed for the 2010-2011 academic year, grant writing, human subjects compliance and principal investigator training workshops from the USF Office of Research and Innovation are being scheduled for spring and summer semester 2011. Monthly New Faculty Roundtables also provide opportunities to discuss research, scholarship and creative activity in relation to tenure and promotion.

3.3.1.5 Community/public service within Its Educational Mission

USF Polytechnic's mission states, "The University of South Florida Polytechnic is committed to excellence in interdisciplinary and applied learning; to the application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs; and to collaborative partnerships that support economic, social, and community development." Academic Division Directors assign all faculty (non-tenure-earning, tenure-earning, and tenured) to a public service assignment. Public service activities extend the professional and/or discipline related services of individuals to the community, the state, or the nation, and is provided at no charge to the recipient. This includes service in professional organizations and academic or professional organizations. Over the last five years service assignments have ranged from 14% to 26%.

Average Percentage of Faculty Effort Assigned to Public Service

2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010**
14.8%	21.1%	26.5%	24.5%	17.4%

Data Source: FAIR Data Marts; 2009-2010 data currently available for summer and fall 2009 only.

The USF Faculty Academic Information Reporting (FAIR) system tracks faculty public service assignments and activity. Faculty members enter their service activity into the Scholarly Activity and Vita Entry (SAVE) vita bank, where the Division Directors, deans and Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs annually review service activities. Faculty members include a listing of this information in their annual review reports, and an **Annual Listing of Faculty Professional and Public Service Activity** is maintained in the Office of the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs [CS3.3.1.5-1, Faculty Professional and **Public Service Activity 2009**].

Use of Results. With community engagement as a core value in the USF Polytechnic Strategic Plan, it is not surprising that faculty public service activity is high. **USF Polytechnic Tenure and Promotion Guidelines [CS3.3.1.5-2]** indicate, "For tenure and/or promotion to be granted a candidate must demonstrate service to the university, professional, and external communities. Community service activities that capitalize on a faculty member's professional expertise are highly valued. The mission of USF Polytechnic also commits faculty to the application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs; and to collaborative partnerships that support economic, social, and community development. Faculty are expected to serve as key resources for communities and to value community service. Service to the community may include serving as an officer or member of community committees, councils, or boards; or service activities for community, state, or federal agencies."

Division Directors and Deans annually review faculty service activities to ensure that individual faculty members are engaged in public service, yet balancing teaching and research assignments as appropriate

for their rank (e.g., tenure-earning faculty are expected to carry less public service assignment than tenured or non-tenure-earning faculty).

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CS3.3.1.1-1] Board of Governors Regulation 8.016 Academic Learning Compacts

[CS3.3.1.1-2] USF System Statement of Policy on Academic Learning Compacts

[CS3.3.1.1-3] USF System Guidelines for Development and Implementation of Academic Learning Compacts

[CS3.3.1.1-4] USF System Academic Learning Compact website: http://www.acad.usf.edu/ALC/alccontent/default.aspx

[CS3.3.1.1-5a-I] Academic Learning Compacts for each degree program:

[CS3.3.1.1-5a] BS Applied Science ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5b] MA Counselor Education ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5c] BA Criminology ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5d] MEd Educational Leadership ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5e] BS Elementary Education ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5f] BS General Business Administration ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5f] BS General Business Administration ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5g] BS Industrial Engineering ALC, see table p. 208 [CS3.3.1.1-5h] BS Information Technology ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5h] BA Interdisciplinary Social Science ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5j] BS Marketing ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5k] BA Psychology ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5k] BA Psychology ALC [CS3.3.1.1-5l] MA Reading Education ALC

[CS3.3.1.1-6a-I] ALC Assessment Reports 2008-2009

[CS3.3.1.1-5a] BS Applied Science

[CS3.3.1.1-5a-1] BS Applied Science Criminal Justice, p. 200 [CS3.3.1.1-5a-2] BS Applied Science Early Childhood Development, see table p. 199 [CS3.3.1.1-5a-3] BS Applied Science General Business, see table p. 205 [CS3.3.1.1-5a-4] BS Applied Science Industrial Operations, see table p. 208 [CS3.3.1.1-5a-5] BS Applied Science Information Technology, see table p. 210

[CS3.3.1.1-5b] MA Counselor Education

[CS3.3.1.1-5c] BA Criminology

[CS3.3.1.1-5d] MEd Educational Leadership

[CS3.3.1.1-5e] BS Elementary Education

[CS3.3.1.1-5f] BS General Business Administration

[CS3.3.1.1-5g] BS Industrial Engineering, p. 208

[CS3.3.1.1-5h] BS Information Technology

[CS3.3.1.1-5i] BA Interdisciplinary Social Science [CS3.3.1.1-5j] BS Marketing [CS3.3.1.1-5k] BA Psychology [CS3.3.1.1-5l] MA Reading Education

ALC Assessment Reports 2009-2010 [CS3.3.1.1-7a-I]

[CS3.3.1.1-7a] BS Applied Science

[CS3.3.1.1-7a-1] BS Applied Science Criminal Justice, see table below
 [CS3.3.1.1-7a-2] BS Applied Science Early Childhood Development, see table below
 [CS3.3.1.1-7a-3] BS Applied Science General Business, see table below
 [CS3.3.1.1-7a-4] BS Applied Science Industrial Operations
 [CS3.3.1.1-7a-5] BS Applied Science Information Technology

[CS3.3.1.1-7b] MA Counselor Education [CS3.3.1.1-7c] BA Criminology [CS3.3.1.1-7d] MEd Educational Leadership [CS3.3.1.1-7e] BS Elementary Education [CS3.3.1.1-7f] BS General Business Administration [CS3.3.1.1-7f] BS Industrial Engineering, see table below [CS3.3.1.1-7h] BS Information Technology [CS3.3.1.1-7i] BA Interdisciplinary Social Science [CS3.3.1.1-7j] BS Marketing [CS3.3.1.1-7k] BA Psychology [CS3.3.1.1-7l] MA Reading Education

[CS3.3.1.1-8] Academic and Student Affairs Council (ASAC) Example Meeting Notes

[CS3.3.1.1-8a]ASAC Meeting Notes 11-13-2008[CS3.3.1.1-8b]ASAC Meeting Notes 2-12-09[CS3.3.1.1-8c]ASAC Meeting Notes 4-09-09[CS3.3.1.1-8d]ASAC Meeting Notes 9-10-09[CS3.3.1.1-8e]ASAC Meeting Notes 1-14-10[CS3.3.1.1-8f]ASAC Meeting Notes 4-8-10[CS3.3.1.1-8g]ASAC Meeting Notes 9-22-10

[CS3.3.1.1-9] Academic Division Annual Reports and Action Plans

	2008 Annual Report	2009 Action Plan
Arts & Sciences	[CS3.3.1.1-9a]	[CS3.3.1.1-9b]
Business	[CS3.3.1.1-9c]	[CS3.3.1.1-9d]
Education	[CS3.3.1.1-9e]	[CS3.3.1.1-9f]
Engineering	[CS3.3.1.1-9g]	[CS3.3.1.1-9h]
Information Technology	[CS3.3.1.1-9i]	[CS3.3.1.1-9j]

	Assessment Plan	Action Plan	Annual Report
Budget & Finance	[CS3.3.1.2-1a, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1b1, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1c, 2009]
	[CS3.3.1.2-1d, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1b2, 2009-2010]	
Campus Planning & Facilities	[CS3.3.1.2-1e, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1f1, 2009-2010]	
		[CS3.3.1.2-1f2, 2009-2010]	
Human Resources	[CS3.3.1.2-1g, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1h, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1i, 2009]
	[CS3.3.1.2-1j, 2009-2010]		
IREP	[CS3.3.1.2-1l, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1m, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1k, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.2-10, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1p, 2010-2011]	[CS3.3.1.2-1n, 2009]
IT/ERDC Services	[CS3.3.1.2-1r, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.2-1s, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.2-1q, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.2-1u, 2009-2010]		[CS3.3.1.2-1t, 2009]

[CS3.3.1.2-1a-u] Administrative Support Services assessment plans, action plans and annual reports

[CS3.3.1.2-2] Client Satisfaction Survey, hard copy only

	[CS3.3.1.3a-cc] Acade	mic Support Services asse	essment plans, action	plans an	nd annual reports
--	-----------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	----------	-------------------

	Assessment Plan	Action Plan	Annual Report
Academic Advising	[CS3.3.1.3-1 b, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 c, 2010-2011]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 a, 2008]
Admissions & Financial Aid	[CS3.3.1.3-1 e, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 f, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 d, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.3-1 g, 2009-2010]		
Diversity	[CS3.3.1.3-1 i, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 j, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 h, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.3-1 l, 2009-2010]		[CS3.3.1.3-1 k, 2009]
Extended University	[CS3.3.1.3-1 n, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 o, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 m, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.3-1 q, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 r, 2010-2011]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 p, 2009]
Library	[CS3.3.1.3-1 t, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 u, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 s, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.3-1 w, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 x, 2010-2011]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 v, 2009]
Student Affairs	[CS3.3.1.3-1 z, 2008-2009]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 aa, 2009-2010]	[CS3.3.1.3-1 y, 2008]
	[CS3.3.1.3-1 cc, 2009-2010]		[CS3.3.1.3-1 bb,2009]

[CS3.3.1.3-2] see Client Satisfaction Survey, CS3.3.1.2-2

- [CS3.3.1.3-3] Graduating Student Survey, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, hard copy only
- [CS3.3.1.4-1] Annual Listing of Faculty Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity
- [CS3.3.1.4-2] Report of Research Activities FY 2008-2009
- [CS3.3.1.4-3] Office of the Research and Innovation website: http://reports.research.usf.edu/
- [CS3.3.1.4-4] Sponsored Research Activity History
- [CS3.3.1.5-1] Annual Listing of Faculty Professional and Public Service Activity 2009
- [CS3.3.1.5-2] USF Polytechnic Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Comprehensive Standard 3.5.1: College-level Competencies

The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance

□ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

A copy of competencies for the general education component (or core) and evidence that graduates have attained the competencies.

USF Polytechnic has provided a 2+2 bachelor's program consistent with the statewide articulation agreement. Students complete the first two years (approximately 60 semester credit hours) at their local community college or another college or university and the last two years (approximately 60 semester credit hours) with USF Polytechnic to obtain a bachelor's degree.

Florida Statute 1007.23 Statewide Articulation Agreement [CS3.5.1-1] preserves Florida's 2+2 system of articulation, facilitating the seamless articulation of student credit across and among Florida's educational entities. The articulation provisions govern

(a) Articulation between secondary and postsecondary education;

(b) Admission of associate in arts degree graduates from community colleges and state universities;

(c) Admission of applied technology diploma program graduates from community colleges or career centers;

(d) Admission of associate in science degree and associate in applied science degree graduates from community colleges;

(e) The use of acceleration mechanisms, including nationally standardized examinations through which students may earn credit;

- (f) General education requirements and statewide course numbers; and
- (g) Articulation among programs in nursing.

The statewide articulation agreement (2)(a) provides that every associate in arts graduate of a Florida college shall have met all general education requirements and must be granted admission to the upper division of a 1) State university, except for a limited access or teacher certification program or a major program requiring an audition, and 2) Florida college if it offers baccalaureate degree programs, except for a limited access or teacher certification program or a major a limited access or teacher certification program or a major program requiring an audition.

The agreement (4) also provides that statewide articulation of appropriate courses within associate in science degree programs to baccalaureate degree programs must be guaranteed.

The **Statewide Course Numbering System [Florida Statute 1007.24, CS3.5.1-2]** is maintained by the Department of Education, in conjunction with the Board of Governors. It is intended to improve program planning, increase communication among all delivery systems, and facilitate student acceleration and the transfer of students and credits between public school districts, public postsecondary educational institutions, and participating nonpublic educational institutions.

Any student who transfers among postsecondary institutions that are fully accredited by a regional or national accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education and that participate in the statewide course numbering system shall be awarded credit by the receiving institution for courses satisfactorily completed by the student at the previous institutions (7).

General Education Policy

Florida Statute 1007.25 General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements [CS3.5.1-3] provides in Section (6) that the boards of trustees of the community colleges identify their core curricula, which shall include courses required by the State Board of Education, and that the boards of trustees of the state universities identify their core curricula, which shall include courses required by the Board of Governors. An associate in arts degree must require no more than 60 semester hours of college credit, including 36 semester hours of general education coursework (section 7). A baccalaureate degree program shall require no more than 120 semester hours of college credit, including 36 semester hours of general education coursework, unless prior approval has been granted by the Board of Governors for baccalaureate degree programs offered by state universities and by the State Board of Education for baccalaureate degree programs offered by community colleges (section 8).

Following Board of Governors Regulation 6.004 Admission of Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Transfer Students [CS3.5.1-4], students who transfer to USF Polytechnic with an Associate in Arts degree will have completed sixty (60) semester hours of college credit courses in an established program of study, exclusive of courses not accepted in the state university system, and including a general education core curriculum of thirty-six (36) semester hours of college credit in communication, mathematics, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences with the remaining twenty-four (24) semester hours consisting of appropriate common program prerequisite courses and electives.

Regulation 6.004 further provides that students must complete requirements for English and mathematics courses as adopted by the Board of Governors and the State Board of Education. **Board of Governors Rule 6.017 Criteria for Awarding the Baccalaureate Degree [CS3.5.1-5]** articulates the requirements of the **Florida Administrative Code Rule 6A-10.030 Other Assessment Procedures for College-Level Communication and Computation Skills, also known as the "Gordon Rule" [CS3.5.1-6].** Students must complete six (6) semester hours of English coursework and six semester hours of additional coursework in which the student is required to demonstrate college-level writing skills through multiple assignments. Each institution designates the courses that fulfill the writing requirements of this section. Students awarded college credit in English based on their demonstration of writing skills through dual enrollment, advanced placement, or international baccalaureate instruction are considered to have satisfied this requirement to the extent of the college credit awarded.

The Rule further requires that students complete six (6) semester hours of mathematics coursework at the level of college algebra or higher. Applied logic, statistics and other computation-based coursework that may not be offered by a mathematics department may be used to fulfill three (3) of the six (6) hours required by this section. Students awarded college credit based on their demonstration of

mathematics skills at the level of college algebra or higher through dual enrollment, advanced placement, or international baccalaureate instruction are considered to have satisfied this requirement to the extent of the college credit awarded. Courses approved by the BOG [6.017 (1)(c)] to fulfill the computation requirement are:

Any combination of two (2) courses from the list below: Any MAC course with the last three (3) digits of 102 or higher MGFX106 – Liberal Arts Mathematics I MGFX107 – Liberal Arts Mathematics II MGFX113 –Topics in College Mathematics I MGFX114 –Topics in College Mathematics II MGFX118 – Mathematics for CLAST Review Any MGF course with last three (3) digits of 202 or higher Any Gordon Rule statistics course Any mathematics course that has College Algebra (MACX105) as a prerequisite

The Gordon Rule communication and computation requirements are considered met for any student entering the university with an A.A. degree from a Florida public community college. Gordon Rule communication requirement is considered met for any student entering the university with 60 or more hours. Students must achieve a proficiency level of at least C- in the course in order to receive Gordon Rule Communication credit.

Requirements for General Education

Consistent with state policy, USF Polytechnic recognizes its commitment to the requirements for general education in Florida, including Gordon Rule requirements. Baccalaureate degree programs require no more than 120 semester hours of college credit, including 36 semester hours of general education coursework. To gain admission into USF Polytechnic, students must have a minimum of 60 transferrable credit hours at time of transfer, and a minimum of a 2.0 cumulative transfer GPA. USF Polytechnic strongly recommends that students complete the Associate in Arts degree or as required for certain majors, the Associate in Science degree, before transferring. USF Polytechnic accepts transfer credit from institutions that are regionally accredited at the time the credits are earned as provided for in F.S. 1007.24. Thus, students enter USF Polytechnic having met their general education requirements in the institutions from which they transferred and through a variety of curricula that address the state's common skills and subject areas. Or, students may take upper-level courses at USF Polytechnic to meet general education requirements that may not have been completed prior to transfer.

For this reason, USF Polytechnic accepts the State of Florida's general education requirements as articulated in Board of Governors Regulation 6.004, a general education core curriculum of thirty-six (36) semester hours of college credit in communication, mathematics, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences, as well as Gordon Rule requirements.

Consistent with the University of South Florida's Liberal Arts Education requirements, students must satisfy the following general education requirements **[USF Undergraduate Catalog 2009-2010, p. 68, CS3.5.1-7]**:

General Education Requirements – 36 hours

6 English Composition
3 Fine Arts
3 Human and Cultural Diversity in a Global Context
6 Humanities
6 Mathematics *Or* 3 Mathematics and 3 Quantitative Reasoning
3 Natural Sciences (Life Science)
3 Natural Sciences (Physical Science)
6 Social and Behavioral Sciences

Exit Requirements – 6 hours 3 Capstone 3 Writing Intensive

Students must receive a minimum grade of "C-" in each course to fulfill any core requirement in either the core curriculum or the exit courses.

General Education Outcomes Assessment

USF Polytechnic assesses reading, writing and mathematics, in addition to critical thinking and diversity, in keeping with core values expressed in its 2007-2012 Strategic Plan:

- 1. We expect students to **read critically**, interpreting meaning and purpose and recognizing fact vs. inference and opinion.
- 2. We expect students to **write correctly and effectively**, producing well-organized and meaningful prose.
- 3. We expect students to recognize and interpret mathematical terms, data, formulas and representations.
- 4. We expect students to **think critically and analytically**, recognizing and questioning assumptions and hypotheses, interpreting information, drawing appropriate conclusions, and presenting persuasive argument.
- 5. We expect students to **value diversity of human thought**, **experience and perspective** and to be open to individual and cultural uniqueness.

USF Polytechnic has provided 2+2 baccalaureate programs consistent with the Statewide Articulation Agreement. A general education program is not offered at USF Polytechnic. However, Florida Statute (1007.25 General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements) requires that a baccalaureate degree consists of 120 semester hours which includes 36 semester hours of general education coursework.

Means of Assessment

USF Polytechnic assesses reading, writing and mathematics, in addition to critical thinking and diversity, in keeping with core values expressed in its 2007-2012 Strategic Plan. Several means of assessment are used: (1) the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) Test, short form; (2) the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); (3) Graduating Student Survey; and (4) the Diversity/Campus Climate Survey.

General Education Competency	Nationally- Standardized Instrument	Nationally- Standardized Student Self-Report Instrument	USF Polytechnic Student Self- Report Instruments
Reading	ETS®Proficiency Profile		
Writing	ETS®Proficiency Profile		Graduating Student Survey
Mathematics	ETS®Proficiency Profile		
Critical Thinking	ETS®Proficiency Profile Reading Level 3	NSSE Survey Academic Challenge & Active Learning	Graduating Student Survey
Diversity		NSSE Survey Supportive Campus Environment	Graduating Student Survey Diversity/Campus Climate Survey

ETS®Proficiency Profile

The ETS®Proficiency Profile is produced and scored by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The ETS®Proficiency Profile Users Guide [FR4.1-11, p. 4] indicates that the test was "developed to assist in the assessment of the outcomes of general education programs in order to improve the quality of instruction and learning. The Profile is a test of college-level skills in critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics. It is designed to measure the academic skills developed through general education courses, rather than the subject knowledge specifically taught in those courses. All of the subject knowledge required to answer each question is contained in the question itself or in the stimulus materials that accompany the question." Profile test questions assess the following:

College-level **reading** questions measure students' ability to a) interpret the meaning of key terms, b) recognize the primary purpose of a passage, c) recognize explicitly presented information, d) make appropriate inferences, and e) recognize rhetorical devices.

College-level **writing** questions measure students' ability to a) recognize the most grammatically correct revision of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences; b) organize units of language for coherence and rhetorical effect; c) recognize and reword figurative language; and d) organize elements of writing into larger units of meaning.

Critical thinking questions measure students' ability to a) distinguish between rhetoric and argumentation in a piece of nonfiction prose, b) recognize assumptions, c) recognize the best hypothesis to account for information presented, d) infer and interpret a relationship between variables, and e) draw valid conclusions based on information presented.

Mathematics questions measure students' ability to a) recognize and interpret mathematical terms; b) read and interpret tables and graphs; c) evaluate formulas; d) order and compare large and small numbers; e) interpret ratios, proportions, and percentages; f) read scientific

measuring instruments; and g) recognize and use equivalent mathematical formulas or expressions.

USF Polytechnic administered the four times in 2009-2010 to sample populations of students. A report on the results of the 2009-2010 administrations was disseminated March 1, 2011 by the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning.

Name of Cohort	Date Administered	Student Level	Number	Form	
All Divisions	Spring 2009	Mostly juniors	34	Abbreviated	
All Divisions	April 2010	Mostly juniors	28	Abbreviated	
Education	November 2010	Seniors	59	Standard	
Marketing	December 2010	Seniors	25	Abbreviated	

Administrations and Populations

The Abbreviated Form of the Profile contains 36 multiple-choice items, which cover the skill areas of Reading, Critical Thinking, Writing and Mathematics. Items are distributed across areas as follows:

	Critical Thinking	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Humanities	3 items	2-4 items		
Social Sciences	3 items	2-4 items	9 items	9 items
Natural Sciences	3 items	2-4 items		

The Standard Form of the Profile contains 108 multiple-choice items, covering the skill areas of Reading, Critical Thinking, Writing and Mathematics. Items are distributed across areas as follows:

	Critical Thinking	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Humanities	9 items	9 items		
Social Sciences	9 items	9 items	27 items	27 items
Natural Sciences	9 items	9 items		

ETS provides different norm groups for different classifications of institutions. For USF Polytechnic the norm group is Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I and II. These norms are based on slightly over 51,000 students who took the Profile at 92 institutions from January 2006 through June 2010. ETS norms are presented by class (i.e., freshman, sophomore, juniors, etc.). The USF Polytechnic sample were largely seniors; therefore, the ETS norm tables for seniors were used.

Norm-referenced Results. The following table shows the overall mean score for the USF Polytechnic total cohort of 146 students for each of the subscales, the possible range of scores, and the percent of institutions that had mean scores below the mean score of USF Polytechnic students.

	Mean Score USF Polytechnic	Possible Range	Percent of Institutions with Mean Scores BELOW USF Polytechnic Mean Scores
Critical Thinking	112.06	100-130	39%
Reading	118.17	100-130	30%
Writing	114.55	100-130	27%
Mathematics	114.64	100-130	60%
Humanities	115.15	100-130	35%
Social Sciences	113.62	100-130	25%
------------------	--------	---------	-----
Natural Sciences	115.48	100-130	28%

<u>Criterion-referenced Results.</u> The following tables show the percentage of USF Polytechnic students who were classified as Proficient, Marginal or Not Proficient at each level of each skill dimension, as well as the percentage of students in the norm group classified as Proficient, Marginal or Not Proficient. Level of skills required for proficiency increases from Level 1 to Level 3.

	Percent	Percent Proficient		Marginal	Percent No	ot Proficient
	POLY	NORM	POLY	NORM	POLY	NORM
Reading Level 1	66%	69%	21%	18%	13%	14%
Reading Level 2	31%	40%	24%	19%	45%	41%
Reading Level 3 –	2%	8%	17%	19%	81%	73%
Critical Thinking						
Writing Level 1	69%	65%	27%	25%	7%	10%
Writing Level 2	19%	21%	37%	37%	43%	42%
Writing Level 3	6%	8%	27%	28%	66%	64%
Mathematics Level 1	62%	55%	25%	24%	13%	21%
Mathematics Level 2	35%	29%	27%	25%	38%	45%
Mathematics Level 3	4%	8%	21%	17%	75%	75%

Discussion of 2009-2010 ETS®Proficiency Profile Results. Participation in the test was voluntary. The results of the test carry no consequences, either positive or negative. Both student selection and motivation for doing well on the test could influence results. The norm group selected was Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities at the senior level. USF Polytechnic students were at different stages of completion of their programs of study in a 2+2 upper level institution; students did not do their foundational General Education curriculum here. The sample size (146) is neither large enough nor diverse enough to draw any strong conclusions.

Based on these limitations, USF Polytechnic student proficiency in Reading was fairly comparable with other schools at Level 1 and Level 2 proficiency. Both USF Polytechnic and norm student performance at Level 3 Reading (Critical Thinking) is certainly of concern. USF Polytechnic student proficiency in Writing was higher than norm schools at Level 1 proficiency, and fairly comparable at Level 2 and Level 3 proficiencies. USF Polytechnic student proficiency in Mathematics was higher than other schools at Level 1 and Level 2 proficiencies and slightly less than other schools at Level 3 proficiency.

Use of Results. MAPP test results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council. Data collected for 2009-2010 will be a baseline for future years. Results for the ETS®Proficiency Profile 2010-2011 administrations are in final analysis with results disseminated in March 2012. As the general education curriculum is developed, these data will be utilized as a foundation to build a strong, focused and integrated general education program. In addition, the campus will examine benefits that may be gained from implementing the long form of the Profile which includes discipline specific areas such as communication, social sciences, humanities and natural sciences. In addition, the use of subject-specific assessments from ETS will also be examined.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) obtains, on an annual basis, information from hundreds of four-year colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college. Survey items on The National Survey of Student Engagement represent empirically confirmed "good practices" in undergraduate education. That is, they reflect behaviors by students and institutions that are associated with desired outcomes of college.

Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience inside and outside the classroom that can be improved through changes in policies and practices more consistent with good practices in undergraduate education. This information is also used by prospective college students, their parents, college counselors, academic advisers, institutional research officers, and researchers in learning more about how students spend their time at different colleges and universities and what they gain from their experiences. **[see NSSE website link below, FR4.1-12]**

The NSSE is administered nationwide to college students selected randomly. USF submits a student population data file of ALL first-year and senior students, and NSSE selects a random sample (half freshman, half seniors) from this file based on undergraduate enrollment. Customized letters endorsed by an institutional representative are included with the surveys mailed or e-mailed to participating schools in February to March.

The NSSE was first administered in spring 2007, in 2009 and again in May 2010. Results are analyzed by NSSE and reported separately as well as comparatively with other USF institutions. Because USF Polytechnic's enrollment is a small proportion of the total USF System enrollment, USF Polytechnic Institutional Research paid an additional fee to oversample USFP senior students in 2007, 2009 and 2010. USF Polytechnic Institutional Research will now administer the NSSE to USFP seniors online during the spring semester every other year, with the next administration of the assessment in spring 2012.

NSSE 2007 and 2009 Results

NSSE identifies five benchmarks of effective educational practice: 1) level of academic challenge, 2) active and collaborative learning, 3) student – faculty interaction, 4) enriching educational experiences, and 5) supportive campus environment. The 2007 survey was the first year where baseline data specific to USF Polytechnic Seniors were available. Therefore, this survey became the baseline to compare with the 2009 data. Comparisons were: academic years, gender, race and USF campuses. The framework of the study was a series of two-way analyses of variances (linear model – least square means Scheffe test with a significance level of .01). The following graphically compares academic years (2007, 2009) and gender:







WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 255





Discussion of Results. Comparisons of year of assessment, campus and race were not significantly different among the Polytechnic students. However, as other studies have found, females and males rated the NSSE benchmarks differently. The study found that within the dimensions of active learning and enriching educational environment female students rated their experiences significantly higher than male students.

In the dimension of Academic Challenge, both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009. In Active Learning both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female students perceptions increasing slightly more. In the area of Student Faculty Interactions, again both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female students perceptions increasing slightly more. In Enriching Educational Environment, both male and female students' perceptions increased positively with female students rating the benchmark higher than male students. In Supportive Campus Environment, male students' perceptions decreased from 2007 to 2009 while female students' perceptions increased positively.

Use of Results. NSSE results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council. The purpose of this analysis was twofold: 1) to get some preliminary information about USF Polytechnic students and how they compare with other USF students; and 2) to get some baseline results for further analysis. The graphs fulfill the spirit of the first purpose. The second purpose was fulfilled as well. Having determined baseline significance of gender, race, campus and year of assessment in the NSSE benchmarks, it is possible to undertake further studies in the future.

In relation to the decrease from 2007 to 2009 in male students' perceptions of the dimension of Supportive Campus Environment, campus demographics indicate that female students comprise 61% of the student population. USF Polytechnic's Diversity Office instituted an annual panel discussion in April 2009 on "Where Are the College Men?" and in April 2010 on "Where Are the Men?" Both panels engaged attendees in discussions with current male students and male alumni around why more men are not attending college, increasing a male student support environment, and issues in male students' successful completion of college degrees.

NSSE 2009 – USF Polytechnic Students and Other NSSE College Students

The 2009 administration of the NSSE also examined USF Polytechnic students' attitudes and experiences as compared to other college students taking the NSSE. Again, an attempt was made to over sample seniors at USFP. NSSE scores are reported for USF Polytechnic students, for students in schools that were categorized in the top 50 percent or top 10 percent of schools based on the weighting system used by NSSE to calculate benchmarks for various subgroups in the NSSE student sample, and for all students. Although a significance level based on means of USF Polytechnic students and the NSSE subgroups might have been calculable, it would have presumed a level of statistical accuracy that was probably unfounded. The following graphics portray our findings:











Discussion of Results. In the benchmark categories of **Level of Academic Challenge** and **Active and Collaborative Learning**, USF Polytechnic students scored their institution higher than the average of all NSSE students sampled. In the categories of **Student Faculty Interaction**, **Enriching Educational Experiences** or **Supportive Campus Environment**, USF Polytechnic students, on average, rated their institution slightly lower than the average NSSE responder. USF Polytechnic students, on average, did not rate their institution higher than the average NSSE responder in schools categorized in the top 50 percent or top 10 percent of schools based on benchmark scores.

Use of Results. It is difficult to determine demographic information for any of the NSSE groups. How significantly they varied from the USF Polytechnic population is difficult to know and could be important. Certainly, as USF Polytechnic shares a campus with a state college which sets the policies for campus use, it is challenging to develop strategies to create a campus environment specific to USFP students. The planning and development of the new campus site is an important opportunity for USF Polytechnic to involve students in the planning stages and to communicate the importance of their interests, needs and perspectives in creating a new campus environment.

The NSSE results were reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association and the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup. Student Affairs is addressing the slightly lower scores on Student Faculty Interaction, Enriching Educational Experiences and Supportive Campus Environment to develop action plans to better engage the students inside and outside the classroom. These new initiatives will be monitored closely.

NSSE Results 2010

The 2010 NSSE questionnaire was administered in May 2010 to 137 USF Polytechnic seniors. Benchmark means were compared for students from USF Polytechnic, USF Sarasota-Manatee, USF St. Petersburg, USF Tampa and the Carnegie "Master's Small" cohort. The table below provides this comparison.

	USF	Poly	USF Sa	rasota	USF St	t. Pete	USF T	ampa	Master	's Sm.	US	F Poly Al	bove/Be	low
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Sar	S.P.	Тра	Sm. Mst.
Level of Academic Challenge	58.26	14.52	58.35	14.42	56.32	14.15	55.77	14.08	59.0	14.1	-0.10	1.94	2.49	-0.74
Active and Collaborative Learning	53.34	20.53	50.04	18.12	48.70	18.19	45.15	17.25	53.9	17.4	3.30	4.64	8.19	-0.56
Student-Faculty Interaction	36.95	21.42	36.25	17.59	34.34	18.83	34.43	19.00	46.5	21.4	0.70	2.61	2.52	-9.55
Enriching Educational Experiences	38.50	17.52	32.51	16.67	34.97	17.36	35.16	16.46	43.5	19.1	5.99	3.53	3.33	-5.00
Supportive Campus Environment	58.95	20.06	62.24	19.49	56.89	18.36	54.99	19.35	62.3	19.5	-3.29	2.07	3.96	-3.35

Comparisons of Results for NSSE Benchmark Means

NOTE: While means for a given benchmark are on the same scale and may be compared across institutions, the scales vary across benchmarks and do not permit comparisons between benchmarks.

