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The University of Vermont is a successful educational institution. Application and matriculation data tell us that students apply and come, and test and graduation data tell us that, once here, they learn and earn degrees. Similarly, elaborate systems of academic credentialing and career-long peer review of research, teaching, and service tell us that well-educated faculty members come to UVM and enjoy successful academic careers as teachers, scholars, and citizens. University life is filled with assessment – office and computer files are crammed with evidence of this – but it is largely assessment of individual performance. And so we claim institutional success, and rightfully so, because the proxies for the academic achievement and success of individuals – good grades and high retention and graduation rates (for students) and educational pedigree, degrees, promotions, and expanding vitae (for faculty) – are abundant.

A successful institution is not the same as an effective or excellent institution. There are hundreds of successful colleges and universities, but fewer effective and excellent ones. Student and faculty academic performance is realized in an organizational context that makes individual excellence and success more or less of an important value, more or less difficult to achieve. Thus, effectiveness and excellence may have as much to do with how we assemble, combine, and set in motion all of the elements of the academic enterprise as they do with individual capacity and motivation.

Ensuring academic excellence and effectiveness, then, requires that we shift our gaze from the individual to the organization. Institutional rather than individual assessment helps us interrogate the ways we put things together to achieve our goals. It is foremost an organizational critique, suggesting that university effectiveness, student learning, and program and service quality are organizational accomplishments. It assumes that the human, fiscal, environmental, technological, and physical resources of the academy can always be organized better to promote and enact the creation, dissemination, and application of knowledge.

The review of the university’s strategic plan and preparation of the university’s re-accreditation self-study report constitute the more immediate context for this organizational scan of institutional assessment. Four specific areas have been targeted: (1) assessment of institutional performance, (2) assessment of learning outcomes at the institutional, school/college, and academic program levels, (3) assessment of academic programs, and (4) assessment of campus offices and services. In each case, the goal has been to highlight how we undertake institutional assessment at UVM, what we’ve learned from it, and what actions have resulted from this knowledge. This effort has been organized by the Provost’s Office, with input and support provided by the UVM Assessment Council whose membership and roles are described in Appendix E.
I. Assessment of Institutional Performance

Background

The strategic plan that has guided the University of Vermont for most of this decade was approved by the Board of Trustees in October of 2000, and its continuing development and elaboration was “acknowledged with enthusiasm” by the Board in May of 2003. At that time, it was envisioned that the plan would guide the university for the next five years. Anticipating the need to review and revise the strategic plan, President Daniel Mark Fogel appointed a reconstituted University Planning Council (UPC) in January of 2007. Chaired by Provost John Hughes, the UPC was charged to assess the existing strategic plan and to ensure that the subsequent work to revise the plan was well integrated with the campus’ NEASC re-accreditation self-study process.

The 2003 plan included a vision statement, mission statement, and seven goals, and was later augmented with an extensive list of action steps, referred to as the “Matrix for Advancing UVM.” Annual updates to the matrix offered evidence of action step accomplishments, but did not directly address the question of the degree to which the university was successful in achieving its strategic goals. The assessment task for the UPC was to define performance indicators for each goal, collect and analyze data related to each indicator, and use the findings of that analysis to critique the current state of the university and inform a revision of the strategic plan.

Methodology

The University Planning Council met monthly from February to May, 2007 and developed a matrix of over 160 performance indicators for the seven strategic goals. Data for most indicators were plotted over the prior five years with peer comparisons, where available. The UPC agreed on a framework for creating and disseminating a smaller set of metrics, which was then developed over the summer months. In early fall, the UPC reviewed a draft of the Strategic Plan Performance Indicators Report, which included 48 metrics. A final draft was presented to the Board of Trustees at its November 2007 meeting and was posted on the President’s homepage. The outcome – a document entitled “Strategic Plan Performance Indicators Report” – is accessible online at: http://www.uvm.edu/president/strategic_planning/SPPI_Metrics_FINAL.pdf. UPC retreats in November and December and the President’s Senior Leadership retreat in January 2008 drew on the report to assess UVM’s progress in achieving its goals and to suggest new and revised goals for the next plan.

Findings and Actions Taken

The University Planning Council concluded that UVM was headed in the right direction, that the list of accomplishments in support of the strategic plan was lengthening and impressive, but there was still work to be done. Highest marks were assigned to progress and achievements relating to financial strength, organizational alignment, and academic program development. Greatest concerns were expressed in relation to the university’s
diversity and research goals. More generally, the UPC emphasized the importance of focusing and prioritizing the university’s academic initiatives and tying the new goals and action steps more closely to the revised vision and mission statements. These conclusions, coupled with President Fogel’s argument (articulated in “Continuing UVM’s Advance: Contexts for a Refocused Strategic Plan,” 2008) that the essential strategic priority of sustaining the advance of UVM must be the vigorous pursuit of academic distinction and distinctiveness, generated a five-goal strategic plan that calls for greater academic definition and focus. Anticipating Board of Trustee approval in September of 2008 following the Faculty Senate’s approval in May, working groups will be appointed and convened around each of the five goals in the fall semester of 2008 and charged with defining and refining action ideas and creating appropriate metrics for the ongoing assessment of progress. Their work will come back to the UPC which will then prioritize and integrate these ideas into a campus action plan. With metrics defined at the outset rather than years into the implementation of the plan, monitoring and assessment of institutional progress and achievement will be an ongoing endeavor. “Strategic Plan 2009-2013: Sustaining the Advance” is available online at
II. Assessment of Learning Outcomes

a. University-Wide

Background

The university has adopted two campus-wide undergraduate requirements in recent decades: a two-credit physical education requirement and a six-credit diversity requirement.

UVM Physical Education Requirement (from the UVM website):

“In order to graduate, all UVM students in four year programs are required to take one year (2.0 credits) of Physical Education, and all students in two year programs are required to take 1.0 credit of physical education. Students 25 years of age or older at the time of admissions or readmission are exempt from this requirement. However, since the two credits are included in the total hours required for graduation, they will need to earn two credits from another area. All transfer students under the age of 25 must complete the physical education requirement. In addition to taking a Physical Education Activity Class (PEAC), students may earn Physical Education credit through Varsity Sport Credit, Club Sport Credit, Credit by Exam, and Independent Study.”

UVM Diversity Requirement (from the UVM website):
(Full proposal available at http://www.uvm.edu/~facsen/RevisedDiversityProposal041006.pdf)

“Beginning with the first-year class entering during the Fall 2007 semester, all undergraduate degree candidates must successfully complete one three-credit Diversity course from Category 1 (Race and Racism in the U.S.) or Category 2 (Human and Societal Diversity). This requirement will apply as well to undergraduate transfer students receiving bachelor's degrees in May or December 2011.

Beginning with the class entering during the Fall 2008 semester, all undergraduates must successfully complete one three-credit course from Category 1 (Race and Racism in the U.S.) and a second three-credit course from either Category 1 or Category 2 (Human and Societal Diversity). These requirements will apply as well to undergraduate transfer students receiving bachelor's degrees from May 2012 onward. (For approved courses refer to Web Page.)”

General Education:

The university has no formal campus-wide general education requirement, although recent history suggests some convergence in how the university community thinks about liberal education and student learning outcomes. In 1999, the Academic Affairs
Committee (AAC) initiated a consideration of the establishment of core competencies for all UVM undergraduates. Just prior to President Fogel’s arrival in 2002, the AAC Subcommittee on Curricular Cohesiveness released a report in which it proposed “core areas of knowledge, skills, and awareness.” The proposal was not formally approved. Since President Fogel’s arrival, the university’s vision and mission statements have featured the idea that UVM will be “preeminent in our comprehensive commitment to liberal education . . .” and President Fogel has encouraged the faculty to consider collectively how to realize this commitment at UVM. At a meeting of the Faculty Senate on October 11, 2004, faculty members exchanged views on the various meanings of liberal education and the knowledge, skills, and values that a 21st century graduate should possess. Two years later on December 11, 2006, upon the release of his “Signatures of Excellence” essay, President Fogel urged the faculty to explore ways to ensure that students acquire the qualities defined by UVM’s distinctive signature. More recently, a revised mission statement approved by the Faculty Senate in May of 2008 and scheduled for action by the Board of Trustees in September of 2008 has drawn on these and other prior conversations to articulate specific learning outcomes:

To create, evaluate, share, and apply knowledge and to prepare students to be accountable leaders who will bring to their work dedication to the global community, a grasp of complexity, effective problem-solving and communication skills, and an enduring commitment to learning and ethical conduct.

The study of school/college-level requirements described in the next section also suggests a voluntary and gradual evolution toward a common conception of liberal education learning outcomes that underlies each undergraduate college’s distribution requirements for graduation.

Assessment

Physical Education:

The physical education requirement was enacted at UVM in the post World War II years when community facilities were limited and educational institutions were seen as the major sites for physical activity. Since the 1980s, the requirement has been a focus of debate on campus, but it has remained in force. Following in depth study and public hearings in 2000, a Faculty Senate resolution to eliminate the requirement failed to pass. Degree audits establish whether or not candidates for the baccalaureate degree have satisfied the requirement, but there is no record of a recent university-wide assessment of its intended outcomes. The Physical Education Department reports that its surveys of physical education students suggest that they enjoy the classes but do not favor a physical education requirement. In recent years, increasing frustration among students over the implementation of the requirement has produced two votes in 2008 -- one by the Student Government Association (SGA) recommending dissolution of the requirement, and one by the Academic Dean’s Council supporting the Provost’s transmittal of the SGA vote to the Faculty Senate for formal action. The SGA resolution is reprinted below to
underscore that this action represented a critique of the program rather than of its aims, a perspective shared by the Academic Dean’s Council. Whether or not the broader goals of a physical education requirement will become concretized in the ongoing development of the revised strategic plan, a plan framed by a vision of the university “as preeminent in our comprehensive commitment to . . . health . . .” remains to be seen.