Discussion of Results: Note that the mean for USF Polytechnic is below that of the Master's Small cohort on each of the five benchmarks. However, the results are much different when USF Polytechnic means are compared to the other USF campuses. In fact, the USF Polytechnic mean is above the corresponding mean for USF Tampa and USF St. Pete on <u>all five benchmarks</u> – most dramatically on the three benchmarks that most assess characteristics closely aligned with the Polytechnic mission. The USF Polytechnic mean is above USF Sarasota on three of the five benchmarks.

If one peruses the questions comprising each benchmark, one can see that the special polytechnic mission of USF Polytechnic is best measured by the items making up the benchmark labeled "Active and Collaborative Learning," followed by "Level of Academic Challenge" and "Enriching Educational Experiences." Note that for "Active and Collaborative Learning," USF Polytechnic is above all three of its local peers, as is also the case for "Enriching Educational Experiences." For "Level of Academic Challenge" USF Polytechnic is above two of its three local peers.

These results strongly support the assertion that USF Polytechnic is differentiating itself from other USF campuses in terms of delivering education consistent with its Polytechnic mission.

Use of Results: The NSSE results were reviewed with the Executive Council and distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association, the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and faculty in fall 2011 semester. [INSERT BRIEF SUMMARY FROM MEETING MINUTES.]

■ Graduating Student Survey Results

Institutional Research administers the **Graduating Student Survey** [**FR4.1-13**] during fall and spring semester registration for Commencement. The survey was first administered in the 2008-2009 academic year; a total of 50 students responded. In 2009-2010 one hundred twenty-four (124) students completed the survey. The following table provides data on students' views of their courses:

2008-2009 N=50 2009-2010 N=113	Strongly Disagree Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree			
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Courses in my major provided me with adequate knowledge and skills.	12%	7%	2%	4%	42%	55%	44%	34%
My writing skills improved.	12%	8%	8%	16%	54%	48%	26%	28%
My oral communication skills improved.	12%	8%	10%	11%	40%	48%	38%	33%
My critical thinking skills improved.	10%	6%	4%	8%	36%	48%	50%	37%

Graduating Student Survey

Discussion of Results. In the category of adequacy of knowledge and skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall (i.e., combined percentage in strong disagree and disagree responses) with the statement decreased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 14% to 11% while the percentage of students agreeing overall (i.e., combined percentage in agree and strongly agree responses) with the statement increased from 86% to 89%.

In the category of writing skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement increased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 20% to 24%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement decreased from 80% to 76%.

In the category of oral communication skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement decreased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 22% to 19%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement increased from 78% to 81%.

In the category of critical thinking skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement remained the same from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 at 14%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement decreased slightly from 86% to 85%.

Use of Results. The Graduating Student Survey results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council and will be reviewed by academic units and the Student Government Association at the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year.

The increase in student disagreement and decrease in student agreement with the statement, "My writing skills improved," from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010, in addition to the Level 1 performance of students on the MAPP short form test (60%) in comparison to all schools in similar master's level colleges and universities (76%) suggests that writing skills is an area for improvement. Additional full-time faculty have been hired for academic year 2010-2011 to teach literature and writing exit courses, as well as technical and professional writing courses. This will reduce the number of courses that would be taught by adjunct faculty. The full-time faculty will be following the results of the 2010-2011 administration of the MAPP test to determine potential curricular changes or the need for additional common course assessments.

Level 3 proficiency in Reading on the MAPP test assesses Critical Thinking; only 2% of USF Polytechnic students and 5% of students in similar master's level colleges and universities demonstrated proficiency in Level 3 Reading/Critical Thinking. In the dimensions of Academic Challenge and Active Learning on the NSSE, both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences at USF Polytechnic as academically challenging increased positively from 2007 to 2009. In addition, USF Polytechnic students scored their institution higher on these two benchmarks than the average of all NSSE students sampled. The decrease from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 on the Graduating Student Survey in student agreement with the statement, "My critical thinking skills improved," is slight (1%); however, results in the area of critical thinking will be monitored in academic year 2010-2011 as this is a key area of value for USF Polytechnic and for student success and achievement.

Graduating Student Survey 2010-2011

Preliminary results of the 2010-2011 Graduating Student Survey were distributed to Executive Council at the end of July 2011. Of the 350 graduating students, 101 completed the survey.

2010-2011 N=101	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Courses in my major provided me with adequate knowledge and skills.	1%	4%	40%	55%
My writing skills improved.	2%	12%	41%	45%
My oral communication skills improved.	1%	6%	35%	58%
My critical thinking skills improved.	1%	3%	30%	66%

Preliminary Discussion of Results. In the category of adequacy of knowledge and skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 4% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 44% in 2008-2009 and 35% in 2009-2010 to 55% in 2010-2011.

In the category of writing skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 8% in 2009-2010 to 2% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 26% in 2008-2009 and 28% in 2009-2010 to 45% in 2010-2011.

In the category of adequacy of oral communication skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 10% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 38% in 2008-2009 and 33% in 2009-2010 to 58% in 2010-2011.

In the category of adequacy of critical thinking skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 10% in 2008-2009 and 6% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 50% in 2008-2009 and 37% in 2009-2010 to 66% in 2010-2011.

Use of Results: The preliminary results were reviewed with the Executive Council distributed and reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association, the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and faculty in the fall 2011 semester. [INSERT SUMMARY OF MEETING MINUTES.]

Campus Climate/Diversity Survey Results

Institutional Research, in collaboration with the USF Polytechnic Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement, administers the **Campus Climate/Diversity Survey** every other year [see CR2.5-18 l&m]. The first administration of the survey was in spring 2008, and the next administration of the survey was fall 2010. The survey measures students' perceptions of the following factors: 1) experience with diversity, 2) academic achievement and personal development, 3) peer relationships, 4) diversity programs and policies, 5) camaraderie among groups, 6) classroom environment, 7) treatment and inter-group relations, 8) expression of insensitivity and prejudice, 9) diversity experiences impact, 10) disabled students, and 11) overall evaluation of campus experiences.

In spring 2008 the total number of USF students responding to the survey was 2,712 with 447 students who took classes at USF Polytechnic participating. In fall 2010 the total number of USF students responding to the survey was 2,395 with 319 students who took classes at USF Polytechnic participating. The following table presents a summary of USF Polytechnic respondents' perceptions of the campus/ diversity climate:

	Spring 2008 (N=447)	Fall 2010 (N=319)
Percentage of students moderately to extremely satisfied with their overall experience at USF Polytechnic [Q167, Q169]	95.8%	86.5%
Percentage of students feeling accepted by the campus community at USF Polytechnic [Q168, Q170]	90.4%	71.1%
Percentage of students feeling the quality of academic programs at USF Polytechnic is excellent [Q169, Q171]	95.6%	82.6%
Percentage of students feeling USF Polytechnic provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs [Q170, Q172]	96.8%	83.2%
Percentage of students feeling an environment that includes diversity improves the quality of education [Q171, Q173]	96.3%	84.3%
Percentage of students who would recommend USF Polytechnic to siblings or friends as a good place to go to college [Q172, Q174]	96.2%	84.4%

Discussion of Results. In spring 2008 USF Polytechnic was USF Lakeland, a regional campus of the University of South Florida System with a newly differentiated mission of applied learning, applied research and applied technology. In fall 2008 USF Polytechnic was established with legislative charge to seek separate SACS accreditation. In fall 2010 USF Polytechnic had evidenced strategic changes to meet its distinct mission, and in faculty, staff and student populations changes occurred as individuals considered and made decisions regarding their "fit" for that mission. Decreases in students' feelings about USF Polytechnic in fall 2010 are not inconsistent with a campus identity change.

Use of Results. Results are distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council and Student Government Association. Units utilize the results to address objectives and subsequent improvements within their assessment plans. The Diversity Office was integrated into Student Affairs and restructured as the Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement to increase collaboration communication with Student Affairs units (e.g., Recruitment, Admissions, Student Activities, Student Government). Survey results data going forward will be assessed for trends and improvements through comparison with administrations of the instrument on a two-year cycle. Fall 2010 data were received in July 2011 and were distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council at the end of July.

Development of USF Polytechnic as a Four-Year Destination Campus

USF Polytechnic's Strategic Plan 2007-2012 [see CR2.4-1] sets a bold vision for becoming a "premier destination campus for applied learning, research, and innovative technology." On September 20, 2009 the USF System Board of Trustees approved the addition of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic [CR2.7.3-8a, Board of Trustees Agenda Item for approval of lower-level courses 9-10-09] and [CR2.7.3-8b, Board of Trustees Meeting minutes 9-10-09]. The request was subsequently approved by the Board of Governors on September 24, 2009 [CR2.7.3-9, Board of Governors Meeting Minutes, Item 6(E)(2)].

On July 8, 2011 Dr. Belle Whelan, President, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, issued a letter to Dr. Judy Genshaft, President, University of South Florida System, approving the offering of lower-level courses at USF Polytechnic, effective spring 2012 with the first freshman class to be admitted in fall 2013 [CR2.7.3-10 Whelan Approval Letter 7-8-11]. A pilot freshman cohort of approximately 100 students is planned for fall 2012.

In spring 2011 a General Education Committee of the Faculty Senate developed a General Education Core Curriculum and Assessment Plan for the first Freshman class anticipated in fall 2013. The plan transitions from the USF Foundations of Knowledge and Learning (FKL), providing a polytechnic philosophy of education and learning outcomes drawn from that philosophy, a rationale for course selection, a listing of and description of courses with relationship of each course to the learning outcomes indicated. An assessment plan continues use of the ETS Proficiency Profile and NSSE survey, and adds a Written Communication Rubric and a common rubric for assessment of Capstone Experiences. (See CR2.7.3-11a-d)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CS3.5.1-1] Florida Statute 1007.23 Statewide Articulation Agreement

[CS3.5.1-2] Florida Statute 1007.24 Statewide Course Numbering System

[CS3.5.1-3] Florida Statute 1007.25 General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements

[CS3.5.1-4] Board of Governors Regulation 6.004 Admission of Undergraduate, Degree-Seeking Transfer Students

[CS3.5.1-5] Board of Governors Rule 6.017 Criteria for Awarding the Baccalaureate Degree

[CS3.5.1-6] Florida Administrative Code Rule 6A-10.030 Other Assessment Procedures for College-Level Communication and Computation Skills, also known as the "Gordon Rule"

[CS3.5.1-7] USF Undergraduate Catalog 2009-2010, p. 68

[CS3.5.1-8, p. 4] ETS Proficiency Profile Users Guide 2010, p.4

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 265

[CS3.5.1-9] NSSE website: http://nsse.iub.edu/html/about.cfm?

[CS3.5.1-10a] Diversity/Campus Climate Survey, ALL Students 2008, hard copy in binder as well

[CS3.5.1-10b] Diversity/Campus Climate Survey, USF Poly HOME Campus Students 2008, hard copy in binder as well

[CS3.5.1-11a] Board of Trustees Agenda Item for approval of lower-level courses 9-10-09

[CS3.5.1-11b] Board of Trustees meeting minutes 9-10-09

[CS3.5.1-12] Board of Governors approval of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic, BOG Agenda Item 6(E)(2) 9-24-09

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Comprehensive Standard 3.7.1: Faculty Competence

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

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. A faculty roster documenting qualifications of faculty to teach courses assigned to them.

A Faculty Roster for Spring 2010 [FQ1] and a Faculty Roster for Fall 2010 [FQ2] semesters are provided.

Both full-time and part-time faculty are well-qualified with 94% of the full-time faculty across semesters and academic divisions holding doctorate degrees and 61% of the part-time faculty across semesters and academic divisions holding doctorate degrees.

Academic Division	Number of Full-time Courses & Percent Degree	t with Doctorate	Number of Part-time Faculty Teachi Courses & Percent with Doctorate Degrees		
	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	Spring 2010	Fall 2010	
Social Sciences	6 (100%)	10 (100%)	19 (68%)	15 (67%)	
Human Sciences	2 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)		
Education	12 (100%)	14 (100%)	24 (38%)	16 (38%)	
Innovation Management	7 (71%)	11 (54%)	13 (31%)	12 (50%)	
Engineering & Applied Sciences	3 (100%)	4 (75%)	6 (50%)	3 (33%)	
Information Technology	7 (100%)	7 (100%)	3 (33%)	2 (50%)	
Technical & Professional Communication	2 (100%)	4 (100%)	1 (100%)		

2. The policy at the institution designating expectations of full-time faculty at the institution (such as number of courses assigned per term, expected advising duties, committee service, curriculum/program review, etc.).

Florida Statute 1012.945 Required number of classroom teaching hours for university faculty members [CS3.7.1-1] articulates the requirements for faculty teaching assignment as follows:

Each full-time equivalent teaching faculty member at a university who is paid wholly from state funds (i.e., funds appropriated annually in the General Appropriations Act) shall teach a minimum of 12 classroom contact hours per week at such university. [A "classroom contact hour" is defined as a regularly scheduled 1-hour period of classroom activity in a course of instruction which has been approved by the university.] However, any faculty member who is assigned by his or her departmental chair or other appropriate university administrator professional responsibilities and duties in furtherance of the mission of the university shall teach a minimum number of classroom contact hours in proportion to 12 classroom hours per week as such especially assigned aforementioned duties and responsibilities bear to 12 classroom contact hours per week. Any fulltime faculty member who is paid partly from state funds and partly from other funds or appropriations shall teach a minimum number of classroom contact hours in such proportion to 12 classroom contact hours per week as his or her salary paid from state funds bears to his or her total salary. In determining the appropriate hourly weighting of assigned duties other than classroom contact hours, the universities shall develop and apply a formula designed to equate the time required for non-classroom duties with classroom contact hours. "Full-time equivalent teaching faculty member" shall be interpreted to mean all faculty personnel budgeted in the instruction and research portion of the budget, exclusive of those full-time equivalent positions assigned to research, public service, administrative duties, and academic advising. Full-time administrators, librarians, and counselors shall be exempt from the provisions of this section; and colleges of medicine and law and others which are required for purposes of accreditation to meet national standards prescribed by the American Medical Association, the American Bar Association, or other professional associations shall be exempt from the provisions of this section to the extent that the requirements of this section differ from the requirements of accreditation.

Faculty assignments are also guided by the University of South Florida/United Faculty of Florida (UFF) Collective Bargaining Agreement 2010-2013, Article 9, pp. 15-20 [CS3.7.1-2]. The following excerpts are most closely related to the requirements of the Statute :

Article 9.2(3) - C. The University and the UFF recognize that, while the Legislature has described the minimum full academic assignment in terms of twelve (12) contact hours of instruction or equivalent research and service, the professional obligation undertaken by a faculty member will ordinarily be broader than that minimum. In like manner, the professional obligation of other professional employees is not easily susceptible of quantification. The University has the right, in making assignments, to determine the types of duties and responsibilities which comprise the professional obligation and to determine the mix or relative proportion of effort an employee may be required to expend on the various components of the obligation.

Article 9.2(3) - D. Furthermore, the University properly has the obligation constantly to monitor and review the size and number of classes and other activities, to consolidate inappropriately small offerings, and to reduce inappropriately large classes.

Article 9.4 (A). The summer instructional assignment, like that for the academic year, includes the normal activities related to such an assignment as defined by the department/unit and the nature of the course, such as course preparation, minor curriculum development, lectures, evaluation of student efforts, consultations and conferences with students, and minor committee activities.

Finally, faculty assignments are guided by the USF Polytechnic Guidelines on Faculty Teaching Load Assignment [CS3.7.1-3]:

1. Tenured Faculty

Evaluation for tenure (see University of South Florida Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion) involves three components: teaching (including advising) or comparable activity appropriate to the unit; research/creative work; and service to the University, profession, and the community. In addition, collegiality and participation as a citizen of the University are an integral part of faculty performance. The judgment to award tenure anticipates a pattern indicative of a lifetime of continued accomplishment and productivity.

A tenured faculty member at USF Polytechnic will be assigned a 3-3 teaching load, with evidence of continued research/creative work productivity and service to the University, profession, and community. A tenured faculty member with outstanding research/scholarship and service to the University, profession, and community has opportunity for a 3-2 teaching load. A tenured faculty member who does not evidence continued productivity in research/creative work and engagement in service to the University, profession, and community will be assigned a higher teaching load.

2. Tenure-earning Faculty

Tenure and promotion in the professorial ranks (see University of South Florida Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion) is granted to individuals of significant achievement, especially in teaching, research/creative activity, and service. As a minimum standard for tenure and/or promotion, there must be evidence of strong performance in both teaching and research/scholarship and outstanding achievement in at least one of these areas. Academic units in which public/professional service receives significant prominence may so recognize service contributions within unit guidelines.

To assist tenure-earning faculty in establishing their teaching performance, research/scholarship credentials, and service engagement, tenure-earning faculty at USF Polytechnic will be assigned a 3-2 teaching load through mid-tenure review at which time reappointment and continuation of a 3-2 teaching load through tenure will be determined. Tenure-earning faculty hired prior to Fall 2008 will retain the teaching load assignment as designated in their letters of offer.

3. Lecturers

A lecturer is a teaching position that can include some research and service expectation. At USF Polytechnic lecturers will be assigned a 3-4 teaching load, to enable lecturers to fulfill research/creative work and service expectations. Lecturers who evidence greater engagement in research/creative work and service to the University and community have opportunity for a 3-3 teaching load.

4. Instructors

An instructor is a teaching position that has no research/creative work expectation but that can have at USF Polytechnic some service expectation. At USF Polytechnic instructors will be assigned a 3-4 teaching load to enable instructors to fulfill service expectations. Instructors who engage in no service to the University or community will be assigned a 4-4 teaching load. Instructors who evidence greater engagement in service to the University and community have opportunity for a 3-3 teaching load.

5. Academic Division Directors/Department Chairs

Academic Division Directors and Department Chairs will be assigned a 1-2 teaching load for the 9month contract and be expected to teach 1 course as part of the summer administrative/teaching assignment.

Factors Contributing to Adjustment in Teaching Load

While the Florida Statutes requirements for the number of teaching hours for University faculty is based on classroom instructional activity, there are many factors that comprise a faculty member's professional obligation and, thus, many factors that can provide opportunity for a course reduction, e.g., coordination of large research projects; management of a large grant; initial development of an online course; initial teaching of a large-enrollment online course; extensive service responsibility such as coordination of accreditation report preparation, unit strategic planning or outcomes assessment; significant service in student recruitment, advising, or mentoring activity; significant service in faculty mentoring activity; extensive requirements in student outcomes assessment, e.g., ongoing e-portfolio assessment and administration; chairmanship of large campus or university councils or committees as provided for in governance documents.

Review of Faculty Teaching Load Assignments

Faculty teaching load assignments and productivity in research/creative work and service assignments will be reviewed at the end of each spring semester to determine teaching load assignment for the next fall and spring semesters. Adjustments to teaching load can be made at the request of a faculty member or by administration from fall to spring semester to reflect changes in factors contributing to the initial annual teaching load assignment.

The FAIR (Faculty Academic Information Reporting) System is a data reporting and management system that collects and reports information about faculty and instructional staff, including assignment of duties, research and scholarly activities, vita content management, annual report and annual review, and faculty credentials. [Example of FAIR Assignment Report, CS3.7.1-4 (hard copy only)]

Academic Division Directors can access FAIR to set and/or review faculty teaching, research and service assignments and verify compliance with load assignment guidelines. Division Directors can also make adjustments or changes in faculty assignments in teaching, research and/or service to address concerns expressed by faculty or changes in the Division's instructional needs. Faculty can both view and enter information into the FAIR System to complete their annual reports or to enter/update their vitae.

3. Narrative and/or list of faculty members and their loads establishing that the number of full-time faculty (and number of part-time faculty) is adequate to provide the programs and services of the institutions.

The following tables provide information on the number and percent of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty and part-time faculty at each instructional site and for each degree program content area during the Spring 2010 and Fall 2010 terms.

Definitions of Terms Used in Tables

Program Content Area = Degree program or academic discipline

SCH = Student credit hours

FT Faculty = USF Polytechnic full-time regular faculty

PT Faculty = Adjuncts, graduate teaching assistants, full-time Tampa faculty on overload, full-time Polytechnic professional staff on overload, Polytechnic full-time professional staff with inload teaching assignment, Polytechnic part-time regular faculty, Polytechnic part-time professional staff

USF Polytechnic Student Credit Hours by FT and PT Faculty, Spring 2010 Form Completed: May 20, 2010

Location of	Program Content	Total Number of	% SCH by FT Faculty	%SCH by PT Faculty
Instruction	Area	SCH Generated		
U	NDERGRADUATE COURSI	ES FOR MAJORS, MINO	RS and CONCENTRATIO	NS
Avon Park, FL	Elementary Ed	496	105 (21%)	391 (79%)
Lakeland, FL	Accounting	312	108 (35%)	204 (65%)
	Tech/Prof Writing	150	150 (100%)	
	Communication	138		138 (100%)
	Criminology	123		123 (100%)
	Elementary Ed	1473	1018 (65%)	455 (35%)
	Engineering	201	126 (63%)	75 (37%)
	Finance	297		297 (100%)
	Information Tech	57	57 (100%)	
	Interdisciplinary Social Science	72	72 (100%)	
	Information Systems Decision Science	429		429 (100%)
	Leadership Studies	15		15 (100%)
	Management	696	594 (85%)	102 (15%)
	Marketing	720	498 (69%)	222 (31%)
	Psychology	805	297 (37%)	508 (63%)
	Sociology	111	66 (59%)	45 (41%)
Online	Tech/Prof Writing	63	63 (100%)	
	Criminology	1485	513 (35%)	972 (65%)
	Elementary Ed	594	72 (12%)	522 (88%)
	Engineering	72	72 (100%)	
	Information Tech	2757	2232 (81%)	525 (19%)
	Interdisciplinary Social Science	180	180 (100%)	
	Leadership Studies	138	90 (65%)	48 (35%)
	Management	99		99 (100%)
	Marketing	90	90 (100%)	
	Sociology	222		222 (100%)
SUB-TOTAL		11,795	6,403 (54%)	5,392 (46%)
	GENERAL EDUCATION	EXIT AND COMMON PR	E-REQUISITE COURSES	
Lakeland, FL	Africana Studies	69	69 (100%)	

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 271

	Economics	63		63 (100%)
	English	42	6 (14%)	36 (86%)
	Gov/Intl Affairs	129		129 (100%)
	Religious Studies	68		68 (100%)
	Women's Studies	105	12 (14%)	93 (86%)
Online	Nutrition	570	570 (100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		1,046	657 (63%)	389 (37%)
		GRADUATE COURSES		
Avon Park, FL	Ed Leadership	105	39 (37%)	66 (63%)
Citrus County, FL	Ed Leadership	24	24 (100%)	
Lakeland, FL	Counseling Ed	372	207 (56%)	165 (44%)
	Ed Leadership	270	213 (79%)	57 (21%)
	MBA	135	135 (100%)	
	Psychology	3	3 (100%)	
	Reading Education	96	96(100%)	
	Social Work	50		50 (100%)
SUB-TOTAL		1,055	717 (68%)	338 (32%)
TOTAL		13,896	7,777 (56%)	6,119 (44%)

In Spring 2010, 13,896 student credit hours were generated in regular, organized courses (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) with 56% taught by full-time regular faculty at USF Polytechnic and 44% taught by part-time faculty.

In Spring 2010, the percentage of undergraduate credit hours in regular, organized courses taught by full-time regular faculty was 55%. The percentage of graduate credit hours taught by full-time regular faculty was 68%.

Twenty-two new faculty were added to the faculty roster for academic year 2010-2011:

Program Content Area	Degree Program Major, Minor, Concentration	Rank	FTE
Accounting	B.S General Business	Professor	1.0
	Administration	Instructor	1.0
Agricultural & Biological Engineering	B.S. Industrial Engineering	Professor and Dean	1.0
Criminology	B.A. Criminology	Professor	1.0
Counselor Education	M.A. Counselor Education	Assistant Professor	1.0
English Composition & Literature	General Education Exit Courses	Assistant Professor	2.0
ESOL	B.S. Elementary Education	Associate Professor	1.0
Finance	B.S General Business Administration	Instructor/Assistant Professor	1.0
Gerontology/Aging Studies	Interdisciplinary Social Science (ISS)	Assistant Professor	1.0
Industrial Engineering	B.S. Industrial	Visiting Assistant Professor	1.0
	Engineering	Visiting Instructor	1.0
Information Systems/Decision	B.S General Business	Instructor/Assistant	1.0

Science (ISDS)	Administration	Professor	
Library	Library		1.0
Management	Management B.S General Business Administration, Management Major		1.0
Mathematics Education	B.S. Elementary Education	Assistant Professor	1.0
Nutrition & Food Science	B.S.A.S.	Assistant Professor, Nutrition	1.0
		Assistant Professor, Food Science	1.0
Psychology	B.A. Psychology	Instructor	1.0
Science Education	B.S. Elementary Education	Assistant Professor	1.0
Sociology	Interdisciplinary Social Science (ISS) & Sociology Minor	Associate Professor	1.0
Technical & Professional Writing	Minor	Assistant Professor	1.0

Addition of the new full-time faculty has potential to impact reduction of courses taught by part-time faculty in several ways:

- Coursework in the Elementary Education Program in ESOL, Mathematics Education and Science Education was delivered by part-time faculty. A full-time faculty member has now been added in each of these areas.
- Coursework in Accounting was delivered by one full-time faculty and one part-time faculty. A full-time faculty member has now been added.
- Coursework in Criminology/Sociology was delivered by two full-time faculty. Two additional full-time faculty have now been added.
- Service courses in ISDS were delivered by part-time faculty. A full-time faculty member in ISDS has now been hired.
- Addition of the major required an additional faculty member in Management.
- Courses in the M.A. in Counselor Education were delivered by two full-time faculty with service courses by a third full-time faculty taught for the undergraduate Elementary Education program as well. An additional faculty member in Counselor Education was added.
- Courses in the minor in Technical and Professional Writing were taught by a full-time faculty member who also taught courses in Composition and Literature. A full-time faculty member was added in Technical and Professional Writing, and two full-time faculty were added in Composition and Literature.

USF Polytechnic Student Credit Hours by FT and PT Faculty, Fall 2010 Form Completed: September 4, 2010

Location of Instruction	Program Content Area	Total Number of SCH Generated	% SCH by FT Faculty	%SCH by PT Faculty					
UNDERGRADUATE COURSES FOR MAJORS, MINORS and CONCENTRATIONS									
Avon Park, FL	Elementary Ed	534	207(39%)	327 (61%)					
Lakeland, FL	Accounting	132	132 (100%)	0 (0%)					

	Tech/Prof Writing	132	132 (100%)	0 (0%)
	Communication	111	0 (0%)	111 (100%)
	Criminology	336	180(54%)	156 (46%)
	Elementary Ed	1789	976 (54%)	813 (46%)
	Engineering	246	159(65%)	87 (35%)
	Finance	255	225(88%)	30 (12%)
	General Business	114	114(100%)	30 (12/0)
	Information Tech	27	27(100%)	
	Information	327	171(52%)	156 (48%)
	Systems Decision Science	527	171(3276)	100 (4070)
	Leadership Studies	51		51 (100%)
	Management	459	234 (51%)	225 (49%)
	Marketing	489	489(100%)	225 (4570)
	Psychology	699	255 (36%)	444(64%)
	Sociology	159	138(87%)	21(13%)
SUB-TOTAL	Sociology	5,860	3,439(59%)	2,421(41%)
Online	Accounting	36	36 (100%)	2,421(41/0)
Onnie	Communication	105	50 (100%)	105(100%)
		1310	220 (250()	. ,
	Criminology Elementary Ed	1310	329 (25%)	981 (75%) 168 (100%)
		108	00 (81%)	
	Engineering		90 (81%)	21(19%)
	Information Tech Interdisciplinary	1626	1356 (83%)	270 (17%)
	Social Science	165	165(100%)	
	Leadership Studies	66		66 (100%)
	Management	333	222(67%)	111 (33%)
	Marketing	105	105 (100%)	
	Sociology	189		189 (100%)
SUB-TOTAL		4,214	2,303 (55%)	1,911 (45%)
	GENERAL EDUCATION	EXIT AND COMMON PRE	-REQUISITE COURSES	
Lakeland, FL	Economics	60		60 (100%)
	English	273	237 (87%)	36 (13%)
	Geology	39	39(100%)	
	Gov/Intl Affairs	162		162 (100%)
			L	
	Mathematics	39	39(100%)	
			39(100%)	32(100%)
	Mathematics	39	39(100%)	32(100%) 66(100%)
SUB-TOTAL	Mathematics Religion	39 32	39(100%) 315(47%)	
SUB-TOTAL Online	Mathematics Religion	39 32 66		66(100%)
	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies	39 32 66 671	315(47%)	66(100%)
Online	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies	39 32 66 671 540	315(47%) 540 (100%)	66(100%)
Online	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies	39 32 66 671 540 540	315(47%) 540 (100%)	66(100%)
Online SUB-TOTAL	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies Nutrition	39 32 66 671 540 540 540	315(47%) 540 (100%)	66(100%) 356(53%)
Online SUB-TOTAL Avon Park, FL	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies Nutrition Ed Leadership	39 32 66 671 540 540 GRADUATE COURSES 12	315(47%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%)	66(100%) 356(53%)
Online SUB-TOTAL Avon Park, FL Citrus County, FL	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies Nutrition Ed Leadership Ed Leadership	39 32 66 671 540 540 540 540 12 45	315(47%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%) 45 (100%)	66(100%) 356(53%) 12 (100%)
Online SUB-TOTAL Avon Park, FL Citrus County, FL	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies Nutrition Ed Leadership Ed Leadership Counseling Ed	39 32 66 671 540 540 540 540 12 12 45 448	315(47%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%) 45 (100%) 372 (83%)	66(100%) 356(53%) 12 (100%) 76 (17%)
Online SUB-TOTAL Avon Park, FL Citrus County, FL	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies Nutrition Ed Leadership Ed Leadership Counseling Ed Ed Leadership MBA	39 32 66 671 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540	315(47%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%) 372 (83%) 171(78%) 207 (76%)	66(100%) 356(53%) 12 (100%) 76 (17%) 48(22%)
Online SUB-TOTAL Avon Park, FL Citrus County, FL Lakeland, FL	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies Nutrition Ed Leadership Ed Leadership Counseling Ed Ed Leadership	39 32 66 671 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540	315(47%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%) 372 (83%) 171(78%) 207 (76%) 51(100%)	66(100%) 356(53%) 12 (100%) 76 (17%) 48(22%) 64 (23%)
Online SUB-TOTAL Avon Park, FL Citrus County, FL	Mathematics Religion Women's Studies Nutrition Ed Leadership Ed Leadership Counseling Ed Ed Leadership MBA	39 32 66 671 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540 540	315(47%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%) 540 (100%) 372 (83%) 171(78%) 207 (76%)	66(100%) 356(53%) 12 (100%) 76 (17%) 48(22%)

TOTAL FACE-TO- FACE	7,577	4,600 (61%)	2,977 (39%)
TOTAL ONLINE	4,856	2,843(58%)	2,013(42%)
TOTAL OVERALL	12,433	7,443(60%)	4,990(40%)

In Fall 2010, 12,433 student credit hours were generated in regular, organized courses (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) with 60% taught by full-time regular faculty at USF Polytechnic and 40% taught by part-time faculty.

In Fall 2010, the percentage of undergraduate credit hours in regular, organized courses taught by full-time regular faculty was 58%. The percentage of graduate credit hours taught by full-time regular faculty was 74%.

Form Completed		by the and the addity	, - F. J	
Location of	Program Content	Total Number of SCH	% SCH by FT Faculty	%SCH by PT Faculty
Instruction	Area	Generated		
	UNDERGRADUATE COURS	SES FOR MAJORS, MINOR	S and CONCENTRATIO	NS
Avon Park, FL	Elementary Ed	456	201(44%)	255(56%)
Lakeland, FL	Accounting	102	72 (70%)	30 (30%)
	Aging Studies	108	93 (86%)	15 (14%)
	Tech/Prof Writing	129	129 (100%)	
	Communication	165		165(100%)
	Criminology	330	138(42%)	192 (58%)
	Elementary Ed	1359	1299 (96%)	60 (4%)
	Engineering	378	195(52%)	183(48%)
	Finance	162	141(87%)	21 (13%)
	General Business	261	102(39%)	159 (61%)
	Information Tech	65	29(45%)	36 (55%)
	Information Systems Decision Science	219		219 (100%)
	Leadership Studies	27		27(100%)
	Management	616	445(72%)	171 (28%)
	Marketing	422	422(100%)	
	Psychology	774	306 (40%)	468(60%)
	Sociology	132	63(48%)	69(52%)
SUB-TOTAL		5,705	3,635(64%)	2,070(36%)
Online	Accounting	39	39 (100%)	
	Aging Studies	75	75 (100%)	
	Criminology	1659	585 (35%)	1074(65%)
	Elementary Ed	252	12 (5%)	240 (95%)
	Engineering	237	114(48%)	123(52%)
	Information Tech	1572	1033 (66%)	539 (34%)
	Interdisciplinary Social Science	172	172(100%)	
	Leadership Studies	168		168 (100%)
	Management	210	90(43%)	120 (57%)
	Marketing	87	87 (100%)	
	Sociology	105		105 (100%)
	Tech/Prof Writing	108	108 (100%)	

USF Polytechnic Student Credit Hours by FT and PT Faculty, Spring 2011 Form Completed: July 30, 2011

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 275

SUB-TOTAL		4,684	2,315 (49%)	2,369 (51%)
	GENERAL EDUCATION EX	XIT AND COMMON PRE	-REQUISITE COURSES	
Lakeland, FL	African Am Studies	51		51 (100%)
	Economics	68		68 (100%)
	Education	69	69 (100%)	
	English	294	249 (85%)	45 (15%)
	Geology	30	30(100%)	
	Gov/Intl Affairs	105		105 (100%)
	Religion	48		48(100%)
	Women's Studies	54		54(100%)
SUB-TOTAL		719	348(48%)	371(52%)
Online	Education	69	69 (100%)	
	Nutrition	765	765 (100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		834	834 (100%)	
	(GRADUATE COURSES		
Avon Park, FL	Ed Leadership	33	33 (100%)	
Citrus County, FL	Ed Leadership	60	30 (50%)	30 (50%)
Lakeland, FL	Counseling Ed	356	356 (100%)	
	Ed Leadership	300	141 (47%)	159(53%)
	MBA	157	93 (59%)	64 (41%)
	Reading Education	100	100(100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		1,006	753(75%)	253(25%)
Online	Ed Leadership	48	48 (100%)	
SUB-TOTAL		48	48 (100%)	
TOTAL FACE-TO-		7,430	4,736 (64%)	2,694 (36%)
FACE				
TOTAL ONLINE		5,566	3,197(57%)	2,369(43%)
TOTAL OVERALL		12,996	7,933(61%)	5,063(39%)

In spring 2011, 12,996 student credit hours were generated in regular, organized courses (i.e., not independent study, directed research, etc.) with 61% taught by full-time regular faculty at USF Polytechnic and 39% taught by part-time faculty. This represents a slight improvement compared to the fall 2010 ratio.

In spring 2011, the percentage of undergraduate credit hours in regular, organized courses taught by full-time regular faculty was 60%. The percentage of graduate credit hours taught by full-time regular faculty was 76%. This also represents improvement as compared to fall 2010.

Faculty Hiring Plan for 2010-2011

A \$10 million increase to the base budget was approved by the State Legislature and Governor for the July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 fiscal year. Additional **faculty to support degree program majors, minors and concentrations** will be recruited during 2010-2011 for the 2011-2012 academic year. A preliminary hiring plan includes the following:

Program Content Area	Rank	FTE
Accounting	Assistant Professor	1.0
Allied Health Sciences	Assistant (3) and Associate	4.0
	Professor	

Applied Sciences	Assistant Professor	2.0
Applied Statistics	Assistant Professor	1.0
Communication/Digital Media	Instructor, Assistant Professor,	3.0
	Associate Professor	
Criminology	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Early Childhood Learning	Assistant Professor	1.0
Educational Leadership	Instructor, Associate/Assistant Professor	2.0
Educational Research & Measurement	Assistant/Associate Professor	1.0
Elementary Education	Assistant and Associate Professor	2.0
Finance	Assistant Professor	1.0
Information Science	Assistant Professor	1.0
Engineering & Information Technology	Open Rank	7.0
Library	Assistant Librarian, Education, Allied Health & Social Sciences	1.0
Management	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Marketing	Assistant Professor	1.0
Psychology	Assistant/Associate Professor	2.0
	TOTAL	34.0

[INSERT USF Polytechnic Student Credit Hours by FT and PT Faculty, Fall 2011; currently being completed]

Faculty Hiring for 2011-2012

USF Polytechnic's Strategic Plan 2007-2012 [see CR2.4-1] sets a bold vision for becoming a "premier destination campus for applied learning, research, and innovative technology." On September 20, 2009 the USF System Board of Trustees approved the addition of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic. The request was subsequently approved by the Board of Governors on September 24, 2009 [see CR2.7.3].

Some lower-level prerequisite course offerings are planned for AY 2010-2011. A pilot freshman cohort of approximately 100 students is planned for fall 2012. A freshman class is planned for fall 2013 with a summer 2013 learning community experience. A general education core consistent with the mission of USF Polytechnic is being developed by faculty in spring 2011.

Faculty to support increased lower-level course offerings and a pilot freshman cohort will be recruited during 2011-2012 for the 2012-2013 academic year:

General Education	Rank	FTE
Biology	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Chemistry	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Communication	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Digital Arts & Media	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
English Composition & Literature	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 277

	TOTAL	32.0
Spanish	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Sociology	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Psychology	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Political Science	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Physics & Physical Science	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Philosophy & Ethics	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Mathematics & Statistics	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Global & International Affairs	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
French	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Film & Visual Arts	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0
Environmental Science	Instructor, Assistant Professor	2.0

3. A copy of the current schedule of courses, including the names of faculty members assigned to teach the courses.

- [CS3.7.1-5] OASIS Course Schedule Spring 2010 On Campus
- [CS3.7.1-6] OASIS Course Schedule Spring 2010 Off Campus
- [CS3.7.1-7] OASIS Course Schedule Fall 2010 On Campus
- [CS3.7.1-8] OASIS Course Schedule Fall 2010 Off Campus
- [CS3.7.1-9] OASIS Course Schedule Spring 2011 On Campus
- [CS3.7.1-10] OASIS Course Schedule Spring 2011 Off campus

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[CS3.7.1-1] Florida Statute 1012.945 Required number of classroom teaching hours for university faculty members

[CS3.7.1-2] University of South Florida/United Faculty of Florida (UFF) Collective Bargaining Agreement 2008-2009

[CS3.7.1-3] USF Polytechnic Guidelines on Faculty Teaching Load Assignment

[CS3.7.1-4] Example of FAIR Assignment Report, hard copy only

- [CS3.7.1-5] OASIS Course Schedule Spring 2010 On Campus
- [CS3.7.1-6] OASIS Course Schedule Spring 2010 Off Campus
- [CS3.7.1-7] OASIS Course Schedule Fall 2010 On Campus
- [CS3.7.1-8] OASIS Course Schedule Fall 2010 Off Campus

[CS3.7.1-9] OASIS Course Schedule Spring 2011 On Campus

[CS3.7.1-10] OASIS Course Schedule Spring 2011 Off campus

USF POLYTECHNIC PART B. DOCUMENTATION OF COMPLIANCE Federal Requirements

Adobe Acrobat Reader may be required to view supporting documents.



WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 280

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Federal Requirement 4.1: Student Achievement

The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement including, as appropriate, consideration of course completion, state licensing examinations, and job placement rates.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Data indicating, as appropriate to the institution's educational programs and mission, course completion, performance on licensing examinations, state board examinations, job placement, student success after transfer or admission to graduate school, etc.

<u>Context</u>

Florida Statute 1008.31 Florida's K-20 education performance accountability system [FR4.1-1] establishes the legislative intent, mission, goals and system-wide measures for K-20 accountability. Section 1(e)(2) identifies the responsibility of the Board of Governors of the State University System to establish performance measures and set performance standards for individual state universities, including actual completion rates.

Florida Statue 1008.46(1) State university accountability process [FR4.1-2] indicates that the Board of Governors will submit an annual accountability report providing information on the implementation of performance standards, actions taken to improve university achievement of performance goals, the achievement of performance goals during the prior year, and initiatives to be undertaken during the next year.

The **Board of Governors State University System Accountability Report 2008 [FR4.1-3]**, released March 2009, indicates that the accountability measures selected by the Board of Governors track growth in undergraduate and graduate degrees, degrees awarded to historically underrepresented students, degrees awarded in programs leading to jobs of critical importance to Florida's economy, graduation and retention rates, licensure pass rates, academic learning compacts, research and development dollars, and innovations (e.g., patents). The report also notes that Board of Governors is continuing to review these measures and the assumptions used to set strategic goals and accountability benchmarks as economic and demographic conditions have changed in the state since these measures and goals were put in place.

The **Board of Governors State University System Annual Report 2009, Volume I [FR4.1-4a]**, released in January 2010, represents the first installment of the Board of Governors effort toward developing a comprehensive planning and accountability framework. Related procedures now include the development of multi-year university work plans and annual reports that reflect each institution's unique mission and focus on core strengths within the context of State University System (SUS) goals and regional and statewide needs. In Volume I the USF System Report is on pp. 103-114, and the USF Polytechnic Report is on pp. 353-366.

Board of Governors State University System Annual Report 2009, Volume II [FR4.1-4b] is comprised of individual university data tables, with a separate appendix (Appendix A) for USF System data tables and individual USF campus data tables. In Volume II the USF System Report is on pp. 53-67, and the USF Polytechnic Report is on pp. 211-219. Volume II represents the first time that the Board of Governors published data separately for the individual SUS institutions, and Appendix A represents the first time data have been published separately for the campuses of the USF System, recognizing the legislative and USF System goal for separate regional accreditation for each of the USF campuses. USF Polytechnic received its separate **IPEDS identification number effective with the AY 2008-2009 reporting cycle [FR4.1-5]**.

Several issues surfaced for the Board of Governors staff and the SUS institutions' offices of Institutional Research in completion of this first annual report. For example, teacher certification examination pass rates are reported for program completers only, so state-wide the pass rate is 100% because state-approved programs require passing the certification exams for program completion. Engineering, accounting, architecture, counseling and other professional licensure data, gathered by the respective licensing boards and housed within the State Department of Business and Professional Regulation, are not currently formatted and do not contain sufficient information to match to SUS data. Such a match is necessary to develop metrics reflecting pass rates for graduates in those fields. Board of Governors staff will work with individuals from the appropriate agencies to try to get data in a format that will enable effective data reporting. Similarly, Board of Governors staff is continuing to work with the SUS Technology Transfer Directors to determine the best way to capture consistent information regarding Jobs Created by Start-Ups in Florida in a cost-effective manner. Internally to the USF System, research and development data are managed as a USF System-wide function and not by individual campus.

The Board of Governors staff continues to work with the SUS institutions' offices of Institutional Research to identify ways to parse and represent data effectively in the SUS data management systems. Similarly, the USF System Office of Decision Support continues to work with campus offices of Institutional Research to identify ways to parse and represent data effectively in the USF System data management systems.

Student Success Measures at USF Polytechnic

The following student success measures are assessed annually at USF Polytechnic through the Office of Institutional Research Effectiveness and Planning:

- A. Semester course completion rates
- B. Degrees awarded
- C. Time to degree
- D. Term to term retention rates
- E. Career plans and employment

A. Course Completion Rates

The following table presents the course completion rates for each semester, summer 2007 through spring 2011 with the exception of spring 2008 for which no data were available in the USF INFOCENTER. For summer 2007 – spring 2010 course completion rates for Undergraduate (Upper Level) students have

ranged from 86% to 91% with the average across semesters of 88%. Course completion rates for Graduate Students have ranged from 83% to 97% with the average across semesters of 95%.

For summer 2010 to spring 2011 course completion rates range from 86% to 87% with the average across semesters of 86.3%. Data reported in INFOCENTER no longer disaggregate grade distributions by undergraduate or graduate.

Semester	Undergraduat	te (Upper Level)	Graduate (Master's)		
Semester	Completion	Non-Completion	Completion	Non-Completion	
Summer 2007	91%	9%	97%	3%	
Fall 2007	89%	11%	94%	6%	
Spring 2008		No Data in IN	FOCENTER	-	
Summer 2008	87%	13%	93%	7%	
Fall 2008	87%	13%	95%	5%	
Spring 2009	86%	14%	96%	4%	
Summer 2009	89%	11%	97%	3%	
Fall 2009	87%	13%	94%	6%	
Spring 2010	86%	14%	97%	3%	
AVERAGE	88%	12%	95%	5%	
ALL STUE		NGER CATEGORIZED BY orted by Current Acader		& GRADUATE	
	COM	PLETION	NON-CC	MPLETION	
Summer 2010	87%	(2,339)	13% (341)		
Fall 2010	86%	(3,941)	14% (638)		
Spring 2011	86% (4,033)		14% (658)		
Summer 2011	88% (2,310)		12%(320)		
Fall 2011	86%	(3,941)	14% (638)		
AVERAGE	8	37%	13%		

USF Polytechnic Course Completion Rates Summer 2007-Fall 2011

Data Source: USF INFOCENTER, Grade Distribution Trends – "Non-completion" is defined as the percentage of undergraduate and graduate students who withdrew or received Incomplete, Unsatisfactory or Failing grades.

Use of Results. Data on student course completion is reviewed by the USF Polytechnic Academic and Student Affairs Council in relation to student population characteristics.

Enrollment data reported for Fall 2010 to IPEDS [FR4.1-6] indicates that 61% of the full-time undergraduate students and 50% of the part-time undergraduate students are female. Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the full-time graduate students and 67% of the part-time graduate students are also female. In addition, the majority of graduate and undergraduate students, both full-time and part-time, are between the ages of 20 to 39.

Age Group	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Graduate	Graduate
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
20-29	74%	51%	40%	41%
30-39	18%	26%	30%	32%
40-49	5%	15%	15%	16%
50-64	2%	8%	15%	11%

Fifty percent of the students responding to the **2009-2010 Graduating Survey [FR4.1-7a]** and 50.5% of student responding to the **2010-2011 Graduating Survey [FR4.1-7b]** indicated that they were married, and 42% in 2009-2010 and 41.6% in 2010-2011 were caring for children under the age of 18.

In 2009-2010 78.7% of the respondents reported that they worked and attended classes, with 71% indicating they worked full-time. In 2010-2011 77.2% of the respondents reported working while attending classes, with 59.3% indicating they worked full time.

Financial Aid data reported for 2010-2011 IPEDS [FR4.1-8] indicates that of the 1,047 undergraduate students receiving aid in 2009-2010 49% received grants or scholarship aid from federal, state or local government, the university or other sources; 34% from Pell Grants; and 42% from federal student loans. This represents an approximate increase of 9% over students receiving financial aid in 2008-2009, and an increase from 30% to 34% in grants or scholarship aid from federal, state or local government, the university or other sources; an increase from 27% to 34% in Pell Grants; and an increase from 36% to 42% in federal student loans.

The Council, comprised of faculty and professional staff, determined that the average completion rate of 87% was acceptable, given these characteristics of the student population. The majority of the students are female, part-time, likely to be working while attending classes, in an age range where they may also have families to raise and support, and may receive need-based financial aid.

B. Number of Degrees Awarded

The table below presents the number of bachelor's and master's degrees awarded from AY2006-2007 through AY2010-2011, by ethnicity. The table indicates that the number of bachelor's degrees awarded has increased after a dip in 2009-2010. The number of bachelor's degrees awarded has increased in the Black sub-group. The number of master's degrees awarded has been declining since 2008-2009, with concern across the USF System for declines in Graduate I (Master's) hours during that same time period.

A1 2006-2007 to 2010-2011						
	Degree	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011
Non- resident	Bachelor's	4	4	3	0	0
Alien	Master's	0	0	1	0	1
Black	Bachelor's	23	27	35	26	31
DIdCK	Master's	9	3	8	5	7
American						
Indian	Bachelor's	3	1	3	2	2
	Master's	0	0	0	0	0

USF Polytechnic Number of Degrees Awarded

• •	Dealer Levile	2	2	40	0	6
Asian	Bachelor's	3	3	13	8	6
	Master's	0	1	1	1	1
Hispanic	Bachelor's	20	24	28	29	20
	Master's	3	7	7	7	6
White	Bachelor's	167	171	215	185	218
	Master's	68	55	86	65	49
Hawaiian- Pacific	Bachelor's	0	0	0	0	0
Islander	Master's	0	0	0	0	0
No Ethnicity	Bachelor's	6	3	2	4	9
Reported	Master's	0	0	0	0	0
τοται	Bachelor's	226	233	299	254	286
TOTAL	Master's	80	66	103	78	64

Data Source: USF INFOCENTER, Degrees Awarded

C. Time to Degree

The table below presents the time to degree completion for bachelor's and master's degrees awarded from AY 2005-2006 through AY 2010-2011, for Florida Community College transfers, other transfers and master's degree students. The table indicates that the mean time to degree for bachelor's degree students is 2.11 years and for master's degree students is 1.91 years.

USF Polytechnic Time to Degree Completion (in years)

AY2006-2007 to AY2010-2011							
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	Mean	
Undergraduate							
Florida Community College Transfer	2.05	2.13	2.04	2.24	2.11	2.11	
Other Transfer	2.36	2.15	1.77	2.15	1.75	2.04	
Graduate							
Master's	1.89	2.25	1.64	1.70	2.05	1.91	

AY2006-2007 to AY2010-2011

Data Source: USF INFOCENTER, Time to Degree

Use of Results. Data on the number of degrees awarded and time to degree completion are reviewed by the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and the Academic and Student Affairs Council. The number of degrees awarded has generally increased over time, and the time to degree completion is appropriate for an upper level undergraduate campus and for master's degree programs that can be completed in 18-24 months. Enhancing admissions advising and academic major advising through the addition of staff and through implementation of DegreeWorks, a comprehensive set of web-based

academic advising, degree audit, and transfer articulation tools, will help students and their advisors negotiate USF Polytechnic's curriculum requirements more easily and effectively.

D. Term to Term Retention Rates

INFOCENTER's term-to-term enrollment data enable the selection of a beginning term and tracking to a selected ending term to find the number of students still enrolled. Student cohorts tracked can include all students by type or subgroups by gender and ethnicity. The table below reflects data fall term to fall term beginning fall 2007.

	Fall 2007-	Fall 2008-	Fall 2009-	Fall 2010-	Fall 2011-	Mean	
	Spring 2008	Spring 2009	Spring 2010	Spring 2011	Spring 2012		
Ui	ndergraduate						
Florida Community College Transfer	BEGIN 239	BEGIN 227	BEGIN 219	BEGIN 208	BEGIN 212	86.3%	
	RETURN 213(89.1%)	RETURN 210(92.5%)	RETURN 180(82.1%)	RETURN 182(87.5%)	RETURN 170(80.2%)	86.3%	
Other Transfer	BEGIN 88	BEGIN 67	BEGIN 83	BEGIN 117	BEGIN 113	70%	
	RETURN 60(68.2%)	RETURN 46(68.7%)	RETURN 57(68.7%)	RETURN 75(64.1%)	RETURN 91 (80.5%)	70%	
Graduate							
Graduate	BEGIN 89	BEGIN 75	BEGIN 52	BEGIN 54	BEGIN 63	86.6%	
Graddate	RETURN 73(80%)	RETURN 68(90.1%)	RETURN 38(75%)	RETURN 50(92.5%)	RETURN 60(95.2%)	80.0%	

USF Polytechnic Fall Term to Fall Term Retention

Data Source: USF INFOCENTER, Term to Term Enrollment with % Retention

In fall 2008 USF Lakeland became USF Polytechnic, and in fall 2010 USF Polytechnic's diplomas were able to reflect University of South Florida Polytechnic Campus. The State of Florida implemented the State College System, enabling community colleges to offer bachelor's degree programs effective fall 2009. With USF Polytechnic co-located on the same campus as Polk State College (formerly Polk Community College) and with a larger percentage of USFP's transfer population from Polk State College, this initial decrease in enrollment retention was expected. Tuition at Polk State College is less; admissions are open; and degree requirements are less rigorous.

Use of Results. Data on term to term retention is reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council and the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup. A number of outreach and communication strategies, including focus group meetings with students, have focused on communicating the value of a university education and a polytechnic model and diploma from USF Polytechnic. In addition, USF Polytechnic Student Affairs implemented Hobson's student recruitment and relationship management tools to enhance communication, relationship building, tracking and retention efforts.

E. Career Plans and Employment

The **2009-2010 Graduating Survey [FR4.1-7a]** indicated that 57% of the respondents are looking for jobs, 11% have been offered or accepted a position, 29% are continuing in their current full-time position, and 4% have received a promotion. **Results of the 2010-2011 Graduating Survey [FR4.1-7b]** indicate that 38.8% are looking for jobs, 9.1% have been offered or accepted a position, 22.4% are continuing with their current full-time position, and 5.1% have been promoted.

The 2009-2010 survey also indicates that 4% of respondents have been accepted to graduate or professional school, 24% are currently applying, 37% plan to apply in the near future, 16% plan to apply in the next 5 years, and 15% have no plans for further education. **Results of the 2010-2011 Graduating Survey** indicate that 6.5% of respondents have been accepted to graduate or professional school, 24.7% are currently applying, 31.2% plan to apply in the near future, 19.4% plan to apply in the next 5 years, and 18.3% have no plans for further education.

Changes in data reported are not inconsistent with the uncertainty of current economic times – employed individuals are less likely to take a risk seeking new jobs, and further education may be delayed. A slight increase in graduates who have been promoted and increases in acceptances to graduate or professional school, as well as intent to apply in the near future, are promising.

Florida Statute 1008.39 Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) [FR4.1-9] requires the Florida Department of Education to compile, maintain, and disseminate information concerning the educational histories, placement and employment, enlistments in the United States armed services, and other measures of success in state educational and workforce development programs.

Fall 2008 FETPIP Analysis of 2007-2008 Graduates [FR4.1-10a] by each campus in the USF System found 231 graduates of USF Polytechnic with bachelor's degrees employed in public, private, or non-profit establishments who were covered by the Florida Unemployment Insurance System during the October - December 2007 target period. Of those individuals 201 (87%) had outcome data. Sixty-nine graduates with master's degrees were found, and 61 (88%) had outcome data.

	Total # of Individuals	Total # of Individual with Outcome Data	% of Total	
Bachelor's	231	201	87%	
Master's	69	61	88%	

Fall 2009 FETPIP Analysis of 2008-2009 Graduates [FR4.1-10b] by each campus in the USF System found 288 graduates of USF Polytechnic with bachelor's degrees employed in public, private, or non-profit establishments who were covered by the Florida Unemployment Insurance System during the October - December 2007 target period. Of those individuals 248 (86%) had outcome data. One hundred one graduates with master's degrees were found, and 92 (91%) had outcome data.

	Total # of Individuals	Total # of Individual with Outcome Data	% of Total	
Bachelor's	288	248	86%	
Master's	101	92	91%	

The following table shows the percentage of USF Polytechnic graduates by degree-level earned who were employed and/or continuing their education.

				-	
	Employed	Not Employed	% Continuing Their Education	% Employed of Those Continuing Their Education	
2007-08 Bachelor's	82%	18%	16%		75%
2008-09 Bachelor's	83%	17%	14%		90%
2007-08 Master's	88%	12%	No data		No data
2008-09 Master's	90%	10%	No data		No data

Percentage of USF Polytechnic Graduates Employed or Continuing Education by Degree Level Earned

FETPIP also reports earnings for those employed and for those employed but not continuing their education. The tables below provide this data, together with data from the Florida Research and Economic Database (FRED) on average 4th quarter earnings for USF Polytechnic's service area (Hardee, Highlands, Hillsborough and Polk counties) and statewide.

Average Earnings of USF Polytechnic Graduates by Degree Level, 4th Quarter 2007 and 2008

0 0		
	Employed	Employed: Not Continuing Education
2007-2008 Bachelor's	\$8,120	\$8,243
2008-2009 Bachelor's	\$8,471	\$8,556
2007-2008 Master's	\$10,210	\$10,019
2008-2009 Master's	\$12,336	\$12,156

Estimated Earnings of Workers in USF Polytechnic Service Area and State, 4th Quarter 2007 and 2008

	4 th Quarter (13 weeks)
Hardee County	2007 - \$6,773 (weekly \$521) 2008 - \$7,189 (weekly \$553)
Highlands County	2007 - \$7,332 (weekly \$564)
	2008 - \$7,085 (weekly \$545)
-------------	--
Polk County	2007 - \$9,048 (weekly \$696) 2008 - \$9,191 (weekly \$707)
Statewide	2007 - \$10,543 (weekly \$811) 2008 - \$10,725 (weekly \$825)

Data Source: Florida Research and Economic Database (FRED)

Data indicate that USF Polytechnic graduates with bachelor's degrees earned more than individuals employed in Hardee and Highlands counties, but slightly less than individuals employed in Polk County, and that USF Polytechnic graduates with master's degrees earned more than individuals employed in all counties in the campus' service area, and more than individuals statewide in 2008-2009.

The following table provides data from the U.S. Census Bureau 2010 American Community Survey on education and income for USF Polytechnic's service area (Hardee, Highlands and Polk counties), the State of Florida, and the nation.

	Hardee County	Highlands County	Polk County	Florida	United States
Percentage with bachelor's degree	5.2%	9.7%	12.6%	16.6%	17.7%
Percentage with graduate or professional degree	2.3%	5%	5.3%	9.2%	9.2%
Mean household income	\$48,363	\$43,010	\$53,111	\$61,877	\$68,259
Mean earnings for workers	\$16,891	\$17,073	\$25,414	\$26,045	\$28,899
Percentage of all people below poverty level	19.2%	15.5%	13.3%	12.0%	15.3%

2010 Education and Income USF Polytechnic Service Region, State and Nation

Data Source: American Community Survey (2010 Data Set), U.S. Census Bureau

Use of Results. Data are reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council and with the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup. FETPIP data and U.S. Census Bureau contextual data provide some validation of the success of USF Polytechnic's graduates. Counties in USF Polytechnic's service area evidence percentages of individuals with bachelor's degrees less than the state and national averages, and the state average is less than the national. Percentages of individuals with master's degrees are less than the state and national averages, mean household incomes are less than the state and national averages, and poverty levels are greater than the state and national averages.

Estimating annual earnings for USF Polytechnic graduates with bachelor's degrees ($$8,471 \times 4 = $33,884$), graduates appear to earn more than the mean/median earnings for workers in all service area counties, the state and the nation. This would also be true for USF Polytechnic graduates with master's degrees with estimated annual earnings of \$49,344 ($$12,336 \times 4 = $49,344$).

Hobson's student recruitment and relationship management tools will enable communication with alumni and opportunity for the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning to gather additional data through a campus-specific alumni survey. Initiating and sustaining contact with alumni will also enhance opportunity for the development of an employer survey.

2. Information regarding student achievement of identified competencies or learning outcomes included in documentation of compliance with Core Requirement 2.5 and Comprehensive Standards 3.3.1 and 3.5.1.

The following student achievement measures are assessed annually at USF Polytechnic through the Office of Institutional Research Effectiveness and Planning:

- A. General Education Student Learning Outcomes
- B. Academic Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes

A. General Education Student Learning Outcomes

USF Polytechnic has provided 2+2 baccalaureate programs consistent with the Statewide Articulation Agreement. A general education program is not offered at USF Polytechnic. However, Florida Statute (1007.25 General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements) requires that a baccalaureate degree consists of 120 semester hours which includes 36 semester hours of general education coursework.

General Education Outcomes Assessment

USF Polytechnic assesses reading, writing and mathematics, in addition to critical thinking and diversity, in keeping with core values expressed in its 2007-2012 Strategic Plan:

- 1. We expect students to **read critically**, interpreting meaning and purpose and recognizing fact vs. inference and opinion.
- 2. We expect students to **write correctly and effectively**, producing well-organized and meaningful prose.
- 3. We expect students to recognize and interpret mathematical terms, data, formulas and representations.
- 4. We expect students to **think critically and analytically**, recognizing and questioning assumptions and hypotheses, interpreting information, drawing appropriate conclusions, and presenting persuasive argument.
- 5. We expect students to value diversity of human thought, experience and perspective and to be open to individual and cultural uniqueness.

Means of Assessment

USF Polytechnic assesses reading, writing and mathematics, in addition to critical thinking and diversity, in keeping with core values expressed in its 2007-2012 Strategic Plan. Several means of assessment are used: (1) the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) Test, short form; (2) the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); (3) Graduating Student Survey; and (4) the Diversity/Campus Climate Survey.

General Education Competency	Nationally- Standardized Instrument	Nationally- Standardized Student Self-Report Instrument	USF Polytechnic Student Self- Report Instruments
Reading	ETS®Proficiency Profile		
Writing	ETS®Proficiency Profile		Graduating Student Survey
Mathematics	ETS®Proficiency Profile		
Critical Thinking	ETS®Proficiency Profile Reading Level 3	NSSE Survey Academic Challenge & Active Learning	Graduating Student Survey
Diversity		NSSE Survey Supportive Campus Environment	Graduating Student Survey Diversity/Campus Climate Survey

ETS®Proficiency Profile

The ETS®Proficiency Profile is produced and scored by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The ETS®Proficiency Profile Users Guide [FR4.1-11, p. 4] indicates that the test was "developed to assist in the assessment of the outcomes of general education programs in order to improve the quality of instruction and learning. The Profile is a test of college-level skills in critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics. It is designed to measure the academic skills developed through general education courses, rather than the subject knowledge specifically taught in those courses. All of the subject knowledge required to answer each question is contained in the question itself or in the stimulus materials that accompany the question." Profile test questions assess the following:

College-level **reading** questions measure students' ability to a) interpret the meaning of key terms, b) recognize the primary purpose of a passage, c) recognize explicitly presented information, d) make appropriate inferences, and e) recognize rhetorical devices.