SGA Senate Resolution/Bill No.: RF07-018

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY'S PHYSICAL EDUCATION CREDIT GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

WHEREAS the University of Vermont has a 2-credit physical education requirement for all students,

WHEREAS there are too few physical education classes, offered often in irregular class times, that frequently require additional fees to take,

WHEREAS without priority registration, many people are unable to register for physical education courses until their senior year, frequently posing problems for those who have other requirements to fulfill for graduation,

LET IT BE KNOWN that the University of Vermont Student Government Association sees the value in a physical education requirement, and that when functioning properly such a requirement can foster and promote healthy lifestyles for University of Vermont students.

LET IT BE KNOWN that the University of Vermont Student Government Association finds the physical education requirement to have insufficient support from the University in offering enough varied classes to function as a general requirement,

LET IT BE KNOWN that the University of Vermont Student Government Association believes it necessary that the currently dysfunctional physical education requirement be dissolved immediately unless the number of courses and times be greatly increased and the class fees reevaluated.

Diversity:

In contrast, the university-wide diversity requirement passed by the Faculty Senate in 2006 was structured around an explicit set of diversity competencies framed as learning outcomes (reprinted below). In addition, the Senate resolution included a richer assessment plan than originally proposed (also reprinted below). A standing committee – the Diversity Curriculum Review Committee (DCRC) – was established to oversee the implementation of the requirement, and it has since created a research subcommittee to focus on the development and implementation of an assessment plan.
Diversity Competencies

Cognizant of the role we can play in educating our students for participation in a multicultural world, the President’s Commission on Racial Diversity has identified the following *eight diversity competencies* as goals for all undergraduate students at the University of Vermont.

1) A multidisciplinary appreciation of diverse cultures, communities, and histories that constitute U.S. society, as well as awareness of global issues regarding diversity.
2) An understanding of U.S. traditions of democracy, active citizenship and how they may serve as a means to understand and resolve conflicts linked to race, class, ethnicity, and gender issues.
3) An ability to describe the nature, historical patterns, and demographics of American society in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, and class differences.
4) An ability to carry out an intellectual discourse with diverse peoples for the purpose of evaluating public policy and creating a shared future vision of American society.
5) The development of problem solving and analytical skills about diversity, while acquiring an understanding of the diversity of American culture and other cultures across the globe.
6) Knowledge of the origins and systemic nature of prejudice, discrimination and oppression that has been directed toward people of diverse backgrounds and orientations.
7) A capacity to visualize and imagine public situations or issues involving diversity from multiple perspectives. The development of capacity to construct action plans for dealing with issues of diversity in the workplace, organizations, and the community.
8) An understanding of the current experiences and issues in the United States of different racial groups (including discrimination in all forms, life experiences of racial groups and white privilege.)

Diversity Requirement Assessment Addendum to Approved Policy

We request that the Provost’s Office consider ways to expand the evaluation procedures currently proposed (i.e., exit surveys with graduating students). Evaluation should occur following the first two years of implementation of the proposal and on a regular basis following the initial evaluation. The evaluation should include measures designed to obtain input from students, faculty, staff, and administrators regarding the effectiveness of the requirement in relation to its overall aims and objectives, as well as the processes used to implement it. Some or all of the evaluation should be conducted by an external reviewer, using rigorous evaluation measures.
**General Education:**

As noted above, although UVM aims to be “preeminent in our comprehensive commitment to liberal education . . .”, there is no codified university-wide undergraduate general education requirement at this time. However, UVM will participate in the National Association of State and Land Grant Universities and Colleges’ (NASULGC)-sponsored Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) program, which requires the reporting of first-year and senior-year student scores from any one of three nationally recognized standardized exams that purport to assess liberal education skills – analytical reasoning, critical thinking, writing, etc. UVM is one of 13 colleges and universities selected to participate in a U.S. Department of Education funded national Test Validity Study (TVS) during the fall of 2008 in which the construct validity of the three tests – Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP), Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), and Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) – will be examined. UVM will draw on the results of the TVS and the input of an internal advisory group to select one of the tests for assessing liberal education outcomes in future years.

b. School/College Learning Outcomes

**Background**

Beside the UVM-wide diversity and physical education requirements, all requirements for the undergraduate degree are defined by each of the seven undergraduate schools/colleges. The Graduate College establishes university-wide requirements for all graduate programs except the M.D. degree. The study of school/college learning outcomes assessment began with questions about the prevalence and variety of school/college requirements and whether or not such requirements were derived from statements about school/college-wide learning goals.