College-level **writing** questions measure students' ability to a) recognize the most grammatically correct revision of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences; b) organize units of language for coherence and rhetorical effect; c) recognize and reword figurative language; and d) organize elements of writing into larger units of meaning.

Critical thinking questions measure students' ability to a) distinguish between rhetoric and argumentation in a piece of nonfiction prose, b) recognize assumptions, c) recognize the best hypothesis to account for information presented, d) infer and interpret a relationship between variables, and e) draw valid conclusions based on information presented.

Mathematics questions measure students' ability to a) recognize and interpret mathematical terms; b) read and interpret tables and graphs; c) evaluate formulas; d) order and compare large and small numbers; e) interpret ratios, proportions, and percentages; f) read scientific measuring instruments; and g) recognize and use equivalent mathematical formulas or expressions.

USF Polytechnic administered the four times in 2009-2010 to sample populations of students. A report on the results of the 2009-2010 administrations was disseminated March 1, 2011 by the Office of Institutional Research, Effectiveness and Planning.

Name of Cohort	Date Administered	Student Level	Number	Form					
All Divisions	Spring 2009	Mostly juniors	34	Abbreviated					
All Divisions	April 2010	Mostly juniors	28	Abbreviated					
Education	November 2010	Seniors	59	Standard					
Marketing	December 2010	Seniors	25	Abbreviated					

Administrations and Populations

The Abbreviated Form of the Profile contains 36 multiple-choice items, which cover the skill areas of Reading, Critical Thinking, Writing and Mathematics. Items are distributed across areas as follows:

	Critical Thinking	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Humanities	3 items	2-4 items		
Social Sciences	3 items	2-4 items	9 items	9 items
Natural Sciences	3 items	2-4 items		

The Standard Form of the Profile contains 108 multiple-choice items, covering the skill areas of Reading, Critical Thinking, Writing and Mathematics. Items are distributed across areas as follows:

	Critical Thinking	Reading	Writing	Mathematics
Humanities	9 items	9 items		
Social Sciences	9 items	9 items	27 items	27 items
Natural Sciences	9 items	9 items		

ETS provides different norm groups for different classifications of institutions. For USF Polytechnic the norm group is Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I and II. These norms are based on slightly over 51,000 students who took the Profile at 92 institutions from January 2006 through June 2010. ETS norms are presented by class (i.e., freshman, sophomore, juniors, etc.). The USF Polytechnic sample were largely seniors; therefore, the ETS norm tables for seniors were used.

Norm-referenced Results. The following table shows the overall mean score for the USF Polytechnic total cohort of 146 students for each of the subscales, the possible range of scores, and the percent of institutions that had mean scores below the mean score of USF Polytechnic students.

	Mean Score USF Polytechnic	Possible Range	Percent of Institutions with Mean Scores BELOW USF Polytechnic Mean Scores
Critical Thinking	112.06	100-130	39%
Reading	118.17	100-130	30%
Writing	114.55	100-130	27%
Mathematics	114.64	100-130	60%
Humanities	115.15	100-130	35%
Social Sciences	113.62	100-130	25%
Natural Sciences	115.48	100-130	28%

<u>Criterion-referenced Results.</u> The following tables show the percentage of USF Polytechnic students who were classified as Proficient, Marginal or Not Proficient at each level of each skill dimension, as well as the percentage of students in the norm group classified as Proficient, Marginal or Not Proficient. Level of skills required for proficiency increases from Level 1 to Level 3.

	Percent	Proficient	Percent	Marginal	Percent N	ot Proficient
	POLY	NORM	POLY	NORM	POLY	NORM
Reading Level 1	66%	69%	21%	18%	13%	14%
Reading Level 2	31%	40%	24%	19%	45%	41%
Reading Level 3 – Critical Thinking	2%	8%	17%	19%	81%	73%
Writing Level 1	69%	65%	27%	25%	7%	10%
Writing Level 2	19%	21%	37%	37%	43%	42%
Writing Level 3	6%	8%	27%	28%	66%	64%
Mathematics Level 1	62%	55%	25%	24%	13%	21%
Mathematics Level 2	35%	29%	27%	25%	38%	45%
Mathematics Level 3	4%	8%	21%	17%	75%	75%

Discussion of 2009-2010 ETS®Proficiency Profile Results. Participation in the test was voluntary. The results of the test carry no consequences, either positive or negative. Both student selection and motivation for doing well on the test could influence results. The norm group selected was Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities at the senior level. USF Polytechnic students were at different stages of completion of their programs of study in a 2+2 upper level institution; students did not do their foundational General Education curriculum here. The sample size (146) is neither large enough nor diverse enough to draw any strong conclusions.

Based on these limitations, USF Polytechnic student proficiency in Reading was fairly comparable with other schools at Level 1 and Level 2 proficiency. Both USF Polytechnic and norm student performance at Level 3 Reading (Critical Thinking) is certainly of concern. USF Polytechnic student proficiency in Writing was higher than norm schools at Level 1 proficiency, and fairly comparable at Level 2 and Level 3 proficiencies. USF Polytechnic student proficiency in Mathematics was higher than other schools at Level 1 and Level 2 proficiencies and slightly less than other schools at Level 3 proficiency.

Use of Results. MAPP test results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council. Data collected for 2009-2010 will be a baseline for future years. Results for the ETS®Proficiency Profile 2010-2011 administrations are in final analysis with results disseminated in March 2012. As the general education curriculum is developed, these data will be utilized as a foundation to build a strong, focused and integrated general education program. In addition, the campus will examine benefits that may be gained from implementing the long form of the Profile which includes discipline specific areas such as communication, social sciences, humanities and natural sciences. In addition, the use of subject-specific assessments from ETS will also be examined.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) obtains, on an annual basis, information from hundreds of four-year colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and

activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college. Survey items on The National Survey of Student Engagement represent empirically confirmed "good practices" in undergraduate education. That is, they reflect behaviors by students and institutions that are associated with desired outcomes of college.

Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience inside and outside the classroom that can be improved through changes in policies and practices more consistent with good practices in undergraduate education. This information is also used by prospective college students, their parents, college counselors, academic advisers, institutional research officers, and researchers in learning more about how students spend their time at different colleges and universities and what they gain from their experiences. **[see NSSE website link below, FR4.1-12]**

The NSSE is administered nationwide to college students selected randomly. USF submits a student population data file of ALL first-year and senior students, and NSSE selects a random sample (half freshman, half seniors) from this file based on undergraduate enrollment. Customized letters endorsed by an institutional representative are included with the surveys mailed or e-mailed to participating schools in February to March.

The NSSE was first administered in spring 2007, in 2009 and again in May 2010. Results are analyzed by NSSE and reported separately as well as comparatively with other USF institutions. Because USF Polytechnic's enrollment is a small proportion of the total USF System enrollment, USF Polytechnic Institutional Research paid an additional fee to oversample USFP senior students in 2007, 2009 and 2010. USF Polytechnic Institutional Research will now administer the NSSE to USFP seniors online during the spring semester every other year, with the next administration of the assessment in spring 2012.

NSSE 2007 and 2009 Results

NSSE identifies five benchmarks of effective educational practice: 1) level of academic challenge, 2) active and collaborative learning, 3) student – faculty interaction, 4) enriching educational experiences, and 5) supportive campus environment. The 2007 survey was the first year where baseline data specific to USF Polytechnic Seniors were available. Therefore, this survey became the baseline to compare with the 2009 data. Comparisons were: academic years, gender, race and USF campuses. The framework of the study was a series of two-way analyses of variances (linear model – least square means Scheffe test with a significance level of .01). The following graphically compares academic years (2007, 2009) and gender:







WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 295





Discussion of Results. Comparisons of year of assessment, campus and race were not significantly different among the Polytechnic students. However, as other studies have found, females and males rated the NSSE benchmarks differently. The study found that within the dimensions of active learning and enriching educational environment female students rated their experiences significantly higher than male students.

In the dimension of Academic Challenge, both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009. In Active Learning both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female students perceptions increasing slightly more. In the area of Student Faculty Interactions, again both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female and female students' perceptions of their experiences increased positively from 2007 to 2009, with female students perceptions increasing slightly more. In Enriching Educational Environment, both male and female students' perceptions increased positively with female students rating the benchmark higher than male students. In Supportive Campus Environment, male students' perceptions decreased from 2007 to 2009 while female students' perceptions increased positively.

Use of Results. NSSE results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council. The purpose of this analysis was twofold: 1) to get some preliminary information about USF Polytechnic students and how they compare with other USF students; and 2) to get some baseline results for further analysis. The graphs fulfill the spirit of the first purpose. The second purpose was fulfilled as well. Having determined baseline significance of gender, race, campus and year of assessment in the NSSE benchmarks, it is possible to undertake further studies in the future.

In relation to the decrease from 2007 to 2009 in male students' perceptions of the dimension of Supportive Campus Environment, campus demographics indicate that female students comprise 61% of the student population. USF Polytechnic's Diversity Office instituted an annual panel discussion in April 2009 on "Where Are the College Men?" and in April 2010 on "Where Are the Men?" Both panels engaged attendees in discussions with current male students and male alumni around why more men are not attending college, increasing a male student support environment, and issues in male students' successful completion of college degrees.

NSSE 2009 – USF Polytechnic Students and Other NSSE College Students

The 2009 administration of the NSSE also examined USF Polytechnic students' attitudes and experiences as compared to other college students taking the NSSE. Again, an attempt was made to over sample seniors at USFP. NSSE scores are reported for USF Polytechnic students, for students in schools that were categorized in the top 50 percent or top 10 percent of schools based on the weighting system used by NSSE to calculate benchmarks for various subgroups in the NSSE student sample, and for all students. Although a significance level based on means of USF Polytechnic students and the NSSE subgroups might have been calculable, it would have presumed a level of statistical accuracy that was probably unfounded. The following graphics portray our findings:











Discussion of Results. In the benchmark categories of **Level of Academic Challenge** and **Active and Collaborative Learning**, USF Polytechnic students scored their institution higher than the average of all NSSE students sampled. In the categories of **Student Faculty Interaction**, **Enriching Educational Experiences** or **Supportive Campus Environment**, USF Polytechnic students, on average, rated their institution slightly lower than the average NSSE responder. USF Polytechnic students, on average, did not rate their institution higher than the average NSSE responder in schools categorized in the top 50 percent or top 10 percent of schools based on benchmark scores.

Use of Results. It is difficult to determine demographic information for any of the NSSE groups. How significantly they varied from the USF Polytechnic population is difficult to know and could be important. Certainly, as USF Polytechnic shares a campus with a state college which sets the policies for campus use, it is challenging to develop strategies to create a campus environment specific to USFP students. The planning and development of the new campus site is an important opportunity for USF Polytechnic to involve students in the planning stages and to communicate the importance of their interests, needs and perspectives in creating a new campus environment.

The NSSE results were reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association and the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup. Student Affairs is addressing the slightly lower scores on Student Faculty Interaction, Enriching Educational Experiences and Supportive Campus Environment to develop action plans to better engage the students inside and outside the classroom. These new initiatives will be monitored closely.

NSSE Results 2010

The 2010 NSSE questionnaire was administered in May 2010 to 137 USF Polytechnic seniors. Benchmark means were compared for students from USF Polytechnic, USF Sarasota-Manatee, USF St. Petersburg, USF Tampa and the Carnegie "Master's Small" cohort. The table below provides this comparison.

	USF	Poly	USF Sa	rasota	USF St	USF St. Pete		USF St. Pete		USF Tampa		USF Tampa		Master's Sm.		USF Poly Above/Below		
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Sar	S.P.	Тра	Sm. Mst.				
Level of Academic Challenge	58.26	14.52	58.35	14.42	56.32	14.15	55.77	14.08	59.0	14.1	-0.10	1.94	2.49	-0.74				
Active and Collaborative Learning	53.34	20.53	50.04	18.12	48.70	18.19	45.15	17.25	53.9	17.4	3.30	4.64	8.19	-0.56				
Student-Faculty Interaction	36.95	21.42	36.25	17.59	34.34	18.83	34.43	19.00	46.5	21.4	0.70	2.61	2.52	-9.55				
Enriching Educational Experiences	38.50	17.52	32.51	16.67	34.97	17.36	35.16	16.46	43.5	19.1	5.99	3.53	3.33	-5.00				
Supportive Campus Environment	58.95	20.06	62.24	19.49	56.89	18.36	54.99	19.35	62.3	19.5	-3.29	2.07	3.96	-3.35				

Comparisons of Results for NSSE Benchmark Means

NOTE: While means for a given benchmark are on the same scale and may be compared across institutions, the scales vary across benchmarks and do not permit comparisons between benchmarks.

Discussion of Results: Note that the mean for USF Polytechnic is below that of the Master's Small cohort on each of the five benchmarks. However, the results are much different when USF Polytechnic means are compared to the other USF campuses. In fact, the USF Polytechnic mean is above the corresponding mean for USF Tampa and USF St. Pete on <u>all five benchmarks</u> – most dramatically on the three benchmarks that most assess characteristics closely aligned with the Polytechnic mission. The USF Polytechnic mean is above USF Sarasota on three of the five benchmarks.

If one peruses the questions comprising each benchmark, one can see that the special polytechnic mission of USF Polytechnic is best measured by the items making up the benchmark labeled "Active and Collaborative Learning," followed by "Level of Academic Challenge" and "Enriching Educational Experiences." Note that for "Active and Collaborative Learning," USF Polytechnic is above all three of its local peers, as is also the case for "Enriching Educational Experiences." For "Level of Academic Challenge" USF Polytechnic is above two of its three local peers.

These results strongly support the assertion that USF Polytechnic is differentiating itself from other USF campuses in terms of delivering education consistent with its Polytechnic mission.

Use of Results: The NSSE results were reviewed with the Executive Council and distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association, the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and faculty in fall 2011 semester. [INSERT BRIEF SUMMARY FROM MEETING MINUTES.]

■ Graduating Student Survey Results

Institutional Research administers the **Graduating Student Survey** [**FR4.1-13**] during fall and spring semester registration for Commencement. The survey was first administered in the 2008-2009 academic year; a total of 50 students responded. In 2009-2010 one hundred twenty-four (124) students completed the survey. The following table provides data on students' views of their courses:

2008-2009 N=50 2009-2010 N=113		rongly sagree Disagree		Ag	ree	Strongly Agree		
	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010	2008-2009	2009-2010
Courses in my major provided me with adequate knowledge and skills.	12%	7%	2%	4%	42%	55%	44%	34%
My writing skills improved.	12%	8%	8%	16%	54%	48%	26%	28%
My oral communication skills improved.	12%	8%	10%	11%	40%	48%	38%	33%
My critical thinking skills improved.	10%	6%	4%	8%	36%	48%	50%	37%

Graduating Student Survey

Discussion of Results. In the category of adequacy of knowledge and skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall (i.e., combined percentage in strong disagree and disagree responses) with the statement decreased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 14% to 11% while the percentage of students agreeing overall (i.e., combined percentage in agree and strongly agree responses) with the statement increased from 86% to 89%.

In the category of writing skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement increased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 20% to 24%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement decreased from 80% to 76%.

In the category of oral communication skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement decreased from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 from 22% to 19%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement increased from 78% to 81%.

In the category of critical thinking skills, the percentage of students disagreeing overall with the statement remained the same from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 at 14%, and the percentage of students agreeing overall with the statement decreased slightly from 86% to 85%.

Use of Results. The Graduating Student Survey results are reviewed by the Academic and Student Affairs Council and will be reviewed by academic units and the Student Government Association at the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year.

The increase in student disagreement and decrease in student agreement with the statement, "My writing skills improved," from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010, in addition to the Level 1 performance of students on the MAPP short form test (60%) in comparison to all schools in similar master's level colleges and universities (76%) suggests that writing skills is an area for improvement. Additional full-time faculty have been hired for academic year 2010-2011 to teach literature and writing exit courses, as well as technical and professional writing courses. This will reduce the number of courses that would be taught by adjunct faculty. The full-time faculty will be following the results of the 2010-2011 administration of the MAPP test to determine potential curricular changes or the need for additional common course assessments.

Level 3 proficiency in Reading on the MAPP test assesses Critical Thinking; only 2% of USF Polytechnic students and 5% of students in similar master's level colleges and universities demonstrated proficiency in Level 3 Reading/Critical Thinking. In the dimensions of Academic Challenge and Active Learning on the NSSE, both male and female students' perceptions of their experiences at USF Polytechnic as academically challenging increased positively from 2007 to 2009. In addition, USF Polytechnic students scored their institution higher on these two benchmarks than the average of all NSSE students sampled. The decrease from 2008-2009 to 2009-2010 on the Graduating Student Survey in student agreement with the statement, "My critical thinking skills improved," is slight (1%); however, results in the area of critical thinking will be monitored in academic year 2010-2011 as this is a key area of value for USF Polytechnic and for student success and achievement.

Graduating Student Survey 2010-2011

Preliminary results of the 2010-2011 Graduating Student Survey were distributed to Executive Council at the end of July 2011. Of the 350 graduating students, 101 completed the survey.

2010-2011 N=101	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Courses in my major provided me with adequate knowledge and skills.	1%	4%	40%	55%
My writing skills improved.	2%	12%	41%	45%
My oral communication skills improved.	1%	6%	35%	58%
My critical thinking skills improved.	1%	3%	30%	66%

Preliminary Discussion of Results. In the category of adequacy of knowledge and skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 4% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 44% in 2008-2009 and 35% in 2009-2010 to 55% in 2010-2011.

In the category of writing skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 8% in 2009-2010 to 2% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 26% in 2008-2009 and 28% in 2009-2010 to 45% in 2010-2011.

In the category of adequacy of oral communication skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 12% in 2008-2009 and 10% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 38% in 2008-2009 and 33% in 2009-2010 to 58% in 2010-2011.

In the category of adequacy of critical thinking skills, the percentage of students strongly disagreeing decreased significantly from 10% in 2008-2009 and 6% in 2009-2010 to 1% in 2010-2011. The percentage of students strongly agreeing increased significantly from 50% in 2008-2009 and 37% in 2009-2010 to 66% in 2010-2011.

Use of Results: The preliminary results were reviewed with the Executive Council distributed and reviewed with the Academic and Student Affairs Council, the Student Government Association, the Enrollment Planning and Management Workgroup and faculty in the fall 2011 semester. [INSERT SUMMARY OF MEETING MINUTES.]

Campus Climate/Diversity Survey Results

Institutional Research, in collaboration with the USF Polytechnic Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement, administers the **Campus Climate/Diversity Survey** every other year [see CR2.5-18 l&m]. The first administration of the survey was in spring 2008, and the next administration of the survey was fall 2010. The survey measures students' perceptions of the following factors: 1) experience with diversity, 2) academic achievement and personal development, 3) peer relationships, 4) diversity programs and policies, 5) camaraderie among groups, 6) classroom environment, 7) treatment and inter-group relations, 8) expression of insensitivity and prejudice, 9) diversity experiences impact, 10) disabled students, and 11) overall evaluation of campus experiences.

In spring 2008 the total number of USF students responding to the survey was 2,712 with 447 students who took classes at USF Polytechnic participating. In fall 2010 the total number of USF students responding to the survey was 2,395 with 319 students who took classes at USF Polytechnic participating. The following table presents a summary of USF Polytechnic respondents' perceptions of the campus/ diversity climate:

	Spring 2008 (N=447)	Fall 2010 (N=319)
Percentage of students moderately to extremely satisfied with their overall experience at USF Polytechnic [Q167, Q169]	95.8%	86.5%
Percentage of students feeling accepted by the campus community at USF Polytechnic [Q168, Q170]	90.4%	71.1%
Percentage of students feeling the quality of academic programs at USF Polytechnic is excellent [Q169, Q171]	95.6%	82.6%
Percentage of students feeling USF Polytechnic provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions and beliefs [Q170, Q172]	96.8%	83.2%
Percentage of students feeling an environment that includes diversity improves the quality of education [Q171, Q173]	96.3%	84.3%
Percentage of students who would recommend USF Polytechnic to siblings or friends as a good place to go to college [Q172, Q174]	96.2%	84.4%

Discussion of Results. In spring 2008 USF Polytechnic was USF Lakeland, a regional campus of the University of South Florida System with a newly differentiated mission of applied learning, applied research and applied technology. In fall 2008 USF Polytechnic was established with legislative charge to seek separate SACS accreditation. In fall 2010 USF Polytechnic had evidenced strategic changes to meet its distinct mission, and in faculty, staff and student populations changes occurred as individuals considered and made decisions regarding their "fit" for that mission. Decreases in students' feelings about USF Polytechnic in fall 2010 are not inconsistent with a campus identity change.

Use of Results. Results are distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council and Student Government Association. Units utilize the results to address objectives and subsequent improvements within their assessment plans. The Diversity Office was integrated into Student Affairs and restructured as the Office of Multicultural Education and Engagement to increase collaboration communication with Student Affairs units (e.g., Recruitment, Admissions, Student Activities, Student Government). Survey results data going forward will be assessed for trends and improvements through comparison with administrations of the instrument on a two-year cycle. Fall 2010 data were received in July 2011 and were distributed to the Academic and Student Affairs Council at the end of July.

Development of USF Polytechnic as a Four-Year Destination Campus

USF Polytechnic's Strategic Plan 2007-2012 [see CR2.4-1] sets a bold vision for becoming a "premier destination campus for applied learning, research, and innovative technology." On September 20, 2009 the USF System Board of Trustees approved the addition of lower-level courses and enrollment at USF Polytechnic [CR2.7.3-8a, Board of Trustees Agenda Item for approval of lower-level courses 9-10-09] and [CR2.7.3-8b, Board of Trustees Meeting minutes 9-10-09]. The request was subsequently approved by the Board of Governors on September 24, 2009 [CR2.7.3-9, Board of Governors Meeting Minutes, Item 6(E)(2)].

On July 8, 2011 Dr. Belle Whelan, President, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, issued a letter to Dr. Judy Genshaft, President, University of South Florida System, approving the offering of lower-level courses at USF Polytechnic, effective spring 2012 with the first freshman class to be admitted in fall 2013 [CR2.7.3-10 Whelan Approval Letter 7-8-11]. A pilot freshman cohort of approximately 100 students is planned for fall 2012.

In spring 2011 a General Education Committee of the Faculty Senate developed a General Education Core Curriculum and Assessment Plan for the first Freshman class anticipated in fall 2013. The plan transitions from the USF Foundations of Knowledge and Learning (FKL), providing a polytechnic philosophy of education and learning outcomes drawn from that philosophy, a rationale for course selection, a listing of and description of courses with relationship of each course to the learning outcomes indicated. An assessment plan continues use of the ETS Proficiency Profile and NSSE survey, and adds a Written Communication Rubric and a common rubric for assessment of Capstone Experiences. (See CR2.7.3-11a-d)

B. Academic Degree Program Student Learning Outcomes

Board of Governors Regulation 8.016 Academic Learning Compacts [FR4.1-15] requires universities to develop "Academic Learning Compacts" and related assessment processes to define and demonstrate student achievement in baccalaureate degree programs in the State University System. The Academic Learning Compacts must clearly articulate core student learning expectations in content/discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills.

The regulation further requires each university to construct clearly defined policies and procedures, aligned with the BOG regulation, for developing, implementing, and reviewing Academic Learning Compacts and related assessment activities. The **USF System Statement of Policy on Academic Learning Compacts [FR4.1-16]** requires the development and implementation of Academic Learning Compacts for each baccalaureate degree program. **USF System Guidelines for Development and Implementation of Academic Learning Compacts [FR4.1-17]** provide additional procedural guidelines for the implementation of the BOG regulation. Also, while the BOG regulation and USF System policy statement require Academic Learning Compacts for bachelor's degrees only, most master's degree programs have adopted the ALC process as well.

The USF System tracks assessment through a database displayed on the **USF System Academic Learning Compact website [FR4.1-18, see link below]** which currently organizes the ALCs by degree program within the USF Tampa Campus college structure.

In 2005 the Board of Governors began the process of establishing policy guidelines and procedures for universities through their boards of trustees to develop and implement Academic Learning Compacts to account for student achievement in baccalaureate degree programs in the State University System. In September 2005 USF Academic Affairs distributed a memorandum directing academic departments to develop ALCs by the end of fall 2005 and review and update student learning outcomes assessment plans in spring 2006 to reflect the outcome and assessment statements in the ALCs. In 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 academic programs on the regional campuses were controlled and administered by the academic departments on the main campus in Tampa. ALC assessment results were reported by academic department, not by campus. Board of Governors regulation 8.016 Academic Learning Compacts was approved March 27, 2007.

In 2007-2008 the USF System began its consideration of mission differentiation and separate IPEDS numbers for each of the USF campuses, in addition to the development of Board of Governors required Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs). ALCs were developed by Tampa departments with expectation that the ALCs would be implemented system-wide.

By July 1, 2008 the USF System had implemented mission differentiation, and USF Polytechnic was established by the Legislature, with expectation that the campus would seek separate SACS accreditation. In AY 2008-2009 the campus, with support of the System President and Provost, took responsibility for its own assessment system while participating in system-wide discussions and assessment guidelines. USF Polytechnic degree program faculty reviewed the ALCs and assessments developed by the Tampa departments and continue to refine/revise assessments to align with the USF Polytechnic campus mission and core values, and used results of ALC assessments to guide changes and improvements in curriculum delivery and/or assessments as needed for the campus.

Academic Learning Compacts are required for each baccalaureate degree major and for each master's degree at USF Polytechnic. Academic Program Coordinators are responsible for ensuring that program assessments required in the ALC are implemented and results gathered and reviewed by program faculty. Assessment results and changes and/or improvements made to the program are submitted to USFP's Office of Assessment and Accountability. Academic Program Coordinators are listed below:

Baccalaureate Degrees

BS Applied Science	Criminal Justice Early Childhood Industrial Operations Information Technology Leadership Studies (fall 2009)	Kim Lersch, Ph.D. Smita Mathur, Ph.D. JoAnne Larsen, Ph.D. Dave Armitage, Ph.D. Jan Lloyd, Ph.D.
BA Criminology		Kim Lersch, Ph.D.
BS Elementary Education		Georgann Wyatt, Ph.D.
BS General Business Administration		Richard Plank, Ph.D.
Concentration in Management	(began fall 2010)	John Selsky, Ph.D.
Concentration in Marketing (be	gan fall 2008)	Richard Plank, Ph.D.
BS Industrial Engineering		JoAnne Larsen, Ph.D.
BS Information Technology		Dave Armitage, Ph.D.
BA Interdisciplinary Social Science	concentration in Criminology	Scot Boeringer, Ph.D.
	concentration in Gerontology/ Aging Studies	Rosemarie Lamm, Ph.D.

concentration in Leadership Studies (began fall 2010) concentration in Psychology concentration in Sociology Jan Lloyd, Ph.D.

James Epps, Ph.D. Cecil Greek, Ph.D.

James Epps, Ph.D.

Andy Artis, Ph.D. Marylou Taylor, Ph.D. Jennifer Reeves, Ed.D. Dave Armitage, Ph.D. Sherry Kragler, Ph.D.

OVERVIEW of 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 Assessment Results Baccalaureate Degree Programs

B.S. Applied Science – Criminal Justice Concentration

The <u>B.S.A.S. Criminal Justice concentration</u> supplements the technical skills learned in study for the AS degree. Students complete two core courses and select four courses in a variety of topics (e.g., criminal justice administration, crime mapping and analysis, corrections, ethics for criminal justice practitioners, juvenile justice, cybercrime, etc.). Students in the B.S.A.S. Criminal Justice concentration take the achievement test administered in CCJ 4934, the required capstone course for both the B.S.A.S. concentration and the B.A. Criminology. The degree programs are taught online; the USF Student Information System does not code or identify students in the B.S.A.S. program, thus student performance is not, at this time, able to be disaggregated. All student performance – B.S.A.S. and B.A. – are reported in the B.A. Criminology ALC.

B.S. Applied Science – Early Childhood Development Concentration

The Early Childhood Development concentration is intended to extend the program of study completed by students with an A.S. degree in early childhood development or associated fields. The concentration does not lead to professional certification in early childhood education. The concentration extends students' knowledge in a) child growth and learning, b) health and nutrition for the young child, c) safety and motor skills for the young child, d) personnel and supervision of early childhood programs, e) creative and affective experiences for young children, and f) young children with special needs.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Child Observation	80% of students will	Mean= 41.5/50	Course for 2009-
Outcome 1.	Paper written in EDG	receive a grade of	Median 41/50	2010 not offered
Students will	4909 (Young	"B" or better.	A or B = 80%	
demonstrate	Children With Special		C = 13.5%	
competence in	Needs)		F = 6.5%	
recognizing the				
uniqueness of a				
young child with a				
developmental				
delay or disability				

B.S. Applied Science – Early Childhood Development Concentration Academic Learning Compact Results

BA Psychology

Graduate Degrees

MBA (began fall 2010) MA Counselor Education MEd Educational Leadership MS Information Technology (began fall 2011) MA Reading Education

and subsequently				
develop a working				
knowledge of				
methods to include				
children with				
disabilities in regular				
EC programs.				
Critical Thinking	The Early Language	80% of students will	100% of students	Course for 2009-
Skills - Outcome 2.	and Literacy	achieve a 3 or	received a rating of	2010 not offered
Students will	Classroom	higher in all areas in	3 or higher.	
demonstrate the	Observation (ELLCO)	the ELLCO: 1) Design		
ability to design a	focuses on assessing	a literacy rich and		
thematic play	literacy instruction	developmentally		
environment for 4-5	within a learning	appropriate		
year old children	environment, using a	classroom		
that meets/exceeds	5-point rating scale	environment for		
Florida State	with a total possible	preschool aged		
Standards as	score of 60.	children, 2) pilot		
measured by ELLCO.		the plan for one		
		week and study the		
		impact of the		
		classroom		
		environment, 3)		
		interview teachers		
		to understand areas		
		of improvement.,		
		and 4) present plan		
		and implementation		
		experiences to		
		peers through a		
		formal presentation.		
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			

USE OF RESULTS. In 2008-2009 80% of students met Outcome 1, and 100% of student met Outcome 2. A detailed rubric for project presentation will be developed to assistant students with formal presentations. The concentration attracts students with different career emphases. To address students' career needs additional courses will be included in the courses choices in the concentration to provide for advised areas of emphasis: a) Leadership in Early Childhood Development, aimed at students who plan to manage early childhood programs; b) Special Education in Early Childhood Education; c) and Childhood Development. These emphases are appropriate for the polytechnic mission and for changes in state-level competencies in Early Childhood Education.

In 2009-2010 the concentration was modified to define advised tracks in the concentration: 1) Leadership in Early Childhood Development, to meet the needs of Center Directors and other administrators in non-teaching positions in Early Childhood Education; 2) Special Education in Early Childhood Education, to meet the needs of early identified special needs children in Early Childhood programs; and 3) Childhood Development, to meet the needs of teaching staff aids in Early Childhood programs. A new faculty member will be recruited for 2010-2011, and scheduling will be reviewed to ensure that courses are schedule to enable student completion of the concentration.

Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Industrial Operations Concentration

The <u>B.S.A.S. Industrial Operations concentration</u> supplements the technical skills learned in study for the AS degree and extends students' knowledge in a) operations management, b) principles of management, c) cost analysis, d) work design and ergonomics, e) quality control, f) industrial statistics, and g) programming concepts. Engineering courses are taught on a two-year rotation. Students in the

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 308

B.S.A.S. Industrial Operations concentration take the assessments in required courses offered to both B.S.A.S. concentration and the B.S. Industrial Engineering students. The USF Student Information System does not code or identify students in the B.S.A.S. program, thus student performance is not, at this time, able to be disaggregated. All student performance – B.S.A.S. and B.S. – are reported in the B.S. Industrial Engineering ALC.

Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Information Technology Concentration

The <u>B.S.A.S. Information Technology concentration</u> supplements the technical skills learned in study for the AS degree. Students in the B.S.A.S. Information

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation	N=4	N=3
Knowledge & Skills -	Exit Interview	Students will score	Excellent: 0	Excellent: 0
Outcome 1.	conducted at	Adequate or higher.	Solid: 3	Solid: 3
Students will	completion of all		Adequate: 1	Adequate: 0
demonstrate strong	course requirements		Deficient: 0	Deficient: 0
skills for elaborating	and assessed by a 5-		Minimal: 0	Minimal: 0
solutions to	point rubric			
practical IT	patterned after a job			
problems that show	interview			
mastery of content				
and discipline				
specific knowledge.				
Critical Thinking -	Exit Interview	Students will score	Excellent: 1	Excellent: 1
Outcome 2.	conducted at	Adequate or higher.	Solid: 2	Solid: 2
Students will	completion of all		Adequate: 1	Adequate: 0
demonstrate the	course requirements		Deficient: 0	Deficient: 0
ability to consider	and assessed by a 5-		Minimal: 0	Minimal: 0
alternative	point rubric			
approaches to	patterned after a job			
solving a practical IT	interview			
problem				
Communication	Exit Interview	Students will score	Excellent: 1	Excellent: 1
Skills- Outcome 3.	conducted at	Adequate or higher.	Solid: 1	Solid: 2
Students will	completion of all		Adequate: 2	Adequate: 0
demonstrate ability	course requirements		Deficient: 0	Deficient: 0
to provide well-	and assessed by a 5-		Minimal: 0	Minimal: 0
formulated answers	point rubric			
to questions about	patterned after a job			
practical IT	interview			
problems.				
USE OF RESULTS. The	e IT department faculty	y consider that if at le	ast 50% of students a	re assessed at a high

Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Information Technology Concentration Academic Learning Compact Results

USE OF RESULTS. The IT department faculty consider that if at least 50% of students are assessed at a high (Excellent) or Satisfactory (Adequate) level of performance in a given outcome, that outcome has been achieved. In 2008-2009 students achieved all three outcomes; however, student performance in Communication Skills was not as strong. Faculty reviewed the questions used to assess communication skills for reliability and validity. In 2009-2010 students achieve all three outcomes with improvement in student performance in Communication Skills. Faculty have continued to add to the catalog of questions in each skill area and have maintained a complete record of students' programs of study over these two academic years. Faculty are exploring if there is a relationship between student goals and performance in assessment outcomes.

Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Leadership Studies Concentration

[INSERT NEW PROGRAM DESCRIPTION]

Bachelor of Arts in Criminology

The <u>B.A. in Criminology</u> provides students with general study of crime and the legal system. Students examine issues of law enforcement, victimology, systems of punishment, development and history of the criminal law, and the organizations that work to enforce our criminal statutes. Students also explore sociological factors (economics, politics, education, etc.) that influence criminality. Both students in the B.A. in Criminology and in the B.S.A.S. Criminal Justice concentration take an achievement test administered in CCJ 4934, the required capstone course.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Achievement test	A score of 60%	Mean Student	45% of students
Outcome 1.	administered in the	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 54%	achieved a passing
Knowledge of	required senior-level	higher	Range of Scores:	score.
research methods	capstone course, CCJ		20%-80%	
used in the fields of	4934.			
criminology and				
criminal justice.				
Knowledge & Skills -	Achievement test	A score of 60%	Mean Student	45% of students
Outcome 2.	administered in the	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 47%	achieved a passing
Knowledge of	required senior-level	higher	Range of Scores:	score.
theoretical	capstone course, CCJ		10%-80%	
explanations of	4934.			
crime and				
delinquency.				
Knowledge & Skills -	Achievement test	A score of 60%	Mean Student	45% of students
Outcome 3.	administered in the	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 56%	achieved a passing
Knowledge of the	required senior-level	higher	Range of Scores:	score.
criminal justice	capstone course, CCJ		30%-90%	
response to crime.	4934.			
Critical Thinking	Assessment of in-	A score of 2	68% of students	100% of students
Skills - Outcome 4.	class presentations	(Satisfactory) or	scored Satisfactory	scored at or above
Students will	in senior-level	higher on each	or above.	Satisfactory; 20% of
demonstrate	capstone course, CCJ	critical thinking		students scored
inductive and	4934, using a rubric	rating sheet.		Outstanding.
deductive thinking,	based on a 3-point			
quantitative	scale.			
reasoning, and				
construct ion of				
sound arguments.				
Communication	Assessment of in-	A score of 2	Mean Student	No data – the
Skills - Outcome 5.	class presentations	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 100% of	assessment is being
Effective oral	in senior-level	higher on each	students scored	re-evaluated in
communication	capstone course, CCJ	critical thinking	Satisfactory or	terms of its
skills.	4934, using a rubric	rating sheet.	above.	applicability to an
	based on a 3-point			online course
	scale.			environment.

Bachelor of Arts in Criminology and Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Criminal Justice Concentration Academic Learning Compact Results

Communication	Assessment of	A score of 2	Mean Student	100% of students
Skills - Outcome 6.	writing exercises in	(Satisfactory) or	Score: 59% of	scored at or above
Effective written	senior-level capstone	higher on each	students scored	Satisfactory; 30% of
communication	course, CCJ 4934,	critical thinking	Satisfactory or	students scored
skills.	using a rubric based	rating sheet.	above.	Outstanding.
	on a 3-point scale.			_

USE OF RESULTS. In 2008-2009 curriculum was reviewed to determine whether changes were needed in course material or course schedules. Assessment method was reviewed to determine revisions needed as the assessment instrument used in 2008-2009 was an early version. Critical thinking elements in courses were reviewed and strengthened. Changes were made in the writing elements of required courses and greater emphasis on conforming to stated ALC expectations in written work.

In 2009-2010 scheduling of CCJ 4934 was reviewed and a scheduling issue identified in that USFP students can take CCJ 4934 prior to taking the research methods course. Scheduling of the research course or CCJ 4934 may need to be addressed. A similar issue was identified in reviewing scheduling for CCJ 4934 and the Theory course. As many students may come to USFP having completed the requirements for Survey of the CJ System at another campus or institution, the assessment may need to be reviewed/revised to account for this. Also, identifying a means of disaggregating assessment scores for BSAS students from scores for BA students is a priority for 2010-2011.

Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education

The B.S. in Elementary Education is designed for students wishing to obtain the skills and certification to teach elementary education (grades K-6) in Florida schools. Studies include both coursework and extensive field experience in elementary school settings to enable students to integrate theory with teaching practice. The program includes a total of three internships, beginning the first semester, and numerous service learning projects. The elementary education program is a State of Florida-approved program leading to certification by the State as a teacher in grades K - 6, and includes an English as a Second Language (ESOL) endorsement. Students in the B.S. in Elementary Education are required to pass the FTCE certification exam as a prerequisite for enrollment in the final internship.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Florida Teacher	All students will	All students (61)	FTCE score reports
Outcome 1.	Certification Exams –	receive a PASS on	received a PASS	from the State not
Students will	Professional	the Elementary	score on both	received as yet.
demonstrate	Education and	Education and	sections of the FTCE.	
Knowledge of	Elementary	Professional		
subject matter	Education	Education subtests	Final Internship	Final Internship
related to		of the Florida	Evaluation Form	Evaluation Form
Elementary		Teacher	<u>Results</u>	<u>Results</u>
Education, teaching		Certification Test.	Assessment (AP1):	Assessment (AP1):
skills to assist			Cooperating	Cooperating
student acquisition			Teacher = 4.3,	Teacher = 4.02,
of new knowledge			University	University
and skills.			Supervisor =	Supervisor =
			4.2; Continuous	3.38; Continuous
			Improvement (AP3):	Improvement (AP3):
			Cooperating	Cooperating
			Teacher = 4.6,	Teacher = 4.32,

Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education

1	1	
	University	University
	Supervisor = 4.7;	Supervisor = 4.03;
	Critical Thinking	Critical Thinking
	(AP4): Cooperating	(AP4): Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.3,	Teacher = 4.2,
	University	University
	Supervisor = 4.4;	Supervisor = 3.84;
	Diversity (AP5):	Diversity (AP5):
	Cooperating	Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.6,	Teacher = 4.29,
	University	University
	Supervisor =	Supervisor =
	4.7; Ethics (AP6):	3.73; Ethics (AP6):
	Cooperating	Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.8,	Teacher = 4.6,
	University	University
	Supervisor = 4.9;	Supervisor = 4.26;
	Human	Human
	Development and	Development and
	Learning (AP 7):	Learning (AP 7):
	Cooperating	Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.4,	Teacher = 4.3,
	University	University
	Supervisor = 4.4;	Supervisor = 3.98;
	Knowledge of	Knowledge of
	Subject Matter	Subject Matter
	(AP8): Cooperating	(AP8): Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.5,	Teacher = 4.34,
	University	University
	Supervisor = 4.5;	Supervisor = 3.99;
	Learning	Learning
	Environments (AP9):	Environments (AP9):
	Cooperating	Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.5,	Teacher = 4.36,
	University	University
	Supervisor = 4.5;	Supervisor = 3.99;
	Planning (AP 10):	Planning (AP 10):
	Cooperating	Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.5,	Teacher = 4.28,
	University	University
	Supervisor = 4.5;	Supervisor = 3.98;
	Role of Teacher	Role of Teacher
	(AP11): Cooperating	(AP11): Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.6,	Teacher = 4.34,
	University	University
	Supervisor = 4.6;	Supervisor = 3.97;
	Technology (AP12):	Technology (AP12):
	Cooperating	Cooperating
	Teacher = 4.5,	Teacher = 4.36,
	University Supervisor = 4.5	University Supervisor = 4.02
	Jupervisor – 4.5	Supervisor – 4.02

Critical Thinking -	Final Internship	All students receive	4.3 out of 5 mean	Mean Student
Outcome 2.	Evaluation Form,	a 3 or above on the	score from the	Score: 4.2 out of 5
Students will apply	aligned to Pre-	Final Internship	cooperating	mean score from
subject matter	Professional Level of	Evaluation Form.	teacher; 4.4 mean	the cooperating
knowledge to real-	Florida Accomplished		score from the	teacher; 3.84 mean
world situations:	Practices (AP) and		university	score from the
data collection and	Domains from the		supervisor. 54	university
use; instructional	Florida Performance		students.	supervisor. 80
plans for students'	Measurement		students.	students.
cognitive, social,	System. Completed			students.
linguistic, cultural,	by Cooperating			
emotional, and	Teacher and			
physical needs;	University			
realistic projects and	Supervisor, using a 5-			
problem solving	point rubric.			
activities; planning	po			
instructional				
activities;				
assessment				
techniques.				
Communication	Final Internship	All students receive	Mean Student	Mean Student
Skills - Outcome 3.	Evaluation, aligned	a 3 or above on the	Score: 4.6 out of 5	Score: 4.4 out of 5
Students will	to Pre-Professional	Final Internship	mean score from	mean score from
demonstrate oral	Level of Florida	Evaluation Form.	the cooperating	the cooperating
communication	Accomplished		teacher; 4.6 mean	teacher; 3.98 mean
skills, effective	Practices (AP) and		score from the	score from the
writing techniques.	Domains from the		university	university
	Florida Performance		supervisor. 54	supervisor. 80
	Measurement		students.	students.
	System, completed			
	by Cooperating			
	Teacher & University			
	Supervisor, using a 5-			
	point rubric.			

USE OF RESULTS. Students must take and pass the FTCE prior to graduation from the elementary education program. The Polk County School district requires that students take and pass the test prior to the Level III internship. Test result reports from the State only indicate pass or fail. No data are available on number of times a student takes the test. While scores are good, critical thinking and assessment areas had slightly lower mean scores than other areas. Students need to become more proficient in asking higher order questions and engaging students in activities that require problem-solving skills. This will be more specifically addressed in courses in 2010-2011. Better maintenance of data is needed as USFP takes over data management for its students. Data needs to be collected and maintained on students who receive a 2 or below on any section of the Internship evaluation form used in three formal observations. Data will be reviewed for trends and determination of programmatic changes if needed. Scores on the Final Internship Form were reviewed for 2009-2010 as university supervisors tended to rate students lower than cooperating teachers. Inter-rater reliability may need to be examined.

Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration

The <u>B.S. in General Business Administration</u> provides students with general knowledge in all business disciplines but allows students to tailor the program to fit their interests and gain more in-depth knowledge by selecting two concentrations. The concentrations available at USF Polytechnic are accounting, finance, management, and marketing.

Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration Academic Learning Compact Results

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009	Data on final exams	
Knowledge & Skills -	Final exams in ACG	Students will pass	were not available	
Outcome 1.	2021, ACG 2071, FIN	the final exams with	from Tampa data	
Students will	4443, MAN 3025,	a score of 60% or	base. Student scores	
demonstrate	MAR 3823	higher on each	were not parsed by	
knowledge of key		exam.	campus.	
concepts in				
accounting, finance,	2008-2009	2008-2009	2008-2009	
management and	Modification	Modification	Modification	
marketing.	Final grades in FIN	Students will receive	Results	
-	3403, MAR 3023 and	a final grade of C	FIN 3403 – 77% of	
	MAN 3025 summer	(75%) or better in	students received a	
	2008, fall 2008 and	FIN 3403, MAR 3023	final grade of C	
	spring 2009; these	and MAN 3025	(75%) or better	
	three courses are	summer 2008, fall		
	common to the BS	2008 and spring	MAN 3025 – 91% of	
	and the BSAS	2009	students received a	
	degrees offered by		final grade of C	
	USFP.		(75%) or better	
			MAR 3023 – 89% of	
			students received a	
2009-2010	2009-2010	2009-2010	final grade of C	2009-2010
Knowledge & Skills -	Final grades in FIN	Modification	(75%) or better	Modification
Outcome 1.	3403, MAR 3023 and	75% of students will		Results
Students will	MAN 3025 summer	complete FIN 3403,		FIN 3403 - The mean
demonstrate	2009, fall 2009 and	MAR 3023 and MAN		final grade average
understanding of	spring 2010.	3025 with a final		was 79% with 67%
the basic tenets of	op8 =0101	course average of		of students
operating a business		75% or higher.		completing the
and using the tools				course with a final
and techniques of a				average of 75% or
business.				higher.
businessi				inghen.
				MAN 3025 - The
				mean final grade
				average was 88.2%
				with 100% of
				students completing
				the course with a
				final average of 75%
				or higher.
				5. mg//c/.
				MAR 3023 - The
				mean final grade
				average was 82.5%
				with 88% of
				students completing
				students completing

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 314

				the course with a final average of 75% or higher.
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate ability to apply knowledge of key concepts in accounting, finance, management and marketing to business problems and situations.	Final exams in ACG 3103, FIN 4443, MAN 3301, MAR 3823 2008-2009 Modification Final grades in MAR 3823 as only the Marketing major was offered at USFP.	Students will pass the final exams with a score of 60% or higher on each exam. 2008-2009 Modification Students will receive a final grade of C (75%) or better in MAR 3823.	Data on final exams were not available from Tampa data base. Student scores were not parsed by campus. 2008-2009 Results MAR 3823 – 87% of students received a final grade of C (75%) or better.	2009-2010 Results MAR 3823 – 98% of students received a final grade of C (75%) or better.
2008-2009 Critical Thinking - Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate critical thinking and analytical abilities, including the capability to engage in inductive, deductive, and quantitative reasoning and to construct sound arguments.	2008-2009 Case study analysis in ACG XXXX, FIN 4443, and MAN 3240; final exam in MAR 3823. 2008-2009 Modification Final grades in MAR 3823; the final exam accounts for 50% of the grade. Only the Marketing major was offered at USFP.	Students will receive a score of satisfactory/meets expectations on the case study and presentation rubric; students will pass the final exam with a score of 60% or higher. 2008-2009 Modification Students will receive a final grade of C (75%) or better in MAR 3823.	2008-2009 Results MAR 3823 – 87% of students received a final grade of C (75%) or better.	
2009-2010 Critical Thinking - Outcome 3. Based on student submission of a case study or project, students demonstrate critical thinking and analytical abilities.	2009-2010 Case study evaluated by a common rubric of 12 items in GEB 4890 or MAR 4824.	2009-2010 At least 70% of students will score a 2 (Moderate Critical Thinking Skill) on a scale of 1-3.		2009-2010 Results The mean score was 10.1, with a range of 9.5 to 10.6. 100% of students received a score of 2 or better.
Communication Skills - Outcome 4. Students will demonstrate effective communication in discussion, presentation, and written analysis and recommendation.	Case study analysis and presentation in ACG 3103, FIN 4443, and MAN XXXX; final exam in MAR 3823.	Students will receive a score of satisfactory/meets expectations on the case study and presentation rubric; students will pass the final exam with a score of 60% or higher.	Data were not available from Tampa data base. Student scores were reported in ALC in total rather than parsed by campus.	

	2008-2009 Modification Final grades in MAR 3823; the final exam accounts for 50% of the grade. Only the Marketing major was offered at USFP.	2008-2009 Modification Students will receive a final grade of C (75%) or better in MAR 3823.	2008-2009 Results MAR 3823 – 87% of students received a final grade of C (75%) or better.	2009-2010 Results MAR 3823 – 98% of students received a final grade of C (75%) or better.
2009-2010 Communication - Outcome 4. Based on student submission of a case study project and presentation to the class, students will demonstrate effective oral/verbal communication and use of presentation skills.	2009-2010 Students' case study analyses and oral presentation skills will be assessed by a rubric in GEB 4890 or MAR 4824.	2009-2010 At least 70% of students will score a 2 (Moderate Skills) on a scale of 1-3.		2009-2010 Results 90% of students scored a 2 (Moderate Skills) on a scale of 1-3, with a mean score of 2.3.
2009-2010 Communication - Outcome 5. Based on student submission of a case study project , students will demonstrate effective writing skills.	Students' case study project writing skills will be assessed by a rubric in GEB 4890 or MAR 4824.	At least 70% of students will score a 2 (Moderate Skills) on a scale of 1-3.		70% of students scored a 2 (Moderate Skills) on a scale of 1-3, with a mean score of 1.8.

USE OF RESULTS. Assessment outcomes and measurements were developed by the Tampa department. USF Polytechnic faculty were required to use them but had minimal input in development or access to data. Because final exam data had not been parsed by campus for 2008-2009 by the Tampa department, the **Outcome 1** assessment method was modified to enable data collection at the campus, using final grades in FIN 3403, MAR 3023 and MAN 3025 for summer 2008, fall 2008 and spring 2009. The expectation was modified in 2009-2010 to set a benchmark of 75% of students completing FIN 3403, MAR 3023 and MAN 3025 with a final course average of 75% or higher. The use of final grades in the absence of final exam score reports from the Tampa department is not the best measure of student performance but provided at least some baseline information regarding student success. Adding a benchmark of 75% of student completing the three courses with a final course average of 75% or higher was a somewhat better measure, but still insufficient. Both measures, however, helped to identify the Finance course as an area for improvement. The assessment method for Outcome 1 will be revised. Tutorials will be added for students in the Finance course.

Outcome 2 uses the final grades from MAR 3823, as the Marketing major was the only discipline-specific major offered at USFP. While students do well, the use of final grades is not sufficient for assessment, and the program will move to the ETS Marketing major exam for the assessment of the major.

The use of a case study evaluated by a common rubric of 12 items in GEB 4890 or MAR 4824 was an acceptable assessment for **Outcome 3.** The rubric was reviewed and enhanced for 2009-2010. Faculty intend to move to using

a capstone project in MAR 4824 and GEB 4890, evaluated through the use of a rubric in 2010-2011. Students are expected to demonstrate more integrative skills through the capstone project.

Communication **Outcomes 4 and 5** indicated that students' oral communication skills were stronger than their written communication skills. Use of the rubric and assessment results will be monitored in 2010-2011, and possible writing assistance explored through collaboration with the English faculty.

ALCs have been revised for 2010-2011 as USFP assumes responsibility for its own assessments and assessment data management. In AY 2010-2011 the ETS Examination for Business Administration will be given at the undergraduate level as well as the comprehensive examination for the MBA. The ETS exam at the undergraduate level includes disaggregation of results by field as well (e.g., management, marketing).

Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration (Marketing Concentration)

The B.S. in General Business Administration – Marketing concentration focuses on advocacy for consumers, understanding their needs, and developing meaningful relationships with them. Students pay particular attention to the marketing mix (product, price, place, promotion) and how marketers create value for individuals and organizations. Students address topics in marketing ethics throughout their coursework, covering the societal marketing concept and best practices in advertising, pricing, product quality, and more. The program provides students with real world skills that will greatly increase their ability to succeed in our rapidly evolving knowledge-based economy. USF Polytechnic began offering the Marketing major in Fall 2008.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Students will work in	At least 60% of	MAR 4824 not	Mean score 2.1 with
Outcome 1.	teams to analyze and	students will	offered until AY	2% of students
Students will	present case	demonstrate a	2009-2010.	scoring 1.
demonstrate ability	analyses in the	Satisfactory (3) level		
to collect, analyze	capstone course	of performance.		
and use information	(MAR 4824			
about customers,	Marketing			
competitors and the	Management			
environment	Problems); assessed			
(develop and use	using a rubric, based			
primary and	on a 5-point scale.			
secondary research				
data).				
Knowledge & Skills -	Students will work in	At least 60% of	MAR 4824 not	Mean score 2.3 with
Outcome 2.	teams to analyze	students will	offered until AY	no student scoring
Students will	cases and present	demonstrate a	2009-2010.	1.
demonstrate ability	marketing plans in	Satisfactory (3) level		
to develop	the capstone course	of performance.		
marketing plans,	(MAR 4824			
including strategies	Marketing			
designed to achieve	Management			
specific goals.	Problems); assessed			

Bachelor of Science in General Business Administration (Marketing Concentration) Academic Learning Compact Results

Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 3.	using a rubric, based on a 5-point scale. A random selection	At least 60% of		
		At least COV/ of		
		AT least 60% Of	87% of students	98% of students
	of items in a	students will	scored 70% or	scored 70% or
Students will	program test bank of	achieve a score of	higher, based on	higher, based on
demonstrate ability	questions will be	70%.	final grades for the	final grades for the
to apply marketing	embedded in exams	, 0,01	course.	course.
concepts and skills,	in MAR 3823			
including	Marketing			
relationship	Management.			
marketing, market				
segmentation and				
targeting,				
competitor analysis				
and selling skills.				
Critical Thinking –	Students complete	At least 60% of	MAR 4824 not	Mean score 2.25
Outcome 4.	oral presentations in	students will	offered until AY	with no students
Students will	the capstone course	demonstrate a	2009-2010.	scoring 1 (Low).
demonstrate ability	(MAR 4824	Satisfactory (2) level		
to develop effective,	Marketing	of performance.		
persuasive oral	Management			
presentations of	Problems); assessed			
complex concepts	using a rubric, based			
including the ability	on a 3-point scale.			
to analyze and				
organize data, draw				
and support				
conclusions, and				
make appropriate				
recommendations.				
Communication	Students complete	At least 60% of	MAR 4824 not	Mean score 2.5 with
Skills – Outcome 5.	oral presentations in	students will	offered until AY	no students scoring
Students will	the capstone course	demonstrate a	2009-2010.	1 (Low).
demonstrate ability	(MAR 4824	Satisfactory (2) level		
to develop effective,	Marketing	of performance.		
persuasive oral	Management			
presentations of	Problems); assessed			
complex concepts,	using a rubric, based			
including the ability	on a 3-point scale.			
to organize ideas				
and data, use				
presentation				
software and other				
audiovisual aids,				
and respond				
incisively to				
	1			
questions.				
•	I ISF Polytechnic began o	offering the Marketing	major in Fall 2008.	Faculty reviewed the
USE OF RESULTS. U assessments, student	l ISF Polytechnic began o performance data and i n Marketing was planned	rubrics to determine ap	propriateness for outc	omes assessment. The

Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering

The B.S. in Industrial Engineering provides students with designated, specialized coursework in industrial processes, work analysis, production control, facilities design, operations research, human factors, computer simulation, quality control, and robotics and automation. Engineering courses are taught on a two-year rotation. Both students in the B.S. in Industrial Engineering and in the B.S.A.S. Industrial Operations concentration take the same required assessments.

Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering and Bachelor of Science in Applied Science – Industrial	
Operations Concentration	

Academic Learning Compact Results					
Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance Expectation	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results	
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 1. Students will demonstrate ability to evaluate and propose solutions for a management problem.	Case study solutions, assessed by rubric, in ETG 3612 Operations Management	100% of students will achieve 180 points out of 240 possible points (75%) in solutions for six (6) out of thirteen (13) case studies.	ETG 3612 was taught in Fall 2007. 5 students (100%) scored at 75% or above.	ETG 3612 was taught in Fall 2009. Mean score: 201.2 9 students (67%) at or above 180 points; 3 students (33%) below 180 points.	
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate knowledge of different quality systems to manage a manufacturing process effectively.	Three project ventures, assessed by rubric, in ETI 4116 Industrial Quality Control	100% of students will achieve 275 (91%) points out of 300 possible points.	No data in INFOCENTER for Spring 2008.	ETI 4116 was taught in Spring 2010. Mean score: 251.7 50% of students at or above 275	
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 3. Students will be able to determine, evaluate, and pro- pose ergonomically and economically feasible solutions in work station design.	Work design project, assessed by rubric, in EIN 3241 Work Design & Ergonomics I	100% of students will achieve 150 points out of 200 possible points (75%).	EIN 3241 was taught in Fall 2008. 7 students (58%) scored at 75% or above.	Course will be taught in Fall 2010.	
Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 4. Students will demonstrate the ability to select an appropriate quantitative model for the analysis of an industrial operations problem and obtain a	Project report, assessed by rubric, in ETG 3612 Operations Management	100% of students will achieve 113 points out of 150 possible points (75%).	ETG 3612 was taught in Fall 2007. 5 students (62%) scored at 75% or above.	ETG 3612 was taught in Fall 2009. Mean 115.44; 6 students (75%) scored 113 points or higher.	

Academic Learning Compact Results

solution.				
Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 5. Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze basic process data using an appropriate statistical testing method.	Three project ventures, assessed by rubric, in ETI 4116 Industrial Quality Control (BSIE)	100% of students will achieve 275 points out of 300 possible points (91%).	No data in INFOCENTER for Spring 2008.	ETI 4116 was taught in Spring 2010. Mean score: 251.7 50% of students at or above 275
Communication Skills - Outcome 6. Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate analysis of real- world problems in a business style report.	Work design project, assessed by rubric, in EIN 3241 Work Design & Ergonomics I	100% of students will achieve 150 points out of 200 possible points (75%).	EIN 3241 was taught in Fall 2008. 8 students (80%) scored at 75% or above.	Course will be taught in Fall 2010.
Communication Skills - Outcome 7. Students will demonstrate the ability to work successfully in a team and produce a written report.	Group project, assessed by rubric, in EIN 4242 Work Design & Ergonomics II	100% of students will achieve 150 points out of 200 possible points (75%).	EIN 4242 was taught in Spring 2009. 7 students (88%) scored 75% or above.	Course will be taught in Spring 2011.
Elluminate sessions to	e venture projects in E review and practice Sta	atistics problems will be	added in 2010-2011. It	was noted that some

students had difficulty adjusting to a fully online course environment. Technical supports for students will be increased during the first few weeks of the course in 2010-2011, as well as support for making presentations online.

Bachelor of Science in Information Technology

The <u>B.S. in Information Technology</u> is designed to bridge the gap between computer science and management information systems, providing students with knowledge of rapidly changing technology. The BSIT program emphasizes knowledge-based computer and information technology, traditional computer science concepts, as well as more practical topics including programming, applications, networking, systems administration and the management of a variety of computing environments.

Bachelor of Science in Information Technology Academic Learning Compact Results

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results	
		Expectation			
Knowledge & Skills -	Discipline-specific	Students will score a	89% of students (8	56% of students (5	
Outcome 1.	skills rubric used to	2 (Proficiency) or	out of 9) scored	out of 6) scored	
Students will solve	assess student IT	higher.	High Proficiency (3);	High Proficiency (3);	
practical problems	colloquium		11% (1 out of 9)	11% (1 out of 9)	

by designing and developing tailored IT solutions that demonstrate the student mastery of content/discipline skills.	presentations, using a 3-point rating scale.		scored Satisfactory Proficiency (2).	scored Satisfactory Proficiency (2); 33% of students (3 out of 9) scored Limited Proficiency (1).
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate an understanding of fundamental knowledge about operating systems concepts and algorithms.	Two questions in exams in COP 4610 IT Operating Systems, assessed using a rubric on a 3- point scale.	Students will score a 2 (Acceptable Proficiency) or higher.	77% of students (20 out of 26) scored High Proficiency (3); 15% of students scored Satisfactory Proficiency (2); and 8% of students (2 out of 26) scored Limited Proficiency (1).	100% of students (4 out of 4) scored High Proficiency (3).
Critical Thinking - Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate ability to consider alternative approaches and/or technologies in the design of an application, and choose an appropriate approach.	Student performance in the IT Colloquium presentation will be assessed using a critical thinking rubric based on a 3- point rating scale.	Students will score a 2 (Proficiency) or higher.	33% of students (3 out of 9) scored High Proficiency (3); 67% of students (6 out of 9) scored Satisfactory Proficiency (2).	33% of students (3 out of 9) scored High Proficiency (3); 22% of students (2 out of 9) scored between Satisfactory and High Proficiency; 44% of students (4 out of 9) scored Limited Proficiency (1).
Critical Thinking - Outcome 4. Students will demonstrate ability to identify ethical questions and dilemmas in the information technology field.	A case study analysis in CIS 4253 IT Ethics will be assessed for students' understanding of ethical dilemmas and social impact of information technology, using a rubric based on a 3- point rating scale.	Students will score a 2 (Satisfactory) or higher.	63% of students (32 out of 51) scored Outstanding (3); 8% (4 out of 51) scored Satisfactory (2); and 29% of students (15 out of 51) scored Unsatisfactory (1).	13% of students (28 out of 223) scored Outstanding (3); 58% (129 out of 223) scored Satisfactory (2); and 30% of students (66 out of 223) scored Unsatisfactory (1).
Communication Skills- Outcome 5. Students will demonstrate ability to organize and deliver effective presentations to convey technical information to an audience.	Student performance in the IT Colloquium presentation will be assessed using a rubric based on a 3- point rating scale.	Students will score a 2 (Proficiency) or higher.	89% of students (8 out of 9) scored High Proficiency (3); 11% of students (1 out of 9) scored Satisfactory Proficiency (2).	56% of students (5 out of 9) scored High Proficiency (3); 33% of students (3 out of 9) scored Satisfactory Proficiency (2); 11% of students (1 out of 9) scored Limited Proficiency (1).