**Methodology**

Following extensive Assessment Council discussion in which school/college representatives described different local requirements but discovered convergence in their underlying rationales, representatives of the seven undergraduate degree granting schools/colleges and the Honors College prepared and posted materials according to the following rubric:

I. (a) Statement of codified school/college level undergraduate degree requirements or competencies.
   (b) Educational rationale for these requirements/competencies, particularly in terms of desired learning outcomes.

II. Description of curricular “commonalities” across the school/college that are not formally codified as school/college requirements but are experienced by all
students as a result either of being required by all majors in the school/college or of course registration patterns. [If appropriate, “segment” the school/college and discuss more than one set of commonalities.]

III. Description of any efforts to assess directly or indirectly the extent to which the underlying learning objectives of requirements or commonalities are achieved.

IV. Description of existing or planned efforts at the school/college level to define, refine, and/or assess college-level requirements.

Findings

- Most colleges define degree requirements beyond the major and minor. For those that do not, there are identifiable “commonalities” that, as a result of being required for all, or almost all, majors within the school/college, function as *de facto* school- or college-wide requirements.

- Although the specific requirements and commonalities vary across the colleges, they are all expressed in terms of broad exposure to the liberal arts and sciences, reflecting the vision of UVM to be “preeminent in our comprehensive commitment to liberal education . . .” This unifying principle and its expression in school/college distribution requirements or commonalities essentially defines general education at UVM as broad exposure, creates a structural interdependence among the schools and colleges, and charges the College of Arts and Sciences, by far the largest of the undergraduate colleges, with the task of delivering most of the general education curriculum to the entire undergraduate population.

- Within the College of Arts and Sciences itself, general education is defined as breadth of exposure which translates into required course work within each of seven areas – fine arts, literature, mathematics, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and foreign language.

- Three of the remaining six degree-granting undergraduate colleges have distribution *requirements* (SBA, CALS, RSEN); three have distribution *commonalities* (CNHS, CEMS, CESS). All prescribe breadth of exposure in the liberal arts and sciences, although the degree of breadth varies.

- Colleges have mapped their exposure requirements against specific learning outcomes to varying degrees. Outcomes that appear with some frequency across the narratives provided by the schools/colleges include the following:

  Knowledge of specific content related to the mission of the school/college
  Critical thinking and analytical reasoning
Written and oral communication
Quantitative reasoning and analysis
Understanding of how knowledge is created
Broad perspective and understanding of the human condition
Integration of theory and practice
Mastery of information technology

- Assessment Council members agree that within their schools/colleges, the assumption is that exposure to humanities, physical sciences, and social sciences content enables students to achieve the general education outcomes listed above. Degree Audits certify the completion of exposure requirements in each school/college and, although course evaluations are widespread and more general student surveys are administered in a few schools/colleges, general education competencies are typically not tied to specific liberal arts courses and there is very little systematic direct or indirect assessment of general education learning outcomes at the school/college level.

- Most of the schools/colleges have undergone substantial curricular reform in recent years or major reform initiatives are under discussion, and most are working toward the development of school/college-level strategies for assessing outcomes.

  A&S: All seven areas of exposure required (no opting out); aligning BS general education requirements with BA
  SBA: New learning goals and objectives
  RSENS: Curriculum reform to define core and general education curriculum in terms of student outcomes
  CALS: Core competencies with assessment plan
  Honors: Change in focus of first-year seminar
  CEMS: Curriculum 21 initiative – re-examination of all curricula
  CESS: Re-visioning the Department of Education initiative
  CNHS: Inter-professional curriculum development
  COM: Vermont Integrated Curriculum based on defined competencies

- The Graduate College establishes university-wide requirements for all master’s and doctor of philosophy degree programs at UVM. These include (quoted from the Graduate Catalogue):
  
  **Time to degree limits:**
  Master’s degree full-time student: 3 years
  Master’s degree part-time student: 5 years
  Doctoral degree student: 9 years

  **Minimum residence requirements:**
  Master’s degree: 21 credits
  Doctoral degree: 51 credits
Master’s comprehensive examination: “All master’s degree students are required to pass a written and/or oral comprehensive examination in their field of specialization.”

Doctoral comprehensive examination: “A written comprehensive examination in the field of study must be passed by the candidate . . . “

Doctoral Teaching Requirement: “All doctoral candidates must acquire appropriate teaching experience in their chosen fields prior to the award of the degree.”

Doctoral Research and Dissertation: “Each candidate . . . must complete an acceptable original research project which contributes new knowledge or techniques in an academic field.”

Although these requirements are not accompanied with explicit formal learning goals, time to degree and residence requirements are typically designed to ensure currency of knowledge as defined by the institution’s graduate faculty at the time of graduation. Comprehensive examinations are meant to test in-depth mastery of subject matter while dissertation research requires demonstration of ability to conduct independent, original research. Assessment occurs in the context of examination committee deliberations on a case by case basis.