USE OF RESULTS. The IT department faculty consider that if at least 50% of students are assessed at a high (Outstanding) or Satisfactory (Acceptable) level of performance in a given outcome, that outcome has been achieved. In 2008-2009 Outcomes 1, 2 and 5 were achieved. Outcome 3 was achieved overall, but only 33% of students scored at High Proficiency. Outcome 4 was achieved overall, but 29% of students scored Unsatisfactory. Faculty will examine the assessment questions and ratings for inter-rater reliability and validity of the two questions used in Outcome 2. A training workshop will be provided to the faculty assessing outcomes. Assistance will be requested from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to organize the workshop and assist in monitoring and measuring inter-rater reliability. Assessment rubrics will be refined, and validity of the assessment questions will be examined. While Outcome 4 was achieved overall, faculty will continue to monitor results in Outcome 4 and examine factors that may contribute to students' perspectives on ethics and performance on the assessment.

In 2009-2010 all Outcomes were achieved. For Outcome 3 raters were in disagreement 33% of the time. The department will provide a small training workshop for faculty assessing Outcome 3. In addition all assessment rubrics will be reviewed and refined where needed.

Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Social Science

The B.A. in Interdisciplinary Social Science gives students a variety of options within the social sciences. It allows students to tailor the program to suit their interests by selecting courses to develop two areas of focus (cognates). Students select four courses from each of the two cognates they select. USF Polytechnic offers cognates in aging studies-gerontology, criminology, psychology and sociology. All cognates are assessed through the three common core courses: STA 2122 Social Sciences Statistics (or PSY 3204 Psychological Statistics), ISS 3010 Introduction to Social Sciences, and ISS 4935 Seminar in the Social Sciences.

Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Social Science
Academic Learning Compact Results

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	Students will	Students will score	89% of students	83% of students
Outcome 1.	complete a research	Satisfactory (3) or	scored Satisfactory	scored Satisfactory
Students will	project in the	better.	or better.	or better.
demonstrate ability	capstone course (ISS			
to employ	4935) assessed using			
principles, methods	a rubric, based on a			
and theories behind	4-point scale.			
interdisciplinary				
inquiry.	Students will rate the	85% of students will	100% of students in	97% of students in
	degree to which the	rate the degree to	ISS 3010 rated the	ISS 3010 and ISS
	outcome has been	which the outcome	achievement of	4935 rated the
	met in two courses:	has been met in	Outcome 1 as met	achievement of
	ISS 3010	both courses as Met	somewhat	Outcome 1 as Met
	Introduction to	(3) or higher.	successfully or	Successfully.
	Social Sciences and		better with 60%	
	ISS 4935 Seminar in		indicating met very	
	Social Sciences		successfully or	
	(capstone course),		completely	
	using a rubric based		successfully.	

				ī
	on a 4-point scale		93% of students in	
	and compared		ISS 4935 rated the	
			achievement of	
			Outcome 1 as met	
			very or completely	
			successfully.	
Knowledge & Skills -	Students will	Students will score	89% of students	100% of students
Outcome 2.	complete a research	Satisfactory (3) or	scored Satisfactory	scored Satisfactory
Students will	project in the	better.	or better.	or better.
identify and	capstone course (ISS			
articulate principles,	4935) assessed using			
methods and	a rubric, based on a			
theories the Social	4-point scale.			
Sciences.				
	Students will rate the	Students will rate	100% of students in	97% of students in
	degree to which the	the degree to which	ISS 3010 rated the	ISS 3010 and ISS
	outcome has been	the outcome has	achievement of	4935 rated the
	met in two courses:	been met in both	Outcome 2 as met	achievement of
	ISS 3010	courses as Met (3)	somewhat	Outcome 2 as Met
	Introduction to	or higher.	successfully or	somewhat
	Social Sciences and		better with 70%	successfully or
	ISS 4935 Seminar in		indicating met very	better with 88%
	Social Sciences		successfully or	indicating met very
	(capstone course),		completely	successfully or
	using a rubric based		successfully.	extremely
	on a 4-point scale		100% of students in	successfully.
	and compared		ISS 4935 rated the	
			achievement of	
			Outcome 2 as met	
			somewhat	
			successfully or	
			better with 93% of	
			students indicating	
			very or completely	
			successfully.	
Critical Thinking –	Students will	Students will score	89% of students	100% of students
Outcome 3.	complete a research	Satisfactory (3) or	scored Satisfactory	scored Satisfactory
Students will	project in the	better.	or better.	or better; 67%
demonstrate ability	capstone course (ISS	better		scored Outstanding.
to analyze	4935) assessed using			
information relating	a rubric, based on a			
to social issues.	4-point scale.			
	Students will rate the	Students will rate	100% of students in	97% of students in
	degree to which the	the degree to which	ISS 3010 rated the	ISS 3010 and 4935
	outcome has been	the outcome has	achievement of	rated the
	met in two courses:	been met in both	Outcome 3 as met	achievement of
	ISS 3010	courses as Met (3)	somewhat	Outcome 3 as met
	Introduction to	or higher.	successfully or	successfully or
	Social Sciences and		better with 80%	better with 86%
	ISS 4935 Seminar in		indicating met very	indicating met very
	Social Sciences		successfully or	successfully or
	Social Sciences		successionly of	succession UI

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 323

				
	(capstone course), using a rubric based on a 4-point scale and compared		completely successfully. 100% of students in ISS 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 3 as met very or completely successfully.	extremely successfully.
Critical Thinking – Outcome 4. Students will demonstrate ability to employ qualitative or quantitative social science	Students will complete a research project in the capstone course (ISS 4935) assessed using a rubric, based on a 4-point scale.	Students will score Satisfactory (3) or better.	89% of students scored Satisfactory or better.	73% of students scored Satisfactory or better; 40% scored Outstanding.
methodology.	Students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been met in two courses: ISS 3010 Introduction to Social Sciences and ISS 4935 Seminar in Social Sciences (capstone course), using a rubric based on a 4-point scale and compared	85% of students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been met in both courses as Met (3) or higher.	100% of students in ISS 3010 rated the achievement of Outcome 4 as met somewhat successfully or better with 78% indicating met very successfully or completely successfully. 100% of students in ISS 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 4 as met very or completely successfully.	91% of students in ISS 3010 and 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 4 as met successfully or better with 58% indicating met very successfully or extremely successfully.
Communication Skills – Outcome 5. Students will communicate analytical skills in written form.	Students will complete a research paper in the capstone course (ISS 4935) assessed using a rubric, based on a 4-point scale.	Students will score Satisfactory (3) or better.	89% of students scored Satisfactory or better.	100% of students scored Satisfactory or better; 65% scored Outstanding.
	Students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been met in two courses: ISS 3010 Introduction to Social Sciences and ISS 4935 Seminar in Social Sciences (capstone course), using a rubric based	85% of students will rate the degree to which the outcome has been met in both courses as Met (3) or higher.	100% of students in ISS 3010 rated the achievement of Outcome 1 as met somewhat successfully or better with 60% indicating met very successfully or completely successfully.	97% of students in ISS 3010 and 4935 rated the achievement of Outcome 4 as met successfully or better with 79% indicating met very successfully or extremely successfully.

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 324
on a 4-point scale and compared	100% of students in ISS 4935 rated the
	achievement of
	Outcome 1 as met
	very or completely
	successfully.

USE OF RESULTS. The rubric used for the capstone course research project and paper (ISS 4935) was designed by the Tampa Department. It is not closely aligned with the course expectations at USF Polytechnic, so the rubric needs to be redesigned. Overall student assessment of the degree to which ISS 3010 and 4935 achieved its outcomes was positive. Student scores in Outcome 4 were lower than the other outcomes. Faculty have discussed a more integrated approach to presenting information on social science methodology to improve student performance in this area. Faculty will work to continue to improve the courses so more students rate their experiences as very or extremely successful.

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

Psychology prepares students to better understand human behavior and mental processing and develop scientific applications that improve the overall human condition. A bachelor's degree in psychology at USF Polytechnic emphasizes critical thinking skills and knowing how to formulate effective questions and research the answers. The program content focuses on abnormal, social, developmental, clinical and industrial psychology along with courses in cognition, perception, learning motivation and physiological psychology.

Outcome Assessment Method 2008-2009 Results 2009-2010 Results Performance Expectation Knowledge & Skills -A pool of multiple Students will No data obtained Students averaged Outcome 1. choice items from average 75% correct from Tampa 51% correct on the Students will which five common on the set of department. set of common demonstrate items each semester common items. However, 75% of items. However, knowledge of will be chosen and students averaged 74% of students descriptive administered to all 75% or better in averaged 75% or final grades for the statistics, including students taking PSY better in final 3204 (Psychological definitions, course. grades for the computation, and Statistics). course. application. Knowledge & Skills -Students will A pool of multiple No data obtained Students averaged Outcome 2. choice items from average 75% correct from Tampa 51% correct on the Students will which five common on the set of department. set of common demonstrate items each semester common items. However, 75% of items. However, knowledge of will be chosen and students averaged 74% of students inferential statistics, administered to all 75% or better in averaged 75% or Including students taking PSY final grades for the better in final 3204 (Psychological grades for the definitions, course. computation, and Statistics). course. application. Knowledge & Skills -A pool of multiple No data obtained Students will Students averaged Outcome 3. choice items from average 75% correct from Tampa 37% correct on the

Bachelor of Arts in Psychology

Academic Learning Compact Results

Students will	which five common	on the set of	department.	set of common
demonstrate the	items each semester	common items.	However, 76% of	items. However,
ability to apply	will be chosen and		students averaged	66% of students
knowledge the	administered to all		75% or better in	averaged 75% or
accepted ethical	students taking PSY		final grades for the	better in final
principles and	3213 (Research		course.	grades for the
practices in the use	Methods in			course.
of humans and	Psychology).			
nonhuman animals				
in research.				
Critical Thinking -	Students in PSY 3213	The student mean	No data obtained	66% of students
Outcome 4.	(Research Methods)	will be at least 75	from Tampa	averaged 75% or
Students will	will collect data,	percent of the	department.	better in final
demonstrate the	analyze the data, and	points possible in	However, 76% of	grades for the
ability to choose a	write a research	the rubric.	students averaged	course.
method appropriate	report, assessed by a		75% or better in	
to answering a	rubric based on a 5-		final grades for the	
research question,	point scale.		course.	
apply the chosen				
method properly to				
data collected, and				
reason soundly				
about the inference				
based upon the				
data collection and				
analysis as it relates				
to the research				
question.				
Additionally,				
students will be able				
to display an				
awareness of				
internal and				
external validity of				
psychological				
studies.	Students' final	The student mean	No data obtained	66% of students
Communication Skills - Outcome 5.	Students' final research projects	The student mean will be at least 75	from Tampa	averaged 75% or
Students will	from the Research	percent of the	department.	better in final
demonstrate writing	Methods course	points possible in	However, 76% of	grades for the
•				•
skills by producing	(PSY 3213) will be	the rubric.	students averaged	course.
research reports	assessed using a		75% or better in	
in APA style	departmental rubric		final grades for the	
containing all	based on APA		course.	
components of a	format and clarity of			
scholarly research	written expression.			
manuscript.			1	

USE OF RESULTS. As no data were obtainable from the Tampa department, the Psychology faculty developed and started implementation of a standardized procedure for collection and evaluation of student results, and moved forward during 2009-2010 to analyze assessment data. Common test items were piloted in 2009-2010. Analysis of student performance on the Psychological Statistics tests indicated problems with several items in relation to item discrimination index and item difficulty indices. These items will be revised for the test's next administration in

2010-2011. Analysis of student performance on the Research Methods test indicated problems with several items in relation to item discrimination index and item difficulty indices. Again, these items will be revised for the test's next administration in 2010-2011. In addition, faculty are examining the degree curriculum, noting, for example, that ethics is addressed in multiple courses but not assessed. Items should be developed to do so. Also, assessments should be given in the courses that address the content, rather than in a single exam. Faculty will continue to work on developing and refining assessments.

OVERVIEW of 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 Assessment Results Graduate Programs

Master of Arts in Counselor Education

The M. A. in Counselor Education prepares professional counselors to facilitate the development of individuals and assist in enriching the quality of their lives. The major goals of the program are to train practitioners who:

- Provide helping interventions for individuals, groups and organizations.
- Serve as effective counselors in schools and community agencies.
- Provide leadership in educational and human service settings.
- Use the resources of the family, school and the community to meet the developmental needs of the client.

The **Community/Mental Health Plan** adheres to the curriculum requirements for licensure as a Mental Health Counselor (LMHC) in the State of Florida and to the standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The plan's curriculum emphasizes: the helping relationship; human growth and development; group dynamics, processing and counseling; lifestyle and career development; social and cultural foundations; appraisal of individuals; research and evaluation; and professional orientation.

Students who complete the Community/Mental Health Plan may, if they elect to do so, take the State LMHC exam. The licensure process takes 24 months following completion of all curriculum requirements and application to the State of Florida as an LMHC intern. All licenses are public on the Florida Department of Health licensure verification website. A review of the most recent postings of students graduating from USF Polytechnic in years 2005 and 2007 (the 2006 cohort did not have a graduating class) indicate that of the fourteen (14) graduates:

- 9 graduates have a documented State of Florida License
- 2 graduates are employed at a facility where licensure is not encouraged
- 1 graduate changed his/her name and is unknown
- 1 graduate with a terminal illness is not seeking licensure
- 1 graduate took a job in Georgia immediately following graduation

In the **Professional School Counseling Plan** students gain general counseling skills plus specialized knowledge about school counseling. This program provides course work and knowledge necessary to pass the Florida Guidance Counseling Certification exam. Students must pass the FGCC exam administered through The Florida Department of Education prior to being allowed to intern. Since the internship and subsequent graduation is predicated on the student passing this exam, 100% of the graduates from the Professional School Counseling Plan achieve this certification. The Professional

School Counseling plan at USFP exceeds the requirements of State of Florida and adheres to the standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Master of Arts in Counselor Education
Academic Learning Compact Results

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills - Outcome 1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of key counseling concepts.	Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination(CPCE), a national standardized exam	90% of Counselor Education students will pass the comprehensive exam on the first administration.	88% of students (8 out of 9) passed the comprehensive exam.	94% of students (16 out of 17) passed the comprehensive exam. Two re-takes from 2008-2009 also passed.
Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2. Practicum students will demonstrate competence with respect to specific clinical counseling skills.	Field supervisor/ practicum advisor rating of student's competence, using a multi-criterion rubric based on a 5-point scale.	90% of Counselor Education students will receive a rating of 3 or higher.	100% of students received a rating of 3 or higher.	100% of students received a rating of 3 or higher.
Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 3. Students will demonstrate the successful application of classroom learning to work.	Field supervisor/ Internship advisor rating of student's application of classroom learning in their specialized subject matter during final practicum, using a multi-criterion rubric based on a 4-point scale.	90% of Counselor Education students will receive a rating of 3 or above on a 4- point scale from their field supervisor and internship advisor.	100% of students received a rating of 3 or higher.	100% of students received a rating of 3 or higher.

USE OF RESULTS. Weakest scores on the **comprehensive exam** were in areas of career guidance and educational research. Courses in both areas were online. In summer 2009 both courses were offered in traditional on campus format to see if there is a difference in test performance. Scores improved. Results will continue to be monitored. Results confirm that the pre-service **clinical training** sequence produces the desired outcome in counselor skill development. Two students in 2008-2009 had failed to complete the practicum due to poor attendance in seminars and tardiness in the work environment. More emphasis was placed on professional responsibility in the Ethics course and Practicum seminar. Anecdotal evidence suggests that **employers** are very satisfied with graduates. An assessment to get feedback from employers on specific strengths and limitations would be helpful for program adjustments, and program faculty will explore the development of an employer satisfaction assessment.

Master of Education in Educational Leadership

The M.Ed. in Educational Leadership focuses on the development, implementation, and generation of outcomes in the organization and management of K-12 education. At USF Polytechnic, the M.Ed. is designed to provide educational leaders, policy makers, and researchers the skills needed to design and implement strategies that improve practice and outcomes in educational organizations. Courses required in the program address the Florida Principal Leadership Standards specified by the Florida Department of Education and prepare students to take and pass the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) prior to applying for graduation from the program.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	An electronic	90% of students will	54 students	55 students
Outcome 1.	Comprehensive	earn an overall	Median Scores	Median Scores
Students will	Program EPortfolio,	(median)	Domain 1 Vision 2.8	Domain 1 Vision
demonstrate	assessed by	assessment rating of	Domain 2 Student	2.98
knowledge and	program faculty	2 (Meets	Performance 2.2	Domain 2 Student
competence in 7	relative using a	Requirements) or	Domain 3	Performance 2.84
domains aligned	multi-criterion rubric	higher	Organization	Domain 3
with state and	on a 3-point rating		Management 2.5	Organization
national standards	scale.		Domain 4	Management 2.74
for educational			Collaboration 2.7	Domain 4
leadership.			Domain 5 Ethics 2.2	Collaboration 2.96
-			Domain 6 Law &	Domain 5 Ethics
			Policy 2.6	2.73
			Domain 7	Domain 6 Law &
			Technology 2.5	Policy 2.81
			Synthesis of Theory,	Domain 7
			Research & Practice	Technology 2.95
			2.5	Synthesis of Theory,
				Research & Practice
				2.89
Knowledge & Skills -	Florida Educational	90% of students	All students passed	All students passed
Outcome 2.	Leadership	will pass each of the	the FELE with scores	the FELE with scores
Students will pass	Examination (FELE)	three Subtests of	above the state	above the state
the three		the FELE on the first	required passing	required passing
Subtests of the		administration	scale scores on each	scale scores on each
Florida Educational		scoring above	subtest.	subtest.
Leadership		the state required		USF Polytechnic
Examination (FELE)		mean in each of the		students must pass
on the first		three subtests.		the FELE in order to
administration.		In January 2009, the		graduate from the
		state of Florida		university; two
		implemented the		students did not
		revised FELE with		graduate due to
		three new Subtests.		incompletion of
				course work.
Critical Thinking -	Field supervisor/	90% of students will	100% of students	96% of students
Outcome 3.	Internship advisor	earn an overall	received a rating of	received a rating of

Master of Education in Educational Leadership Academic Learning Compact Results

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 329

demonstrate	application of	of Satisfactory (3) or	students (4%) did
knowledge,	classroom learning in	higher from their	not complete
dispositions and	their specialized	site-based K-12	internship
performance of	subject matter	supervisor and the	requirements.
the seven (7)	during final	university	
Leadership Domains	practicum, using a	supervisor.	
in a supervised	multi-criterion rubric		
internship.	based on a 4-point		
	scale.		

USE OF RESULTS. Faculty are assessing the validity of having one instructor assess each domain per the instructor's expertise and/or the content area of assigned teaching responsibilities. Consideration is being given to assigning two assessors per domain to ensure inter-rater reliability. Additionally, the areas below the 2.0 overall average will be addressed regarding the objectives, criteria and content in the course/s correlated to the specific domains to ascertain whether the course objectives, criteria and content are relevant to the established Educational Leadership domains. Faculty will reexamine course syllabi to ensure that that the FELE competencies are being taught for mastery. The new FELE Subtest Passing Scale Scores starting in 2009-2010 will be evaluated to see if pass rates change from historical scores of students. Consideration will be given to change to a final assessment of letter grade (A, B, C, D, F, I) determined by the assessment of each individual Administrative Internship activity with a weighted score value for each. Such an assessment will provide more validity to the final internship assessment, as well as provide a more accurate analysis of student performance ranging from A = Excellent Performance; B = Strong Performance; C = Satisfactory Performance; D = Unsatisfactory Performance; F = Unacceptable Performance.

The USF Polytechnic Educational Leadership faculty has reexamined the objectives, criteria, and content of each course syllabi to determine that each graduate course has been fully developed to assure that the Florida Principal Standards, which are the content of the FELE, are being taught for mastery. Course critical tasks have been determined and have been made a part of the course syllabi.

The USF Polytechnic Educational Leadership faculty will continue to review the internship for its completeness in better preparing students for future administrative assignments. Discussions will continue regarding expanding the internship to a six semester hour course covering a two semester period. Implementation of such a change will have to focus on the timing of accreditation and cooperation with the county school system.

Master of Arts in Reading Education

The M.A. in Reading Education is designed to prepare students with the appropriate skills to become reading specialists, teachers and supervisors and may lead to a Florida reading certificate in grades K-12. This program is designed for those that already have a Florida teaching certificate.

Graduates in the M.A. in Reading Education are required to pass the certification examination as a prerequisite for enrollment in the practicum in reading.

Outcome	Assessment Method	Performance	2008-2009 Results	2009-2010 Results
		Expectation		
Knowledge & Skills -	State of Florida K-12	Students will pass	100 % of candidates	Score reports from
Outcome 1.	certification exam	the state	for the Reading	the State until
Students will		certification exam.	Masters Program in	August 2010.
demonstrate a			2007-2008 and	
broad and working			2008-2009 passed	

Master of Arts in Reading Education Academic Learning Compact Results

reading and writing processes and instruction. An action research project in a Classroom, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale. Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2. Students completes a case study of a Students will students will a case study of a Students will a cases study of a student who is based on a 5-point scale. Students will achieve a score of 3 students completed the action research project with a mean score of 3.5; in 2008-2009, 15 students completed the case study of a students will achieve a score of 3 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54. Scores are not received until end of June 2010. Scores are not students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.42; in 2008-2009, 13 students score of 4.54. Skills - Outcome 3. Scores are not score of 4.54. Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher. Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher. Students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completing a presentations on a Iteracy topic. Both will be assessed by a students oral development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students' oral	lun availa al an an Cal			th - 1/ 42	[]
processes and instruction.An action research project in a Classroom, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 20 students completed the action research project with a mean score of 3.5; in 2008-2009, 15 students completed the project with a mean score of 3.62.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for implementing effective literacy assessents in educational stitigs and provide effective literacy istates to based on a 5-point scale.Students will active a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 20 students completed the age scudy with a mean score of 3.62.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate the effective literacy assessent is a educational stitigs and provide effective literacy interventions and recompletions that are based on the assessment completence by completing a propriate verbal and written for in-service treachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5- point scale.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan for in-service treachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professiona	knowledge of the foundations of				
Instruction.An action research project in a Classroom, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.Students will or higher.In 2007-2008, 20 students completed the action research project with a mean score of 3.5; in 2008-2009, 15 students completed the action research project with a mean score of 3.62.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills,Students completed case study of a student who is having problems in reading and writing, assessements in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.4.2; in 2008-2009, 11 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Communication skills - Outcome 3. Students will use appropriate verbal and mritten skills.Candidates will display their written competence by completing a professional development plan moressional development plan moressional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional 	reading and writing			their first attempt.	
project in a Classroom, assessed by a rubric based on a S-point scale.achieve a score of 3 or higher.students completed the action research mean score of 3.5; in 2008-2009, 15 students completed the project with a mean score of 3.62.received until end of June 2010.Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2.Students complete a case study of a students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for mapter wither verbia and provide effective literacy assessments in that are based on a S-point stulatents will defucational settings and provide effective literacy assessments in that are based on a Sudents will deucational settings and provide effective literacy assessment in the assessment results.Students will students will display their written completed student will sea scale.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.42; in 2008-2009, 11 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.In 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008, 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students' oralIn 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students' oral	processes and				
Classroom, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.or higher.the action research project with a mean score of 3.5; in 2008-2009, 15 students completed the project with a mean score of 3.62.June 2010.Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for implementing effective literacy interventions and recommendations studaets will and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations skills - Outcome 3.Students will aciale swill aciale swill display their written completing a professional development plan and written completing skills.Students will aciale swill aciale swill display their written completing a professional development plan skills.In 2007-2008, 21 students will aciale swill aciale swill aciale swill aciale set on the assessment results.In 2007-2008, 21 students completide the case students completed the case students completed the case students completed the case students completed the case students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008-2000, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students oral interacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students oral development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students oralIn 2009-20010, 7 students development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students oral <td>instruction.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td>	instruction.			-	
by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.project with a mean score of 3.5; in 2008-2009, 15 students completed the project with a mean score of 3.62Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2.Students complete a case study of a student who is having problems in reading and writing, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.42; in 2008-2009, 11 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Communication Skills.Candidates will display their written completing a professional development plan for in-service trackers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy torbug beass presentations on a literacy torbug beassed by a rubric, based on a 5-Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the case students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.In 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.Communication skills.Candidates will display their written completing a professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 studentsIn 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.The rubric to assess rubric, based on a 5-Stud					
a 5-point scale.score of 3.5; in 2008-2009, 15 students completed the project with a mean score of 3.62.Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2.Students completed a case study of a students will demonstrate the having problems in reading and writing, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2.Student who is having problems in reading and writing, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Scores of 4.54.Scores of 4.54.Communication Students will and written competence by completing a professional development plan skills.Candidates will display their written completing a professional development plan professional development plan professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students' oralIn 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students' oral			or nigher.		June 2010.
Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate the knowledge and sklip eccessary for assessments in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment sculation writen competence by completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both wills.Students will students will active a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Communication skills.Candidates will display their writhen appropriate verbal and writhen completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric based on a 5- point scale.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 05.15 studentsIn 2009-20010, 7 studentsStudent will and written completing a professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students' oralIn 2009-20010, 7 students'		•			
Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2.Students complete a case study of a students will demonstrate the having problems in reading and writing, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.4.2; in 2008-2009, 11 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Precent of the sesses of by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.Students will assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.Students will achieve a score of 4.54.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.4.2; in 2008-2009, 11 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.In 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.In 2009-20010, 7Students will se appropriate verbal and written computing a presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rub					
Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and reading and writing, assessments in educational settings and provide effective literacy students will and provide effective literacy interventions and reading and writiten competence by competence by com					
Critical Thinking Skills - Outcome 2.Students complete a case study of a student who is having problems in reading and writing, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point sessements in educational settings and provide effective literacy assessment results.Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.42; in 2008-2009, 11 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Communication Stills.Candidates will display their written completence the ordersonal development plan mominication skills.In 2007-2008, 21 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Scores are not received until end of June 2010.Communication skills.Candidates will display their written completence by completing a professional development plan mith a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students oral development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students oralIn 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students' oral					
Skills - Outcome 2. Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for implementing effective literacy assessments in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessmentcase study of a student who is having problems in reading and writing, assessents in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and presentations that are based on the assessmentcase study of a students will display their written completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their werbal completence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a 35-students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.received until end of June 2010.Skills - Outcome 3. Skills.Candidates will display their written completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their werbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a sessed by a 5-Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 13.55 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.In 2009-2010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.					
Students will demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for implementing effective literacy assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.or higher.the case study with a mean score of 4.42; in 2008-2009, 11 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.June 2010.add provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results.Candidates will display their written completence by completence by completed the professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence by completed competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.In 2009-2010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.	-				
demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary for implementing effective literacy assessments in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results.having problems in reading and writing, assessed by a rubric based on a 5-point scale.a mean score of 4.42; in 2008-2009, 11 students completed the case study with a mean score of 4.54.Communication Skills - Outcome 3. Skills - Outcome 4.Candidates will display their written competence by completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-Students will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.In 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.Will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-The rubric to assess students' oralIn 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 studentsIn 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57.		-			
knowledge and skills necessary for implementing effective literacy assessments in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Students will use appropriate verbal and written completing a professional development plan skills. Kills - Utione 5, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-point scale. Additional settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Skills - Utione 3. Students will and written completence by completence			or nigher.		June 2010.
necessary for implementing effective literacy assessments in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Students will use appropriate verbal and written computed their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-		• ·			
effective literacy assessments in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Students will use appropriate verbal and written completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal completence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-	necessary for				
assessments in educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Students will use appropriate verbal and written competence by completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-	implementing	based on a 5-point		completed the case	
educational settings and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Stills - Outcome 3. Students will use appropriate verbal and written competence by completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-	effective literacy	scale.			
and provide effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Students will use appropriate verbal and written communication skills. Candidates will sudents will and written communication skills. Candidates will sudents will achieve a score of 3 or higher. Candidates completed the professional development plan for in-service through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-				score of 4.54.	
effective literacy interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Students will use appropriate verbal and written computence by completing a professional development plan skills. Students will use appropriate verbal and written computence by completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-	-				
interventions and recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Skills - Outcome 3. Students will use appropriate verbal and written computence by completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-	-				
recommendations that are based on the assessment results. Communication Skills - Outcome 3. Students will use appropriate verbal and written communication skills. Students will students completed the professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-	-				
the assessment results. Communication Skills - Outcome 3. Students will adisplay their written competence by completing a and written communication skills. Communication skills. Competence by completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-	recommendations				
results.Candidates willStudents willIn 2007-2008, 24In 2009-20010, 7Skills - Outcome 3.display their written competence by appropriate verbal and written communicationStudents will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24In 2009-20010, 7Students will use appropriate verbal and written communication skills.In 2007-2008, 24In 2009-20010, 7Students will use appropriate verbal and written completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-In 2007-2008, 24In 2009-20010, 7Students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.14.In 2007-2008, 24In 2009-20010, 7Students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.57. The rubric to assess students' oralIn 2009-20010, 7	that are based on				
CommunicationCandidates will display their written competence by appropriate verbal and written communicationStudents will achieve a score of 3 or higher.In 2007-2008, 24 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-In 2007-2008, 24 students will achieve a score of 3In 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.14.In 2009-20010, 7 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.14.	the assessment				
Skills - Outcome 3.display their written competence by completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-achieve a score of 3 or higher.students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.14.students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.14.	results.				
Students will use appropriate verbal and writtencompleting a professional development plan for in-serviceor higher.the professional development plan with a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan for in-servicethe professional development plan of 4.14.skills.for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class2009, 15 students completed the professional development planof 4.14.presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-mean score of 4.57.of 4.57.					
appropriate verbal and written communication skills.completing a professional development plan for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-development plan development plan of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan with a mean score of 4.14.development plan with a mean score of 4.14.				-	-
and written communicationprofessional development plan for in-servicewith a mean score of 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development plan through class presentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-with a mean score of 4.14.with a mean score of 4.14.			of higher.	-	-
communication skills.development plan for in-serviceof 3.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 studentsof 4.14.for in-service teachers, and their verbal competence through classcompleted the professional development planin 4.14.prosentations on a literacy topic. Both will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-of 4.75; in 2008- 2009, 15 students completed the professional development planof 4.14.	and written				
teachers, and theircompleted theverbal competenceprofessionalthrough classdevelopment planpresentations on awith a mean scoreliteracy topic. Bothof 4.57.will be assessed by aThe rubric to assessrubric, based on a 5-students' oral	communication			of 3.75; in 2008-	
verbal competenceprofessionalthrough classdevelopment planpresentations on awith a mean scoreliteracy topic. Bothof 4.57.will be assessed by aThe rubric to assessrubric, based on a 5-students' oral	skills.				
through classdevelopment planpresentations on awith a mean scoreliteracy topic. Bothof 4.57.will be assessed by aThe rubric to assessrubric, based on a 5-students' oral				-	
presentations on awith a mean scoreliteracy topic. Bothof 4.57.will be assessed by aThe rubric to assessrubric, based on a 5-students' oral				-	
literacy topic. Bothof 4.57.will be assessed by aThe rubric to assessrubric, based on a 5-students' oral		-			
will be assessed by a rubric, based on a 5-The rubric to assess students' oral		-			
rubric, based on a 5- students' oral					
point rating coals					
		point rating scale.		presentation will be	
field tested in fall					
2009.				2009.	
USE OF RESULTS. Candidates' results on the K-12 state certification test will continued to be monitored. In	USE OF RESULTS. Car	ndidates' results on th	l e K-12 state certificati	on test will continued	to be monitored. In
analyzing the rubrics used to assess the action research projects, the candidates provide a clear rationale and					
relevant and seminal research related to their project. However, the analysis of the rubrics indicates some areas	relevant and seminal i	research related to thei	r project. However, the	e analysis of the rubrics	indicates some areas
where the candidates need to provide more details of their methodology, especially their data collection and data	where the candidates need to provide more details of their methodology, especially their data collection and data				

analysis. Finally, some candidates need more support with the APA format. The candidate who did not meet the passing criteria was provided individual guidance and support with the organization of the candidate's paper. Candidates were referred to library workshops to better understand scientific writing.