- The College of Medicine establishes the requirements for the doctor of medicine degree. Successful completion of the degree requires:

  MD competency examinations: All MD degree students are required to pass Step 1 and 2 CK of the United States Medical Licensing Exams (USMLE). Step 1 assesses application of knowledge and understanding of key concepts of basic biomedical science, with an emphasis on principles and mechanisms of health, disease, and modes of therapy. Step 2 CK assesses application of medical knowledge and understanding of clinical science considered essential for the provision of patient care under supervision, including an emphasis on health promotion and disease prevention.

Conclusions

- There is evidence of a common conception of liberal education learning outcomes that underlies each undergraduate school/college’s distribution requirements for graduation.
- There is evidence of significant effort at the undergraduate school/college level to define learning outcomes more explicitly, which is the essential first step in the development of learning outcome assessment plans at the school/college level.
- In general, at present, the outcomes of exposure are not assessed directly.

c. Academic Programs

Background

Requirements and curricula within majors and degree programs typically reflect a sense of the relevant knowledge domain and how best to organize it. Becoming a college or university professor involves entering a system of shared meanings – some derived from the wider academic discipline; others from the local institutional setting – that defines the domain and its internal organization at a particular place and time. Individual faculty members claim expertise in various areas of the domain and are assigned courses, the vehicle for communicating knowledge domains and assessing student mastery of them. Often implicit in the transformation of a knowledge domain into curriculum are notions of what students should learn. Academic programs involved in educating for professional practice have made those notions formal and explicit as they have grappled with their complex accreditation and licensing environments. Increasingly, liberal arts programs are being asked to do the same, and to investigate systematically the extent to which such learning outcomes are realized.

There is substantial anecdotal evidence of assessment at UVM in general, but little information about the prevalence of formal learning outcome assessment at the academic program level. Two consultants on learning outcome assessment visited UVM during 2006-2007 (Professor Paul Anderson, Miami University; and Professor Emerita Barbara Walvoord, University of Notre Dame) to conduct workshops with academic programs on learning outcome assessment. This section describes the status of learning outcome assessment at the program level at UVM.

Methodology

Although learning outcome assessment is appropriate for any programmatic structure that is organized around a set of learning goals (i.e., undergraduate major, minor, concentration, certificate program, graduate degree), this inventory defined the universe of study as all active undergraduate majors and graduate degree programs. This program array is listed in Appendix A, and consists of 95 undergraduate majors, 52 master’s degree programs, and 22 doctoral degree programs. Not included are new programs that have received approval but have not yet been implemented. Multi-college sponsored programs are listed and counted only once under the school/college tenure-home of the program director.
Because UVM’s accrediting body, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), now requires its participating institutions to make assessment more explicit in self-study documents through the submission of a completed template that provides a program-by-program inventory of assessment practices (“E1A. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators”), the Assessment Council chose to use that template as the data collection instrument for this survey of 169 UVM programs. For each program, the template asks:

1. Have formal learning outcomes been developed?
2. Where are these learning outcomes published?
3. Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree?
4. Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?
5. How are the findings used? Note changes that have been made as a result of using the data/evidence.
6. Web address for full documentation

Assessment Council members were responsible for gathering the data on each program within their respective schools/colleges. Once submitted, analytical categories were developed from the responses and quantitative frequencies were calculated. The data provided by each program have been entered into a spreadsheet. (See E1A).

Caveat: The open-ended questions in the template produced responses that varied greatly in terms of level of detail and specificity. A reasonable interpretation is that some respondents offered only illustrative examples of assessment work whereas others provided exhaustive accounts. Therefore, the aggregation of these responses cannot be viewed as a rigorously exhaustive portrait of the state of assessment activities in academic programs.

Findings

- 80 of 95 undergraduate majors (84%) have developed formal learning outcomes.

  - CALS: 11 of 13 (85%)
  - CAS: 37 of 46 (80%)
  - SBA: 1 of 1 (100%)
  - CESS: 12 of 12 (100%)
  - CEMS: 5 of 9 (56%)
  - RSEN: 7 of 7 (100%)
  - CNHS: 7 of 7 (100%)

- All 80 undergraduate majors with formal learning outcomes identify web addresses where the learning outcomes can be found. Eighteen of the 80 majors (23%) include program learning outcomes on course syllabi. Twenty-five of the
80 (31%) publish learning outcomes in student or program handbooks. Only 4 of 37 (11%) CAS majors with learning goals report communicating this material beyond posting on a website. Of the non-CAS majors with learning outcomes, 28 of 43 (65%) communicate learning goals beyond the website. CEMS and CALS are more like CAS. Almost all of the majors in four schools/colleges -- SBA, CESS, RSENR, and CNHS – report using more than one method to communicate learning outcomes.