Students' case study reports indicate the students can analyze the informal and formal assessments to determine instructional goals for their tutees. However, the candidates need more support in providing detailed descriptions of their instructional program and more specific information about changes in their tutees' reading and writing development.

Analysis of the 2008-2009 professional development rubric scores indicates students include a clear rationale and clearly stated purpose for the professional development project. They provide a well-written body of knowledge that supports their plan. Generally, students also provide a clear presentation that incorporates technology throughout their professional development sessions. However, in some cases, the students need additional support in clarifying details that outline the procedures for completing their plan. Students usually attempt to either include too much information for each planned session or the sessions do not provide enough variety of activity nor provide enough audience participation. This will be addressed in course work. Analysis of the 2009-2010 professional development rubric scores indicates three areas to be addressed: a) encouraging students to incorporate more and varied technological experiences in their plans; b) developing more realistic plans, e.g., too much material to be covered; and c) providing additional support with APA style and other writing conventions.

The rubric for assessing oral presentations was developed, reviewed and revised for pilot implementation in fall 2009. Two faculty used the rubric in spring 2010, but analysis of the rubric has not been completed.

SUMMARY OF 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 ASSESSMENT RESULTS

The following two tables provide a summary of assessment results and improvement actions for AY 2010-2011:

Degree Program	Student Performance Trends
Criminology, B.A.	Only 45% of student received a passing score (60%) on the comprehensive exam. 100% of students scored satisfactory or above in critical thinking and communication skills.
Elementary Education, B.S.	Student scores overall meet the performance expectation. Critical thinking and assessment areas had slightly lower mean scores than other areas. Scores on the Final Internship Form will be reviewed for 2009-2010 as university supervisors tended to rate students lower than cooperating teachers. Inter-rater reliability may need to be examined.
General Business Administration, B.S.	Students met benchmark scores in management and marketing; student performance in finance was below the benchmark. 70% of students scored a 2 (Moderate Skills) on a scale of 1-3, with a mean score of 1.8 on Writing Skills.
General Business Administration, B.S. (concentration in Marketing)	Mean scores on knowledge assessments was less than benchmark score (2, rather than 3). Students exceeded benchmark for application of concepts and skills. Students met benchmarks for Critical Thinking and Communication.
Industrial Engineering, B.S.I.E.	Student performance was less than expected on all measures with an average of 60% of students meeting benchmarks.
Information Technology, B.S.I.T.	All Outcomes were achieved. For Outcome 3 raters were in disagreement 33% of the time.

Summary of Student Performance Trends

Interdisciplinary Social Sciences	Overall student assessment of the degree to which ISS 3010 and 4935 achieved its outcomes was positive. Student scores in Outcome 4 (Research Methods) were lower than the other outcomes.
Psychology, B.A.	Student performance on all measures was less than expected. The assessments themselves had problems in the areas of item discrimination index and item difficulty indices.
Counselor Education, M.A.	Students met all performance benchmarks.
Reading Education, M.A.	Students met performance benchmarks. Analysis of the 2009-2010 professional development rubric scores indicates three areas to be addressed: a) encouraging students to incorporate more and varied technological experiences in their plans; b) developing more realistic plans, e.g., too much material to be covered; and c) providing additional support with APA style and other writing conventions.

Summary of Actions to Be Taken to Improve Performance

Degree Program	Actions to be Taken to Improve Assessments
Criminology, B.A.	Students can take CCJ 4934 prior to taking the research methods course.
	Scheduling of the research course or CCJ 4934 may need to be addressed.
	Many students may come to USFP having completed the requirements for
	Survey of the CJ System at another campus or institution; the assessment
	may need to be reviewed/revised to account for this.
Elementary Education, B.S.	Students need to become more proficient in asking higher order questions
	and engaging students in activities that require problem-solving skills. This
	will be more specifically addressed in courses in 2010-2011. Scores on the
	Final Internship Form will be reviewed for 2009-2010 as university
	supervisors tended to rate students lower than cooperating teachers. Inter-
	rater reliability may need to be examined.
General Business Administration,	Finance is an area for improvement. The assessment method for Outcome
B.S.	1 will be revised. Tutorials will be added for students in the Finance course.
	Writing assistance will be explored through collaboration with the English
	faculty.
General Business Administration,	ETS Major Field test in Marketing will be used in AY2010-2011 as the
B.S. (concentration in Marketing)	assessment for knowledge and skills.
Industrial Engineering, B.S.I.E.	Students need additional practice in statistics. Tutorial sessions to review and practice Statistics problems will be added in 2010-2011. Some students
	had difficulty adjusting to a fully online course environment. Technical
	supports for students will be increased during the first few weeks of the
	course in 2010-2011, as well as support for making presentations online.
Information Technology, B.S.I.T.	The department will provide a small training workshop for faculty assessing
mormation recimology, b.s.i.r.	Outcome 3. In addition all assessment rubrics will be reviewed and refined
	where needed.
Interdisciplinary Social Studies	Faculty will take a more integrated approach to presenting information on
	social science methodology in courses to improve student performance in
	this area.
Psychology, B.A.	Items will be revised for the test's next administration in 2010-2011.
, -0,,	Assessments should be given in the courses that address the content,
	rather than in a single exam. Faculty will continue to work on developing
	and refining assessments.

Counselor Education, M.A.	Anecdotal evidence suggests that employers are very satisfied with graduates. An assessment to get feedback from employers on specific strengths and limitations would be helpful for program adjustments, and program faculty will explore the development of an employer satisfaction assessment.
Reading Education, M.A.	Faculty will continue to review and refine rubrics used to assess student performance.

[INSERT OVERVIEW of 2010-2011 Assessment Results Baccalaureate Degree Programs]

[INSERT OVERVIEW of 2010-2011 Assessment Results Graduate Degree Programs]

Academic and Student Affairs Council (ASAC)

The Academic and Student Affairs Council (ASAC) meets monthly and provides academic and student affairs units with a venue for discussion, review and recommendation regarding campus-wide academic and student affairs issues. The ASAC ensures, through consensus, consistency in academic and student affairs procedures and practices across units, and provides advice and recommendation to the chief academic officer of USF Polytechnic with respect to academic and student affairs matters. The ASAC may appoint ad hoc or subcommittees to address specific issues and report outcomes as appropriate. Areas within the scope of the ASAC include, but are not limited to:

- Academic policy issues—undergraduate and graduate
- Degree program planning and development—undergraduate and graduate
- Enrollment planning and management
- Faculty well-being and development
- Student affairs programs and services
- Strategic planning
- Assessment and accountability reporting
- Coordination of implementation of campus-wide or system-wide policies and procedures

In AY 2008-2009 when USF Polytechnic, with support of the System President and Provost, took responsibility for its own assessment system, the ASAC was regularly updated on system-wide discussions and assessment guidelines, including benefits of using MAPP, NSSE and FETPIP data; a graduating student survey and a client satisfaction survey for administrative and academic support units. ASAC discussions contributed to USF Polytechnic's decisions regarding assessments to be used or developed.

The ASAC reviews student learning outcomes assessment data, particularly campus-wide data, annually throughout the academic year as assessments are completed and results analyzed. Degree program-specific data may be identified for discussion as well, particularly if program results appear to be related to campus-wide data which provide an indirect measure of students' perceptions of their learning experiences. Student success data, e.g., enrollment trends, degree completion, trends, course

completion and term-to-term retention data, may also be discussed in relation to degree program learning outcomes assessment results for implications for academic and student affairs units [FR4.1-22a—g, ASAC Meeting Notes].

Academic Division Directors also prepare calendar year annual reports and concurrent action plans by the end of February of the next year. Examples of **Academic Division Annual Reports and Action Plans [FR4.1-23a-j]** follow:

	2008 Annual Report	2009 Action Plan
Arts & Sciences	[FR4.1-23a]	[FR4.1-23b]
Business	[FR4.1-23c]	[FR4.1-23d]
Education	[FR4.1-23e]	[FR4.1-23f]
Engineering	[FR4.1-23g]	[FR4.1-23h]
Information Technology	[FR4.1-23i]	[FR4.1-23j]

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[FR4.1-1] Florida Statute 1008.31 Florida's K-20 education performance accountability system

[FR4.1-2] Florida Statue 1008.46 State university accountability process

[FR4.1-3] Board of Governors State University System Accountability Report 2008

- [FR4.1-4a-b) Board of Governors State University System Annual Report 2009
 - a. FR4.1-4a Volume I, Annual Report for the State University System
 - b. FR4.1-4b Volume II, Individual University Data Tables

[FR4.1-5] Notification of IPEDS identification number

- [FR4.1-6] IPEDS Enrollment report for Fall 2010
- [FR4.1-7] 2009-2010 Graduating Senior Survey, hard copy only
- [FR4.1-8] IPEDS Financial Aid Report for Fall 2009
- [FR4.1-9] Florida Statute 1008.39 Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program
- [FR4.1-10] Fall 2007 FETPIP Report for USF Campuses
- [FR4.1-11] ETS®Proficiency Profile Users Guide, see p. 4
- [FR4.1-12] NSSE website: http://nsse.iub.edu/html/about.cfm
- [FR4.1-13] 2009-2010 Graduating Senior Survey, hard copy only
- [FR4.1-14a] Diversity/Campus Climate Survey, ALL Students 2008

[FR4.1-14b] Diversity/Campus Climate Survey, USF Poly HOME Campus Students 2008

[FR4.1-15] Board of Governors Regulation 8.016 Academic Learning Compacts

[FR4.1-16] USF System Statement of Policy on Academic Learning Compacts

[FR4.1-17] USF System Guidelines for Development and Implementation of Academic Learning Compacts

[FR4.1-18] USF System Academic Learning Compact website: http://www.acad.usf.edu/ALC/alccontent/default.aspx

[FR4.1-19a-I] Academic Learning Compacts 2009-2010 for each degree program

[FR4.1-19a] BS Applied Science ALC
[FR4.1-19b] MA Counselor Education ALC
[FR4.1-19c] BA Criminology ALC
[FR4.1-19d] MEd Educational Leadership ALC
[FR4.1-19e] BS Elementary Education ALC
[FR4.1-19f] BS General Business Administration ALC
[FR4.1-19g] BS Industrial Engineering ALC, see table below
[FR4.1-19h] BS Information Technology ALC
[FR4.1-19i] BA Interdisciplinary Social Science ALC
[FR4.1-19k] BA Psychology ALC
[FR4.1-19l] MA Reading Education ALC

[FR4.1-20a-I] ALC Assessment Reports 2008-2009

[FR4.1-20a] BS Applied Science

[FR4.1-20-1] BS Applied Science Criminal Justice, p. 200

[FR4.1-20-2] BS Applied Science Early Childhood Development, see table p. 199

[FR4.1-20-3] BS Applied Science General Business, see table p. 205

[FR4.1-20-4] BS Applied Science Industrial Operations, see table p. 208

[FR4.1-20-5] BS Applied Science Information Technology, see table p. 210

[FR4.1-20b] MA Counselor Education

[FR4.1-20c] BA Criminology

[FR4.1-20d] MEd Educational Leadership

[FR4.1-20e] BS Elementary Education

[FR4.1-20f] BS General Business Administration

[FR4.1-20g] BS Industrial Engineering, see table below

[FR4.1-20h] BS Information Technology

[FR4.1-20i] BA Interdisciplinary Social Science

[FR4.1-20j] BS Marketing

[FR4.1-20k] BA Psychology

[FR4.1-20] MA Reading Education

ALC Assessment Reports 2009-2010 [FR4.1-21a-I]

[FR4.1-21a] BS Applied Science

[FR4.1-21-1] BS Applied Science Criminal Justice, see table p. 200
 [FR4.1-21-2] BS Applied Science Early Childhood Development, see table p. 199
 [FR4.1-21-3] BS Applied Science General Business, see table p. 205
 [FR4.1-21a-4] BS Applied Science Industrial Operations
 [FR4.1-21a-5] BS Applied Science Information Technology

[FR4.1-21b] MA Counselor Education
[FR4.1-21c] BA Criminology
[FR4.1-21d] MEd Educational Leadership
[FR4.1-21e] BS Elementary Education
[FR4.1-21f] BS General Business Administration
[FR4.1-21g] BS Industrial Engineering, see table below
[FR4.1-21h] BS Information Technology
[FR4.1-21i] BA Interdisciplinary Social Science
[FR4.1-21j] BS Marketing
[FR4.1-21k] BA Psychology
[FR4.1-21l] MA Reading Education

[FR4.1-22a—g] Academic and Student Affairs Council (ASAC) Example Meeting Notes

[FR4.1-22a] ASAC Meeting Notes 11-13-2008
[FR4.1-22b] ASAC Meeting Notes 2-12-09
[FR4.1-22c] ASAC Meeting Notes 4-09-09
[FR4.1-22d] ASAC Meeting Notes 9-10-09
[FR4.1-22e] ASAC Meeting Notes 1-14-10
[FR4.1-22f] ASAC Meeting Notes 4-8-10
[FR4.1-22g] ASAC Meeting Notes 9-22-10

[FR4.1-23a—g] Academic Division Annual Reports and Action Plans

	2008 Annual Report	2009 Action Plan
Arts & Sciences	[FR4.1-23a]	[FR4.1-23b]
Business	[FR4.1-23c]	[FR4.1-23d]
Education	[FR4.1-23e]	[FR4.1-23f]
Engineering	[FR4.1-23g]	[FR4.1-23h]
Information Technology	[FR4.1-23i]	[FR4.1-23j]

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Federal Requirement 4.2: Program Curriculum

The institution's curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the purpose and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance

□ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Narrative linking institution's mission and its curriculum

USF System Policy 10-036 Authorization of New Degree Programs [FR4.2-1] requires that new degree program proposals meet the criteria listed in BOG Regulation 8.011 New Academic Program Authorization [FR4.2-2] and be prepared in accordance with the common state university new degree proposal format. BOG Regulation 8.011 requires that "THE PROGRAM IS CONSISTENT WITH INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND BOG STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM STRATEGIC PLAN – The proposal must demonstrate that the goals of the program are aligned with the university's mission and relate to specific institutional strengths, and that the program is consistent with the current State University System Strategic Planning Goals as demonstrated by an explanation of the goals which the program will directly advance" (Institutional and State Level Accountability, 1).

To ensure consistency with institutional mission, proposals are reviewed and approved by appropriate institutional/campus committees (e.g., USF Polytechnic Academic and Student Affairs Council, USFP Executive Council); by the campus Senate (e.g., USFP Faculty Senate Undergraduate or Graduate Council); by the USFP Campus Board; and by appropriate USF System Councils (e.g., Academic and Campus Environment Advisory Council), prior to submission to the Board of Trustees Academic and Campus Environment (ACE) Work Group which reviews and recommends for approval, if appropriate, to the USF Board of Trustees.

The Florida Board of Governors New Degree Program Proposal Form (IB) [FR4.2-3] requires that the proposed new program demonstrate its consistency with the current State University System (SUS) Strategic Planning Goals, identifying specifically which goals the program will directly support and which goals the program will indirectly support. In addition, the form requires a description of how the goals of the proposed program relate to the institutional mission statement (6A). Furthermore, the form (IIA) requires a description of national, state, and/or local data that support the need for the program.

Degree programs offered by USF Polytechnic are consistent with its mission [FR4.2-4, USF Polytechnic 2007-2012 Strategic Plan]:

The University of South Florida Polytechnic is committed to excellence in interdisciplinary and applied learning; to the application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs; and to collaborative partnerships that support economic, social, and community development.

In 2008, the Central Florida Development Council hired SRI International, an independent research firm, to conduct a detailed analysis of the region's current economic strengths and opportunities. The resulting "cluster analysis" study identified seven industry sectors that were already represented in the regional economy and primed for future growth. These areas were: research and engineering services; logistics and supply chain management; life science and medical services; education and government; construction and real estate; business and financial services; and agriculture and agritechnology **[FR4.2-5, SRI International Study]**.

Many of the industry clusters map to degree programs available at USF Polytechnic as illustrated in the table below:

Industry Cluster	Current USF Polytechnic Degree Program
Business & Financial Services	BGS, General Business
	BS/BA, General Business Administration
	MBA
Education & Government	BSAS, Leadership Studies
	BSAS, Criminal Justice
	BA, Criminology
	BA, Interdisciplinary Social Science
	BSAS, Early Childhood Development
	MA, Counselor Education
	MEd, Educational Leadership
	MA, Reading Education
	BS, Elementary Education
Life Science & Medical Services	BA, Interdisciplinary Social Science
	BA Psychology
Logistics & Supply Chain Management	BSAS, Industrial Operations
	BS, Industrial Engineering
Research & Engineering Services	BS, Information Technology
	BSAS, BGS Information Technology
	MS, Information Technology

The industry clusters also provide opportunity for growth and development of new degree programs that leverage the region's economic strengths and opportunities and align with polytechnic values in interdisciplinary and applied learning, application of cutting-edge research and technology to real world needs, and collaborative partnerships that support economic, social, and community development. New degrees in such fields as agricultural and biological engineering, entrepreneurship and venture planning, supply chain management, cyber crime and safety, forensic studies, nutrition, health information technology, health informatics, medical research technology, integrative STEM education, technology-mediated learning, interdisciplinary engineering, for example, would well support the mission of a polytechnic and the economic development of the region.

A Distinctive Mission

The USF Polytechnic **2007-2012 Strategic Plan** expanded the regional campus' vision beyond its local service area, focusing on transition to a destination campus with a polytechnic mission. The Business Plan: A New Polytechnic University in Florida [see HIST6A] presented to the Board of Governors on

November 9, 2011 outlines a three phase program development plan. A thoughtful, deliberative analysis, informed by national sources, identified new programs that would rapidly build the polytechnic model in Florida. Resources were consulted to gain both a regional and state perspective, as well as a national perspective, on STEM fields, typical paths to STEM job, educational attainment of STEM workers, employment projections, and worker earnings.

Since 2008, degree programs offered at 10 other universities, nine of which are "polytechnic" by institutional name and one "institute of technology", have been regularly reviewed: Arizona State University Polytechnic Campus; California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo; Georgia Institute of Technology; Polytechnic Institute of New York University; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; Southern Polytechnic State University; University of Wisconsin – Stout; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; and Worcester Polytechnic Institute. Analysis of the degrees provided insight into fields of study, department and college structures, levels of degrees offered, and similarities and differences in relation to planned degree offerings at a new polytechnic university. In addition, the analysis provided an overview of the proportion of degrees that were in STEM fields and STEM-related professions and those that were liberal arts in nature.

	Percent of Degrees in	Percent of Degrees in	Percent of Degrees in
	STEMFields	STEM-related	Liberal Arts Fields
		Professional Fields	
Arizona State	54%	34%	12%
Cal Poly Pomona	41%	27%	32%
Cal Poly San Luis	56%	220/	21%
Obispo	50%	23%	2170
Georgia Tech	70%	20%	10%
NYU Polytechnic	71%	19%	10%
Rensselaer	66%	17%	17%
Southern Poly	65%	21%	14%
U Wisconsin-Stout	26%	52%	22%
Virginia Tech	38%	41%	21%
Worcester	73%	9%	18%
Mean Distribution	56%	26%	18%
USF Polytechnic	29%	57%	14%
NEW UNIVERSITY	55%	35%	10%

Distribution of Degree Programs in STEM, STEM-related Professions, and Liberal Arts Fields

Benchmarks established by the Board of Governors for USF Polytechnic to achieve, in order to be reviewed for final approval as the 12th university in the State University System attainment of a minimum FTE of 1,244 with a minimum 50% of the FTE in STEM and 20% of the FTE in STEM-related programs.

The Business Plan: A New Polytechnic University in Florida also included a program development plan [see HIST6b]. As USF Polytechnic enters into its strategic planning process for development of the 2012-

2018 strategic plan, this benchmark and curriculum development plan will drive academic program planning:

Accounting& Financial Management, BS Alternative Energy, MS Animal Sciences, BS Applied Economics & Public Policy, BS **Applied Mathematics & Statistics, MS** Applied Psychology, BS Architectural Engineering & Design, BS Biochemistry, BS **Biological Sciences**, BS Business Administration, BS/MBA Accelerated Program Chemistry, BS Clinical Laboratory/Medical Research Technology, BS Cultural Resource Administration & Policy, BS Cyber Security & Safety, MS Design& Applied Arts, BS Dietetics & Nutritional Science, BS, MS Digital Design & Technology, BS Elementary Mathematics & Science Education, BS Engineering Psychology, BS Financial Engineering & Risk Management, MS Food Science, Production & Technology, BS Forensic Science/Studies, MS Green Technology Management, MS Health Information Technology, BS Health Promotion & Education, MS Human Factors Integration, MS Informatics, BS, MS Integrated STEM Education, MS Language& Global Culture Studies, BS Law Enforcement Science & Technology, BS Learning Psychology, MS Logistics & Supply Chain Management, MS Mathematics, BS Mobile Technologies, MS Modeling& Simulation, MS Pharmaceutical Sciences, BS Photonics/Optics, MS Physics, BS Recreational Therapy, MS Secondary Mathematics & Science Education, BS Software Engineering, BS Systems Engineering, BS, MS, PhD **Talent Management, MS** Technology & Innovation Management, BS, MS

Technology-Mediated Learning, MAT, MEd Veterinary Biomedical & Clinical Sciences, MS

Peer Institutions

To guide our development as a polytechnic from 2012 - 2018, we have selected *three developmental peers*: Arizona State University's Polytechnic Campus in Mesa, AZ; Southern Polytechnic State University, Marietta, GA; and the University of Wisconsin Stout Campus in Menomonie, WI. We have also selected *three aspirational peers*: California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; and Virginia Polytechnic & State University (Virginia Tech). Below is a comparison of degrees offered by USF Polytechnic and degrees offered at peer institutions, indicating that in some ways we are consistent with other "polytechs" and in others we can develop distinctiveness of programming among our peers.

USF Polytechnic	Arizona State	Southern	University	California	Rensselaer	Virginia
Degrees	University's	Polytechnic	of	Polytechnic	Polytechnic	Polytechnic
	Polytechnic	State	Wisconsin	State	Institute	& State
	Campus	University	Stout	University in		University
			Campus	San Luis		
				Obispo		
Applied Science,	х		x		х	
B.S.	~		~		Χ	
Criminology, B.A.						
Elementary	x			x		х
Education, B.S.	^			^		^
General Business						
Administration,		х	X	Х		
B.S.						
General Studies,						
B.G.S.						
Industrial				х	х	х
Engineering, B.S.				^	Λ	Λ
Information		х	х			
Technology, B.S.		^	^			
Interdisciplinary						
Social Science,						
B.A.						
Psychology, B.A.		B.S.	Х	Х	Х	Х
Counselor			х	х		
Education, M.A.			^	^		
Educational				х		
Leadership, M.Ed.				^		
Reading				Х		
Education, M.A.				^		
Business						
Administration,		Х		Х	Х	Х
M.B.A.						
Information		Х	х			
Technology, M.S.		^	^			

Comparison of USF Polytechnic Current Degrees Offered and Peer Institution Degrees Offered

Program Review

Board of Governors Regulation 8.015 Academic Program Review 2007-2014 [FR4.2-6] requires the cyclic review of all academic degree programs in State universities at least every seven years:

(1)(b) Program reviews must document how individual academic programs are achieving stated student learning and program objectives within the context of the university's mission, as illustrated in the academic learning compacts. The results of the program reviews are expected to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level and, when appropriate, at the state level.

Program review must at least include the following components (3)(b):

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

4. For baccalaureate programs, a review of lower level prerequisite courses to ensure that the program is in compliance with State-approved common prerequisites and (if appropriate) a review of the limited access status of the program to determine if such status is still warranted.

- a. The Office of Academic and Student Affairs shall review all university program review policies and procedures.
- b. Each university must electronically submit its program review policies and procedures for the 2007-2014 program review cycle to the Office of Academic and Student affairs by April 1, 2007. Thereafter, revisions and updates to university procedures must be submitted to the Office for review by December 15 of each year of the cycle.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[FR4.2-1] USF System Policy 10-036 Authorization of New Degree Programs

[FR4.2-2] BOG Regulation 8.011 New Academic Program Authorization

[FR4.2-3] Florida Board of Governors New Degree Program Proposal Form (IB)

[FR4.2-4] USF Polytechnic 2007-2012 Strategic Plan

[FR4.2-5] SRI International Study

[FR4.2-6] Board of Governors Regulation 8.015 Academic Program Review 2007-2014

[FR4.2-7a-u] Degree program profiles

UNDERGRADUATE [FR4.2-7a] Applied Science, BS - Criminal Justice concentration [FR4.2-7b] Applied Science, BS - Early Childhood Development concentration [FR4.2-7c] Applied Science, BS - Industrial Operations concentration [FR4.2-7d] Applied Science, BS - Information Technology concentration [FR4.2-7e] Applied Science, BS - Leadership Studies concentration (18 credits from Leadership Minor) [FR4.2-7f] Criminology, BA [FR4.2-7g] Elementary Education, BS [FR4.2-7h] General Business Administration, BS/BA [FR4.2-7i] General Studies, BGS [FR4.2-7j] Industrial Engineering, BS [FR4.2-7k] Information Technology, BS [FR4.2-71] Interdisciplinary Social Science, BA [FR4.2-7m] Management concentration in BS/BA General Business Administration [FR4.2-7n] Marketing concentration in BS/BA General Business Administration [FR4.2-70] Psychology, BA

GRADUATE

[FR4.2-7p] Counselor Education, MA - Community/Mental Health Plan

[FR4.2-7q] Counselor Education, MA – Professional School Counseling Plan

[FR4.2-7r] Educational Leadership, MEd

[FR4.2-7s] Master of Business Administration, MBA

[FR4.2-7t] Reading Education, MA

[FR4.2-7u] Information Technology, MS

[FR4.2-8] Academics website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/Academics.html

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Federal Requirement 4.3: Publication of Policies

The institution makes available to students and the public current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Include publications and cite specifically where academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies can be found.

The **USF academic calendar [FR4.3-1]** is published on the **Registrar's website [FR4.3-2 see link below]**. In addition the Registrar's Office posts the **Registrar's Event Calendar [FR4.3-3]** on the website, which provides detailed information about academic processing deadlines.

The USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog [FR4.3-4] and USF Polytechnic Graduate Catalog [FR4.3-5] are available to students on the Student Tools website [FR4.3-6, see link below]. Academic policies, which include grading policies and refund polices, are provided in the catalogs:

Undergraduate Catalog	Academic Policies	pp. 46-83
	Grading	pp. 51-52
	Refund	pp. 39-40
Graduate Catalog	Academic Policies	pp. 31-63
	Grading	pp. 51-54
	Refund	pp. 30-33

USF System Policy 30-013 Office of Financial Aid Policy on Refunds and Payments [FR4.3-7] establishes for the USF System policies on refunds and repayments of Federal aid received by students who withdraw during a term for which repayment has been received. The policies are only effective if the student completely terminates enrollment.

The OASIS Schedule of Classes [FR4.3-8, also see link below] is the official USF System site for class schedules. Students and faculty can conduct an OASIS Schedule Search [FR4.3-8a] to identify courses available for a given semester [FR4.3-8b, search example]. USF Polytechnic provides several additional sources of information for students: the Registration Information website [FR4.3-8c]; USF Poly Registration FAQs [FR4.3-8d]; and USF Polytechnic Registration workshops [FR4.3-8e].

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[FR4.3-1] USF academic calendar

- [FR4.3-2] University Registrar website: http://www.registrar.usf.edu/enroll/regist/calendt.php
- [FR4.3-3] Registrar's Event Calendar
- [FR4.3-4] USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2010-2011
- [FR4.3-5] USF Polytechnic Graduate Catalog 2010-2011

[FR4.3-6] Student Tools website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/StudentTools.html

[FR4.3-7] USF System Policy 30-013 Office of Financial Aid Policy on Refunds and Payments

[FR4.3-8] OASIS Schedule of Classes website: http://www.registrar.usf.edu/ssearch/search.php

[FR4.3-8a] OASIS Schedule Search
[FR4.3-8b] OASIS Search Example
[FR4.3-8c] USF Polytechnic Registration Information
[FR4.3-8d] USF Poly Registration FAQs
[FR4.3-8e] USF Polytechnic Registration workshops

Part B - Documentation of Compliance Federal Requirement 4.4: Program Length

Program length is appropriate for each of the institution's educational programs.

Compliance Deartial Compliance Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Note program length for educational programs and describe appropriateness of program length.

USF Polytechnic offers eleven (9) baccalaureate degrees and five (5) graduate (Master's) degrees:

Degree Program	Number of Semester Credit Hours Required			
Undergraduate Degrees				
Applied Science, B.S. with concentrations in	120			
Criminal Justice, Early Childhood Development,				
Industrial Operations, Information Technology and				
Leadership Studies				
Criminology, B.A.	120			
Elementary Education, B.S.	120			
General Business Administration, B.S./B.A. with	120			
concentrations in Accounting, Finance,				
Management and Marketing				
General Studies, B.G.S. with concentrations in	120			
Aging Studies, General Business and Information				
Technology				
Industrial Engineering, B.S.	128			
Information Technology, B.S.	120			
Interdisciplinary Social Science, B.A. with	120			
concentrations in Aging Studies/Gerontology,				
Communication, Criminology, Psychology and				
Sociology				
Psychology, B.A.	120			
Graduate Degrees				
Counselor Education, M.A.	60-63			
Educational Leadership, M.Ed.	36			
Reading Education, M.A.	36			
Master of Business Administration, M.B.A.	37-48			
Information Technology, M.S.	36			

Baccalaureate Degrees

All of the baccalaureate degrees offered by USF Polytechnic meet the minimum requirement of at least 120 semester credit hours. **Florida Statute 1007.25(8)** [FR4.4-1] indicates the following:

(8) A baccalaureate degree program shall require no more than 120 semester hours of college credit, including 36 semester hours of general education coursework, unless prior approval has been granted by the Board of Governors for baccalaureate degree programs offered by state universities and by the State Board of Education for baccalaureate degree programs offered by community colleges.

USF System basic requirements for a baccalaureate degree completion of at least 120 semester hours with an overall 2.00 GPA, including a 2.00 GPA on all courses attempted at the University of South Florida [FR4.4-2, USF System Regulation 3.007, Graduation Requirements – Undergraduate, (2)].

Graduate (Master's) Degrees

All of the master's degrees meet the minimum requirement of at least 30 semester credit hours. USF System minimum requirements for the master's degree are a minimum of thirty (30) hours, at least sixteen (16) hours of which must be at the 6000 level. At least twenty (20) hours must be in formal, regularly scheduled course work, ten (10) of which must be at the 6000 level. Up to six (6) hours of 4000-level courses may be taken as part of a planned degree program. Additional graduate credit may be earned in 4000-level courses only if specifically approved by the appropriate College Dean. Students enrolled in undergraduate courses as part of a planned degree program are expected to demonstrate a superior level of performance. Graduate students may not enroll for more than 18 hours in any semester without written permission from the College Dean [FR4.4-3, USF System Regulation 3.009 Graduate Degree Requirements; and FR4.4-4 Graduate Catalog, Section 8 "Master's Degree Requirements"].

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[FR4.4-1] Florida Statute 1007.25 General education courses; common prerequisites; and other degree requirements

[FR4.4-2] USF System Regulation 3.007, Graduation Requirements – Undergraduate, (2)

[FR4.4-3] USF System Regulation 3.009 Graduate Degree Requirements

[FR4.4-4] Graduate Catalog, Section 8 "Master's Degree Requirements"

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Federal Requirement 4.5: Student Complaints

The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints.

🗹 Compliance 🛛 Partial Compliance 🖓 Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Include a copy of the institution's policies and procedures for addressing written student complaints.

The University of South Florida has system-level policy for addressing academic and non-academic student complaints:

USF System Regulation 3.027 Academic Integrity of Students [FR4.5-1] USF System Policy 10-002 Student Academic Grievance Procedure [FR4.5-2] USF System Regulation 3.025 Disruption of Academic Process [FR4.5-3] USF System Regulation 6.0021 Student Code of Conduct [FR4.5-4] USF System Policy 0-007 Diversity and Equal Opportunity: Discrimination and Harassment [FR4.5-5] USF System Policy 0-108 Disability and Accommodations (Public/Employees/Students) [FR4.5-6]

USF Polytechnic adheres to these system policies, follows designated procedures, and demonstrates compliance with those policies and procedures when resolving student complaints. All policies and procedures are accessible to students online.

Academic Integrity

USF System Regulation 3.027 Academic Integrity of Students [see FR4.5-1] addresses the importance of academic honesty and personal integrity in the University community. The expectation of academic honesty is that all academic endeavors and claims of scholarly knowledge as one's own are, in fact, representative of one's own efforts. Knowledge and maintenance of the academic standards of honesty and integrity as set forth by the University are the responsibility of the entire academic community, including the instructional faculty, staff and students.

The policy identifies behaviors that violate academic integrity - cheating; plagiarism; fabrication, forgery and obstruction; multiple submissions; complicity; misconduct in research and creative endeavors; computer misuse; and misuse of intellectual property – and provides definition and clarifications.

Violations for **undergraduate students** are classified into four levels according to the nature of the infraction. For each level of violation a corresponding set of sanctions, intended as general guidelines, is provided. Academic programs may include additional and different sanctions. <u>Level I</u> violations include

actions where intent is questionable, involve a small fraction of the total course work, are not extensive and/or occur in a minor assignment. Level II violations affect a more significant aspect or portion of the course work. Sanctions for Level I and II violations are handled by the instructor at Level I, for example, by reducing or giving no credit for the assignment, assigning a paper or project on a relevant topic, assigning a make-up assignment that is more difficult than the original assignment, or requiring attendance in a non-credit workshop on ethics or related topics; and at Level II, for example, by assigning a failing grade for the assignment or a failing grade for the course. Level III violations affect a major or essential portion of work done to meet course requirements, or involve premeditation, or are preceded by one or more violations at Levels I and/or II. Sanctions for Level III may be handled by the instructor by assigning a failing grade for the course with a designation of FF (Academic Dishonesty) on the student's internal transcript, or by the University with suspension from the University for one semester. Level IV violations represent the most serious breaches of intellectual honesty, e.g., forging a grade form, falsifying a transcript, fabrication of evidence, falsification of data, sabotaging another student's work). Level IV sanction is typically permanent academic dismissal from the University with the designation of "Dismissed for Academic Dishonesty" placed permanently on the student's external transcript.

For Levels II-IV, the instructor sends a concise written statement describing the academic dishonesty of an incident to the USF Polytechnic Dean of Students for retention until graduation or until the records are of no further administrative value. This enables better handling of multiple violations by an individual student.

For **graduate students** sanctions similarly depend on the seriousness of the offense and may range from assignment of an F or Zero grade on the work suspected of violation of academic integrity, an F in the course or activity in which credit is earned, or an FF in the course; or academic dismissal and possible revocation of the degree or graduate certificate following a thorough investigation. Graduate students who are assigned an "FF" grade will be academically dismissed from the University and will not be eligible to apply to any graduate program at USF.

Both undergraduate and graduate students have the right to appeal the instructor's decision that a violation has occurred once the initial violation of the academic integrity regulation has been documented and fairly discussed by the student and the instructor. At that point the student will follow the procedures outlined in the USF System Policy on Student Academic Grievance Procedure. For academic integrity violations that are reviewed at the department and college levels, the respective committees will consider all evidence available to determine if the instructor's decision was correct. The student's ability to proceed within an academic program while an Academic Grievance is in process will be determined by the individual academic program Director.

The Academic Integrity Regulation is published on the General Counsel's website [FR4.5-7, see link below], in the USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2011-2012 (pp. 58-61) [FR4.5-8], and in the USF Polytechnic Graduate Catalog 2011-2012 (pp. 34-39) [FR4.5-9].

Academic Grievance

USF System Policy 10-002 Student Academic Grievance Procedure [see FR4.5-2] provides all undergraduate and graduate students taking courses within the USF System an opportunity for objective review of facts and events pertinent to the cause of the academic grievance. The procedures include

levels and steps for resolution at the department, college and University levels (division, college and campus levels at USF Polytechnic):

Level I Department/Division – 1) The student should first make a reasonable effort to resolve his or her grievance with the instructor concerned, with the date of the incident triggering the start of the process. The instructor is expected to accommodate a reasonable request to discuss and attempt to resolve this issue. 2) If the situation cannot be resolved or the instructor is not available, the student files a notification letter within three weeks of the triggering incident to the Department Chair/Division Director. The letter should be a concise written statement of particulars and must include information pertaining to how, in the student's opinion, USF System policies or procedures were violated. The Director provides a copy of this statement to the instructor. The instructor may file a written response to the grievance. 3) The Director discusses the statement jointly or individually with the student and the instructor to see if the grievance can be resolved. If the grievance can be resolved, the Director provides a statement to that effect to the student and instructor with a copy to the College Dean. 4) The Director informs the student of his/her right to file a written request directed back to the Director within three weeks to advance the grievance to the College Level. Upon receipt of the student's request to move the process to the College Level and the instructor's response to the grievance (if provided), the Director immediately notifies the College Dean of the grievance, providing copies of the student's initiating grievance statement, the instructor's written response to the grievance, and the written request from the student to have the process advanced to the College Level. Should the student not file a written request to move the grievance to the College Level within the prescribed time, the grievance will end. If the grievance concerns the Chairperson/Director or other officials of the department, the student has a right to bypass the departmental process and proceed directly to the College Level.

Level II College – 1) Upon receipt of the grievance, the College Dean either determines that the matter is not an academic grievance and dismisses it or within three weeks establishes an Academic Grievance Committee comprised of three faculty and two students. 2) The committee's deliberations are private and held confidential by all members of the Committee. The recommendation of the Committee is based on the factual evidence presented to it. 3) Within three weeks of the Committee appointment, the Committee Chairperson delivers in writing to the College Dean a report of the findings and a recommended resolution. 4) Within three weeks of receipt of the Committee recommendation, the College Dean provides a decision in writing to all parties (the student, the instructor and the department Chair/Program Director). The Dean's decision indicates whether the decision was consistent with the committee recommendation. 5) The student or the instructor may appeal the decision of the College Dean to the University Level only if the decision of the College Dean is contrary to the recommendation of the Committee (which will be indicated in the Dean's decision) or if there is a procedural violation of these Student Academic Grievance Procedures. Such an appeal must be made in writing to the USF Polytechnic Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within three weeks of receipt of the decision from the College Dean. Otherwise, the College Dean's decision is final and not subject to further appeal within the USF System.

Level III Campus/University – 1) The student or the instructor may appeal at the Campus/University Level within three weeks of the receipt of a decision made at the College

Level, when (a) the decision by a College Dean is contrary to the recommendation of a college Grievance Committee, or (b) there is cause to think a procedural violation of these USF System Academic Grievance Procedures has been made. Within three weeks of receipt of the appeal to the decision, the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in consultation with the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate, shall appoint an Appeals Committee consisting of three faculty members drawn from the USF Polytechnic Faculty Senate Undergraduate Committee or Graduate Committee (as appropriate), and two students, undergraduate or graduate (as appropriate). 2) The structure, functions and operating procedures of the Appeals Committee will be the same as those of the College Committee (i.e., chaired by one of the appointed faculty members appointed by the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs who will not vote except in the case of a tie. 3) Within three weeks of the appointment, the Committee Chairperson delivers in writing to the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs a report of the findings of the Committee and a recommended resolution. 4) Within three weeks of receipt of the Committee recommendation, the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs areport of the findings a decision in writing to all parties.

The Academic Grievance Procedure policy is published on the General Counsel's website [FR4.5-7, see link below], in the USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2011-2012 (pp. 58-61) see [FR4.5-8], and in the USF Polytechnic Graduate Catalog 2011-2012 (pp. 43-47) [see FR4.5-9].

Disruption of the Academic Process

USF System Regulation 3.025 Disruption of Academic Process [FR4.5-3] defines what constitutes disruptive behavior in the academic setting; what actions faculty and relevant academic officers may take in response to disruptive conduct; and the authority of the USF Polytechnic Dean of Students to initiate separate disciplinary proceedings against students for disruptive conduct.

If a student is disruptive, the instructor may ask the student to stop the disruptive behavior and/or warn the student that such disruptive behavior can result in academic and/or disciplinary action. Alleged disruptions of the academic process will be handled initially by the Instructor, who will discuss the incident with the student whenever possible. The Instructor is authorized to ask a student to leave the classroom or academic area and desist from the disruptive behavior. If the Instructor does this, s/he will send an Academic Disruption Incident Report within 48 hours simultaneously to the Division Director, the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, and the student. If the situation is deemed an emergency or if circumstances require more immediate action, the instructor should notify campus security or the appropriate law enforcement agency, as soon as possible. Any filed Incident Report can, and should, be updated if new information pertinent to the situation is obtained.

The instructor may also further exclude the student from the classroom or other academic area pending resolution of the matter. If the instructor recommends exclusion, the student must be informed before the next scheduled class either by phone, e-mail or in person. The notice must a) inform the student of the exclusion, and b) inform the student of his/her right to request of the Division Director within two days an expedited review of the exclusion.

If such academic exclusion occurs, and if the student requests a review, the Division Director will review the exclusion within two days of the date the student requests the review and decide if the student can return to the specific class and/or any academic setting. This decision may be appealed to the Dean of Students in writing within two days. The Dean of Students reviews the decision within two days and communicates the decision to the student. Any decision rendered at that point must be in writing and will serve as the final and binding academic decision of the University.

The Academic Grievance Procedure policy is published on the General Counsel's website [FR4.5-7, see link below], in the USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2011-2012 (pp. 61-64) see [FR4.5-8], and in the USF Polytechnic Graduate Catalog 2011-2012 (pp. 39-43) [see FR4.5-9].

Academic Regulations Committee

Certain academic regulations for the University are managed by the USF Polytechnic Academic Regulations Committee (ARC). The committee regularly reviews petitions submitted by undergraduate students. Undergraduate students must petition and secure approval from the ARC to return to the University after having been academically dismissed or to receive special consideration regarding an academic regulation, including late or retroactive drop of a course, late registration or late add of a course, deletion of a course, and withdrawal from a term. The student completes the ARC petition form and submits it to the Office of Records and Financial Aid.

The ARC reexamines petitions when the student provides new and substantive information directly related to the petition or evidence that an error was made. A final ARC decision may be appealed first through the College Dean or designee, and then the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The USF System has implemented a two calendar year statute of limitations on student petitions for retroactive adds, drops, withdrawals, and registration. The limitation applies to such appeals whether the student is in attendance or not.

The USF Polytechnic ARC is comprised of the Director of Records and Financial Aid, the Director of Academic Advising, the Assistant Director of Enrollment Management, and respective Academic Advisors across the campus. Representatives from across the USF System meet formally once a semester to review ARC policies and procedures for USF System

Information on the Academic Regulations Committee is published in the **USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2011-2012 (pp. 57-8) [see FR4.5-8]**, accessible to students online. The **University Registrar's website [see FR4.5-10 below]** houses the ARC process forms (see links below for ARC Instructor's Documentation Form **[FR4.5-10a]**, ARC Medical Form **[FR4.5-10b]**, ARC Late Drop/Add Form **[FR4.5-10c]**, and ARC Reinstatement after Academic Dismissal Form **[FR4.5-10d]**).

Non-Academic Formal Grievance Policy

A Non-Academic Formal Grievance or Formal Complaint is a written claim raised by a student alleging improper, unfair, or arbitrary action by a USF System department, administrator, and/or staff member involving the application of a specific provision of a USF System regulation, policy or procedure. For the purposes of this policy, each step shall be afforded three (3) weeks as a standard time limit. If the complaint or grievance is not presented within the established limits, it shall not be considered.

Students must first attempt to resolve any issue by discussing it with the person most directly involved. If no agreement or resolution can be reached, then the student can discuss the issue with that person's direct supervisor. If the student feels that the answer or action of the supervisor has violated published policies and procedures or has been applied to the student in a manner different from other students, the student may file a written grievance to the Director or Dean of the area in question as listed below or directly to the Office of the Dean for Students. If the student feels that the answer or action of the Director or Dean has violated published policies or procedures or has been applied to the student in a manner different from other students, the student can appeal to the Dean of Students.

The Dean of Students will review the material and determine if it constitutes a grievance or not. Should a grievance occur, the Dean of Students will recommend in writing to the student and the USF Department proposed remedies and corrective action. It is important to note that the Dean can only recommend corrective action and assist in communicating that action to the parties. If the student disagrees with the determination or recommendation of the Dean, the student may appeal the determination to the Regional Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in writing within ten (10) days of the determination for review and final recommendation.

Student Code of Conduct

USF System Regulation 6.0021 Student Code of Conduct [FR4.5-4] establishes the USF System community's value for the principles of integrity, civility, and respect. All students are expected to behave in a manner that supports these principles. The Student Code of Conduct is a document, which describes behavior that is counteractive to these principles and how the USF System will hold students accountable for those inappropriate behaviors.

Any member of the USF Polytechnic community may refer a student for an alleged violation of the Student Code of Conduct by filing a referral in writing with the USF System Office of Rights and Responsibilities which will initiate or follow up any investigative leads where there is reasonable belief of possible violations of the Student Code of Conduct.

The regulation outlines the process and proceedings which include a referral by the complainant to the USF System Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities; a written letter is sent to the student, stating that a referral has been made and informing the student of an opportunity for a meeting; an initial review and disposition letter indicating either that the Referral has been dismissed or that the Referral has been accepted and sanctions have been proposed; an opportunity for the charged student to accept responsibility and agree to proposed sanctions; a formal hearing either before an Administrative Officer or a hearing before a University Conduct Board; and an appeal process.

The code of conduct also articulates the rights of the charged students and the rights of the complainant/victim, sanctions that can be imposed by the University, provision for parental notification for all students under the age of 21, and maintenance and retention of disciplinary action records.

The USF System regulation applies to all campuses. However, non-substantive procedural modifications to reflect the particular circumstances of each campus are permitted. Information concerning these campus-specific procedures is available through the student affairs office at the individual campus.

The USF Polytechnic Office of Student Affairs is responsible for maintaining the **USF Polytechnic Student Code of Conduct [FR4.5-11].** The **Office of Student Affairs [FR4.5-12]** is also responsible for Student Rights and Responsibilities, and the Student Government Association. The Student Code of Conduct is accessible online and reviewed annually.

Diversity and Equal Opportunity

USF System Policy 0-007 Diversity and Equal Opportunity: Discrimination and Harassment [FR4.5-5] prohibits discrimination and harassment on the basis of race, color, marital status, sex, religion, national origin, disability or age, as provided by law. The USF System Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity is responsible for investigating discrimination and/or harassment complaints/allegations. Procedures and forms for filing complaints, as well as expectations for the complainant, respondent and supervisor regarding the complaint process, are accessible online through the **Diversity and Equal Opportunity website [FR4.13, see link below; FR4.5-13a-f Forms, see links below].** USF Polytechnic complies fully with all federal and state laws and regulations involving complaints regarding discrimination or harassment. Diversity is a core value of the campus as indicated in its strategic plan. We embrace the **USF System's Diversity Statement [FR4.5-14]** and the educational benefits of diversity in education and is committed to maintaining a diverse student body at the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as perpetuating initiatives that enhance the diversity of the campus climate, curriculum, student body, faculty, staff, and administration.

Disability and Accommodations

USF System Policy 0-108 Disability and Accommodations (Public/Employees/Students) [FR4.5-6] establishes the policy of the USF System to comply fully with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and all other federal and state laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability or handicap. The policy articulates the processes for providing reasonable accommodations for attendees at a public event, job applicants, employees and students, and for maintain confidentiality of documents. USF Polytechnic complies fully with all federal and state laws and regulations involving disability and accommodations. The **Office of Student Disability Services** [**FR4.5-15**] provides information for students on eligibility and documentation, as well as assistance with the application for accommodations process.

2. Include an example of a complaint demonstrating that the institution followed its policies and procedures (do not include names in the example).

Example of Complaint [FR4.5-16]

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[FR4.5-1] USF System Regulation 3.027 Academic Integrity of Students

[FR4.5-2] USF System Policy 10-002 Student Academic Grievance Procedure

[FR4.5-3] USF System Regulation 3.025 Disruption of Academic Process

[FR4.5-4] USF System Regulation 6.0021 Student Code of Conduct

[FR4.5-5] USF System Policy 0-007 Diversity and Equal Opportunity: Discrimination and Harassment

[FR4.5-6] USF System Policy 0-108 Disability and Accommodations (Public/Employees/Students)

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 355

[FR4.5-7] USF General Counsel's website: http://generalcounsel.usf.edu/

[FR4.5-8] USF Polytechnic Undergraduate Catalog 2010-2011

[FR4.5-9] USF Polytechnic Graduate Catalog 2010-2011

[FR4.5-10] USF Registrar's website: http://www.registrar.usf.edu/index.php

Forms

[FR4.5-10a] ARC Instructor's Documentation Form [FR4.5-10b] ARC Medical Form [FR4.5-10c] ARC Late Drop/Add Form [FR4.5-10d] ARC Reinstatement after Academic Dismissal Form

[FR4.5-11] USF Polytechnic Student Code of Conduct

[FR4.5-12] USF Polytechnic Student Affairs website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/CampusLife/StudentAffairs.html

[FR4.5-13] Diversity and Equal Opportunity website: http://usfweb2.usf.edu/eoa/

DEO Forms

[FR4.5-13a] DEO Complaint Process [FR4.5-13b] Expectations for the Complainant [FR4.5-13c] Expectations for the Respondent [FR4.5-13d] Expectations for the Supervisor [FR4.5-13e] Incident Report [FR4.5-13f] Intake Form

[FR4.5-14] USF Diversity Statement

[FR4.5-15] USF Polytechnic Office of Student Disability Services

[FR4.5-16] Example of Complaint

[FR4.5-17] Non-academic Grievance Policy

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Federal Requirement 4.6: Recruitment Materials

Recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent the institution's practices and policies.

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. Include a sample of recruitment materials and descriptions of a sample presentation and note accuracy of samples relative to the institution's practices and policies (such as admissions policies or academic policies).

All recruitment materials for USF Polytechnic are developed in collaboration between Enrollment Management, External Affairs, and the academic programs. Students receive recruitment information through brochures, flyers, and the website. Academic policies represented in these formats are derived from the university catalogs.

A sample undergraduate recruitment packet from the University of South Florida Polytechnic contains a tri-fold brochure asking the question, "Are you weird? – Are you read to get connected with people who are hands-on in classes that are useful and let you be innovative? Did you know it's OK to be weird?" The brochure provides information on the USF Polytechnic experience and is accompanied by Program Profiles for each of the degree programs and minors offered **[FR4.6-1, e.g., BA Criminology Program Profile]**. The Program Profiles provide an overview of the program/minor, admissions criteria, pre-major prerequisites, course of study requirements, and upper-level general education requirements. A sample recruitment packet is provided in hard copy.

A sample graduate education recruitment packet from the University of South Florida Polytechnic contains an overview of all programs offered by the division, highlighting the university admissions criteria, delivery methods, and program accreditation. The graduate education brochure is accompanied by a program sheet which details course listing, specific program admissions criteria, and an overview about the program [FR4.6-2].

The graduate business brochure contains information about the admissions criteria and process, detailed course listings and scheduling, and program accreditation. This brochure also highlights the benefits of the polytechnic experience [FR4.6-3].

Student Affairs

The **Office of Student Affairs [FR4.6-4]** is a comprehensive unit providing integrative services designed to enhance student learning and engagement. Student Affairs is comprised of Recruitment, Orientation, Enrollment Management, Admissions, Registration and Records, Financial Aid, Pre-Major Advising, Multicultural Education and Engagement Programs, Student Learning Success Programs, Personal and Career Counseling, Residential Life, Health and Wellness, Student Rights and Responsibilities, and Student Leadership and Engagement Programs.

Student Affairs is led by the Dean of Students who provides overall leadership and direction for the development, administration, evaluation and continuous improvement of all student services and programs. The Dean is responsible for strategic planning and collaborative leadership with administration, faculty, staff and students focused on a well-balanced and wholistic academic, co-curricular, extracurricular and developmental approach to student learning and success.

Recruitment is directly responsible for recruiting upper-division undergraduate and graduate (Master's) students. Faculty and staff participate in recruitment events on and off-campus, and provide recruiters with information about degree programs, curriculum requirements, and changes or updates in policies and procedures.

Future Students Website

The **USF Polytechnic Future Students website [FR2.6-5, see link below]** provides students with opportunity to get information 1) tailored to students' specific needs through completion of a Student Interest Page; 2) about USF Polytechnic generally (about the campus, about the "Get Weird" outreach, Fast Facts, the Polytechnic Model, how to Visit USF Polytechnic and about Off Campus Housing); and 3) about the application and admissions procedures at USF Polytechnic.

A Student Interest Form provides recruiters with student contact information, general information about the student's educational background (e.g., intended major, highest level of education attained, attendance at a Florida community college), factors important to the student in choosing USF Polytechnic, and areas of interest. Based on the information provided, a student is placed onto a communication plan managed through Hobson's EMT Connect and receives messaging electronically, by mail, by phone or in person.

The **Poly Preview Days [FR4.6-6]** are typically scheduled in October, March and June. It is an opportunity for future students to learn more about becoming a USF Polytechnic student, take a campus tour, attend an admissions workshop, have a transcript evaluation, speak with admissions advisors, financial aid specialists, academic major advisors, faculty, and student organization representatives.

New students are required to complete an online or on campus Orientation for New Students [FR4.6-7, New Student Orientation Manual]. Orientation helps new students to learn about:

- University policies
- Academic major requirements
- College requirements
- How to register for classes
- Student activities available on campus
- How to get an email account
- Where to pay for classes
- Where to buy books
- Meet your college academic advisor
- Career Center resources available
- Opportunities for grants, scholarships and loans
- Meet your classmates
- How to succeed at USF Polytechnic

• Get questions answered

Electronic Communication

USF Polytechnic communicates with future and current students through cross-media communications which include online marketing campaigns and cross-media strategies (e.g., e-mail, text messages, direct mail, personalized web portals, chat, social networking), including its Twitter website **[FR4.6-8, Twitter website, see link below]**. Hobson's EMT Technologies provides three centralized customer relationship management (CRM) systems dedicated to recruitment, retention and alumni. Through these CRM systems USFP is able to track student progress through the inquiry, application, admissions, enrollment, retention and completion processes.

Future students also receive appropriate information from USF Polytechnic through web-based information on the popular **Student Tools website [FR4.6-9, see link below]**. On this page students are able to directly access the course catalogs, schedules of classes and information about resources available to USF Polytechnic students.

Other Information Formats

Recruiters at USF Polytechnic are part of the Office of Enrollment Management. In order to provide information about the institution, outreach is done in several venues. Frequent visits are made to partner community/ state colleges to set up information tables to speak with potential students. Information Sessions are hosted on a regular basis for graduate programs both on campus and at locations that are convenient for prospective students to attend. In addition, outreach is done at local businesses, community agencies, and government organizations.

Consistency in Brand and Format

The Director of Marketing approves all materials and presentations to ensure conformity to **USF System Policy 0-209 Publications [FR4.6-10]** regarding the appropriate use of the University's logo, seal, and visual identity and graphic standards **[FR4.6-11, USF Visual Identity and Graphic Standards Manual]**. The Assistant Director of Enrollment Management and the Director of Marketing meet quarterly and as needed to review all recruitment materials and presentations to ensure compliance with publication standards and to incorporate institutional changes to ensure accurate representation of USF Polytechnic practices and policies. The Assistant Director of Enrollment Management meets regularly with the USF Polytechnic web strategist to make website revisions as changes in practice and/or policy occur.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[FR4.6-1] BA Criminology Program Profile, example; other profiles are provided in hard copy

[FR4.6-2] Sample graduate education recruitment packet

[FR4.6-3] Graduate business brochure

[FR4.6-4] USF Polytechnic Office of Student Affairs

[FR2.6-5] USF Polytechnic Future Students website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/FutureStudents.html

[FR4.6-6] Poly Preview Day

[FR4.6-7] Student Orientation Manual, see CR2.10-4 for hard copy

[FR4.6-8] USF Polytechnic Twitter website: http://twitter.com/USFP

[FR4.6-9] Student Tools website: http://poly.usf.edu/StudentTools.html

[FR4.6-10] USF System Policy 0-209 Publications

[FR4.6-11] USF Visual Identity and Graphic Standards Manual, sample pages in hard copy

Part B: Documentation of Compliance Federal Requirement 4.7: Title IV Program Responsibilities

The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the 1998 Higher Education Amendments. (In reviewing the institution's compliance with these program responsibilities, the Commission relies on documentation forwarded to it by the Secretary of Education.)

☑ Compliance □ Partial Compliance □ Non-compliance

MINIMUM DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED:

1. If the institution receives Federal Financial Aid under Title IV, it should provide its most recent financial aid audit and any letters within the last two years reflecting issues of non-compliance.

USF System Regulation 3.0121 Financial Aid Administration, Distribution and Use of Financial Aid Resources [FR4.7-1] establishes the USF Office of Financial Aid as the single office designated to coordinate and administer financial aid at the University of South Florida (University/USF). All USF offices and departments must report any and all awards made to students to the USF Office of Financial Aid, in a timely manner, so that this information is properly included in the University's reports to the Board of Governors and the Department of Education. Information concerning any institutional need-based financial aid program may be obtained from the Office of Financial Aid. This office coordinates the distribution and use of all need-based resources, as well as all merit-based programs awarded by the Office of Admissions, the Graduate School, the individual colleges or departments, and the other campuses of the University. Additionally, this office coordinates scholarships awarded to students by donors external to the University.

USF and the University of South Florida Polytechnic as part of the USF System is authorized to participate in the Federal Title IV programs by the United States Department of Education under the Federal Program Participation Agreement valid through September 30, 2013 [FR4.7-2, only available at USF Tampa].

In accordance with the **Code of Federal Regulations Student Assistance General Provisions [FR4.7-3]** and the **Standards for Participation in Title IV HEA Programs [FR4.7-4]**, USF Polytechnic adheres to all federal regulations in processing student aid applications and federal funds.

Financial aid specialists verify student eligibility, checking the accuracy of the information reported by the student and/or parents on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and correct any discrepant data in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, 34 CFR 668, subpart E and required policies, 34 CFR 668.53. Corrections made are consistent with the instructions on the FAFSA, the current tax return(s) and Federal Verification Worksheet(s).

All policies and related regulations for review of eligibility and awarding of financial aid are maintained, reviewed, and updated in the USF Office of Financial Aid Policy and Procedure electronic manual. The **USF Office of Financial Aid website [FR4.7-5, and see link below]** provides a detailed site index of policies and guidelines.

As a condition of receiving Federal funds, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) requires, as described in OMB Circular A-133, an audit of the State's financial statements and major Federal awards programs. Pursuant to Section 11.45, Florida Statutes, the Florida Auditor General's Office conducted an audit of the basic financial statements of the State of Florida as of and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2009. They also subjected supplementary information contained in the State's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report and the State's Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards to auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements. Additionally, they audited the State's compliance with governing requirements for the Federal awards programs or program clusters that were identified as major programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2009.

All campuses of the University of South Florida are included in the audit. The most recent audit was completed for fiscal year ending June 30, 2009 [FR4.7-6 2010-165 State of Florida Compliance & Internal Controls over Financial Reporting & Federal Awards for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010] and a Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings for FY Ended June 30, 2009 [FR4.7-7]. Neither the Compliance and Internal Controls Report (pp. 239, 251-252) nor the Summary Schedule (p.75) showed corrections to be made in the area of financial aid.

The University of South Florida Polytechnic Office of Records and Financial Aid is led by the Director of Records and Financial Aid who is assisted by one (1) financial aid specialist and one (1) financial aid team manager. All three staff assist students with the aid application process, as well as with the processing of aid in accordance with each student's established eligibility. During fiscal year 2009-2010, USF Polytechnic disbursed \$1,979,830 in federal and state student financial aid [FR4.7-8 USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010, p.14]. The USF Polytechnic Financial Aid and Scholarships website [FR4.7-9, see link below] provides students with financial aid opportunities and services on campus. The campus supports fifteen scholarships locally [FR4.7-10, USF Polytechnic Scholarships].

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

[FR4.7-1] USF System Regulation 3.0121 Financial Aid Administration, Distribution and Use of Financial Aid Resources

[FR4.7-2] Federal Program Participation Agreement valid through September 30, 2013, only available at the USF Office of Financial Aid, USF Tampa (SVC 1102).

[FR4.7-3] Code of Federal Regulations Student Assistance General Provisions

[FR4.7-4] Standards for Participation in Title IV HEA Programs

[FR4.7-5] USF Office of Financial Aid website: http://usfweb2.usf.edu/finaid/

[FR4.7-6] State of Florida Compliance & Internal Controls over Financial Reporting & Federal Awards for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010

[FR4.7-7] Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings

[FR4.7-8] USF Polytechnic Financial Audit for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2010

WORKING DRAFT 1 (1/12/2012) Application Update - USF Polytechnic | 362

[FR4.7-9] USF Polytechnic Financial Aid and Scholarships website: http://www.poly.usf.edu/Apply-USFP/FinancialAid.html

[FR4.7-10] USF Polytechnic Scholarships