- Nine types of assessment methods were identified from the responses to the question regarding assessment evidence (6 direct methods; 3 indirect methods). The number and proportion of the 80 undergraduate majors with learning goals using each method is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>#Programs</th>
<th>%Programs (of 80)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Course</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework (incl internships) evaluated in terms of program learning goals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Paper Assessment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Standardized Exam</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Review</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Exam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Senior Survey</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Honors and Awards</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Two operationalizations of the richness of evidence/methods were developed: the first provides a simple count of how many different kinds of methods are used by academic programs; the second examines the prevalence of assessment plans that combine direct and indirect methods of assessment.

(1) Number of assessment methods used by each program by school/college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of methods used</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16
# of programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS (11)</td>
<td>0 3 3 4 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS (37)</td>
<td>0 5 23 8 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA (1)</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESS (12)</td>
<td>1 2 0 1 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMS (5)</td>
<td>0 0 0 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSENR (7)</td>
<td>0 0 5 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNHS (7)</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1 10 27 18 15 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>1% 13% 34% 23% 19% 11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Number of programs using both direct and indirect methods of assessment by school/college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS (11)</td>
<td>5 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS (37)</td>
<td>29 (78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA (1)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESS (12)</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMS (5)</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSENR (7)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNHS (7)</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (80)</strong></td>
<td>63 (79%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Virtually all programs with defined learning outcomes describe a deliberative process for interpreting assessment data and using that information to improve the academic program. The typical pattern is for a subset of the program faculty to collect data and interpret findings and for the full faculty to discuss recommended changes.

- Three ways of examining the use of assessment findings to strengthen academic programs are presented: the prevalence of different kinds of program reforms; the number of programs instituting assessment-driven changes; the scope of reform efforts within programs making changes.

(1) Number of categories of reforms made by each program by school/college:

Reform Categories:
1 = course content  
2 = degree requirements  
3 = pedagogical changes  
4 = new courses/programs  
5 = course requirements  
6 = changes in student advising

Reform Categories: 1 2 3 4 5 6

# of programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS (11)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS (37)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESS (12)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMS (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSENR (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNHS (7)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (80)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of programs</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Number and proportion of programs that made changes by school/college:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS (11)</td>
<td>8 (73%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS (37)</td>
<td>14 (38%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA (1)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESS (12)</td>
<td>8 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMS (5)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSENR (7)</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNHS (7)</td>
<td>6 (86%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (80)</td>
<td>41 (51%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Scope of change: Of the programs in each school/college that made changes, the number that made changes in a given number of reform categories

CALS (8): All 8 programs made changes in one category.
CAS (14):  6 programs made changes in one category; 
           8 programs made changes in two categories.
SBA (1):   1 program made changes in two categories.
CESS (8):  6 programs made changes in one category; 
           1 program made changes in two categories. 
           1 program made changes in three categories.
CEMS (2):  2 programs made changes in three categories.
RSENR (2): 2 programs made changes in three categories.
CNHS (6):  1 program made changes in three categories. 
           2 programs made changes in four categories.

TOTAL (41): 20 programs (49%) made changes in one category.
             13 programs (32%) made changes in two categories. 
             6 programs (15%) made changes in three categories. 
             2 programs (5%) made changes in four categories.

- Program-specific learning outcomes are less common in graduate programs. 
  Assessment Council members were able to identify 18 of 52 master’s programs 
  (35%) and 7 of 22 doctoral programs (32%) with learning outcomes. Very few 
  changes as a result of assessment are reported for master’s programs. At both the 
  master’s and doctoral levels, assessment of learning goals focuses on evidence 
  provided by the evaluation of thesis and dissertation work.

Master’s Programs with Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALS (10)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS (15)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBA (1)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESS (10)</td>
<td>10 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMS (9)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSENR (1)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNHS (1)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM (5)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL (52): 18 (35%)

Doctoral Programs with Learning Outcomes

Psychology, Natural Resources, Neuroscience, Molecular Physiology and 
Biophysics Ph.D., Ed.D., DPT, MD

Conclusions
The vast majority of UVM’s undergraduate degree majors has developed formal learning outcomes for their programs.

All programs with formal learning outcomes communicate this information via the web. Programs outside of the College of Arts and Sciences are more likely to publish this information in additional outlets such as student handbooks and course syllabi.

Assessment at UVM includes both direct and indirect methods of data gathering. The most common direct methods involve evaluation of student work in capstone courses or in other advanced courses in which student performance is assessed in terms of the overall learning goals of the major. The use of national standardized examinations is less prevalent, but typical in majors that prepare students for professional practice. Senior and alumni surveys are the most common type of indirect assessment method, with over one-half of all of the programs with learning outcomes reporting that they survey current or former students.

Most programs use multiple methods and almost four-fifths of those doing assessment employ both direct and indirect methods.

Just over one-half of the undergraduate majors with assessment plans report making changes based on assessment evidence. Course content changes are the most commonly reported type of reform. Of those programs that have made changes, one-half have done so in more than one category of reform.

Assessment Council members report that implementing assessment plans within their schools/colleges has produced improvement and innovation in the assessment process itself such as modifications in assessment methodology and refinement of learning goals.

Overall, the findings indicate that the establishment of learning goals at the undergraduate program level is widespread and approaching universality. Evidence-gathering activities suggest both breadth and depth across the campus, even though they are still under development in several programs. Evidence-based reform is less prevalent, but still substantial, and is expected to increase as more programs implement and complete their first full cycle of the assessment process.

Based on their experiences within their schools/colleges and interactions with academic program representatives, Assessment Council members defined two areas of need: (1) a formally constituted and sanctioned body responsible for articulating an institution-wide vision and plan for assessment beyond the accreditation process and then implementing it, and (2) a technical assistance capacity that can satisfy program and college needs for assessment guidance and expertise through best practice workshops, individual consultation, and centralization of widely-endorsed strategies and practices.
Not analyzed here is the substantive content of program learning outcomes. However, a cursory review of the individual program assessment plans suggests that many programs develop learning goals that relate to liberal or general education outcomes rather than being focused exclusively on disciplinary content or competencies.

This inventory understates the scope of both assessment dialogue and innovative curricular change. Assessment Council members described numerous examples of faculty discussions of varying degrees of formality that produced curricular change, and many reforms and innovations have been introduced in recent years that cannot directly be tied to evidence from formal assessment of learning outcomes.

Assessment of program-defined learning outcomes is far less prevalent at the graduate level. This quite likely reflects the use of comprehensive examinations and thesis and dissertation work as capstone experiences beyond formal course work that require demonstration of mastery of a field and ability to contribute to the knowledge base of that field.
III. Assessment of Academic Programs

Background

In 2000, the UVM Faculty Senate approved the policy and procedures for the periodic and systematic review of academic programs. As we near the end of a full cycle of program reviews, our assessment of the academic program review (APR) process centers on four research questions: (1) To what extent do our programs meet the Faculty Senate’s standards of performance? (2) Are there patterns in the nature of the recommendations for program improvement that emerge from the process? (3) To what extent are recommendations addressed? (4) What improvements in the APR process are suggested by the first seven years of experience?

Methodology

Academic program review is conducted by the Faculty Senate’s Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC) according to the policy and procedures established by the Faculty Senate in 2000 (http://www.uvm.edu/~facsen/apr_document.pdf). An inventory of the APR progress as of 2008 produced Appendix B, which indicates that a total of 47 program review “clusters” has been approved by the CAC thus far. All 47 completed reviews were included in the first study to determine the extent to which UVM programs meet our internal standards of performance. Those seven standards are listed in Appendix C. In each review, the CAC assesses whether or not each standard is met.

For the second study of the status of program review recommendations, only those reviews that had been approved by CAC no later than early in the 2007-08 academic year were selected for study in order to allow time for a response to the recommendations (n = 38; see Appendix B for this subset). Recommendations embedded in the CAC reports were identified for each program cluster and sent to the appropriate dean’s office with a request that the dean indicate whether each recommendation had been substantially addressed, sufficiently addressed, minimally addressed, or not addressed at all. Deans were invited to consult with department chairs and program directors to make these assessments. Assessments were returned on 258 recommendations. Review recommendations were organized for analysis into broader categories using a two-step process that initially yielded 12 categories which were then collapsed into the following six categories:

Organizational Issues: program mission or focus; departmental/program organization and leadership; program planning; establishing a particular role/status within the university; communication about the program internally and externally; governance structures and processes; student advising and faculty mentoring; linkages with other organizational units both internally and externally; student recruitment strategies; external fundraising.
Resource Issues: support for administrative work, teaching, research, and equipment/technology; graduate assistant allocations; aligning with university priorities and initiatives; meeting increased student needs generated by increasing enrollment; managing teaching loads and class sizes in the face of increasing enrollment.

Faculty Issues: faculty recruitment needs; faculty diversity issues; faculty salary issues.

Space & Facility Issues: needs for additional space; health and safety concerns; equipment and technology purchases and support.

Curricular Issues: new program development; specific courses; managing student access to particular courses or curricular levels.

Assessment Issues: defining learning outcomes; developing appropriate direct and indirect methods of assessing learning outcomes; instituting programmatic changes based on assessment evidence.

Finally, during the 2007-08 academic year, CAC Chair Professor Cindy Forehand led the CAC in an open-ended discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the APR process. Several suggestions for increasing the effectiveness of the process were offered and are summarized here.

Caveats: (1) APR subcommittees produce reports with varying breadth and depth so the universe of recommendations is not evenly distributed across the program clusters. (2) CAC-approved documents often contain recommendations that are not sanctioned in the Memoranda of Understanding that are subsequently drafted. By drawing on CAC recommendations rather than MOU documents, the study is including recommendations that not all parties to the APR process would agree should be addressed. However, because of a backlog of MOU agreements to be drafted, using the CAC recommendations produced a richer data set and, perhaps, a broader conception of “what needs to be done.” (3) No systematic methodology for determining the status of review recommendations was prescribed. As a result, there is variation in the voices and perspectives represented (e.g., dean only, department chair only, dean in collaboration with department chair) and in the ways in which respondents approached the task of assessing the degree to which a recommendation had been addressed. (4) Although most of the recommendations focused on one major issue, some were broad and wide-ranging, making them more difficult to fit neatly within one category.

Findings

- Assessment of programs against internal program review standards:
  n = 47 CAC approved clusters
Standard % of clusters that do not meet the standard unequivocally
(See Appendix C)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of standards not met Number of programs

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 of 47 (43%) meet all standards without qualification.
17 of 47 (36%) meet all but one standard without qualification.
9 of 47 (19%) meet all but two standards without qualification.
1 of 47 (2%) does not meet six of the seven standards.

- Addressing APR Recommendations:
  n = 38 clusters; 258 recommendations

(1) Frequency of Types of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>258</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) Frequency of Recommendation Dispositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantially Addressed</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiently Addressed</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimally Addressed</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Addressed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>258</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) Degree to which Various Types of Recommendations have been Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Subst</th>
<th>Suff</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>NotAt</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>258</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26%</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Faculty Senate Curricular Affairs Committee Suggestions for APR process improvement (abridged):
Content –

The emphasis of program review self-studies should shift from an analysis of the past to a focus on the future.

It is often difficult for reviewers to determine the status of a particular program within the larger context of a school or college. Either as part of the self-study or as an institutionalized feature of the site visit, reviewers should receive information from the Dean regarding the priorities of the school/college and the position of the program in relation to those priorities.

Academic program review reports should emphasize concrete steps that should be taken to improve the viability and/or quality of the academic program.

Addressing issues related to program viability and quality often requires the involvement or cooperation of a variety of units – the department, school/college, Graduate College, Academic Affairs, and an array of academic and administrative offices. Program review recommendations and MOUs should identify responsible partners for addressing issues that require action.

Process –

External reviewers should have a greater role in the program review process. A more formally structured process for selecting reviewers should be developed, and site visits by the reviewers should be an integral part of the review process.

Many academic programs would benefit from institutional direction and technical support for student learning outcome assessment initiatives.

A formalized and transparent follow-up review process should be developed to ensure that agreed-upon action items are addressed to the extent possible.

The master program review schedule should be reviewed and reconstructed with the following considerations in mind: (a) There are too many programs to fit within a five-year cycle; consider lengthening the cycle; (b) Determine the best clustering of programs within each review; patterns of clustering should make substantive sense and result in the most efficient use of university resources; (c) Align the scheduling of reviews of externally accredited programs with planned accreditation site visits.

Reassess the CAC and APR subcommittee roles and processes to decrease the time between the completion of the self-study and formal action by the CAC, reduce redundancy in report writing, and ensure an appropriate match between the size and composition of the review subcommittees and the programs being reviewed.
Conclusions

- In general, the UVM program clusters reviewed thus far stand up well against our internal standards of performance. Four-fifths of the clusters meet either all seven standards or six of the seven standards without qualification.

- By far, standard 2 (“The program has qualified faculty and students as well as resources appropriate to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness.”) is the standard least likely to be unequivocally met with 43% of the clusters not meeting this standard. However, the CAC has consistently made this judgment on the basis of lack of resources rather than of poor quality. Twenty-one percent do not meet standard 7 (“The program uses an identified plan for systematic evaluation and assessment of goals and purposes.”). These findings suggest that programs need more resources and a greater emphasis on assessment to increase their effectiveness in this area.

- Organizational issues account for almost one-third of the 258 APR recommendations studied. The resource and faculty issue categories, when combined, account for another one-third of the total.

- Overall, the distribution of recommendation dispositions is rather even across the four categories suggesting a significant degree of unevenness in responding to the recommendations. However, over one-half (55%) of the recommendations were judged to be substantially or sufficiently addressed, and those recommendations that were “not addressed at all” constituted the smallest of the four groups (17%).

- The responses to organizational, assessment, and curricular issues were the strongest, with over 60% of the recommendations in each category being judged as substantially or sufficiently addressed. Responses to faculty and resource issues indicated slightly less than half of the recommendations in each category being judged as substantially or sufficiently addressed. Only one-third of the space and facility issues were judged to be substantially or sufficiently addressed.

- The CAC assessment of academic program review at UVM has raised a number of issues related to content and process, suggesting that a revision of the APR policy and procedures is warranted. The Provost’s Office has begun working with the CAC to improve the effectiveness of academic program review.
IV. Assessment of Campus Offices and Services

Background

Assessment in higher education has typically emphasized teaching and learning, and much of this work to describe institutional assessment at the University of Vermont has indeed focused on student learning outcomes. However, improving institutional performance and effectiveness requires a broader view of the university, one that directs us to examine the state of assessment in our academic, administrative, and student support units.

Methodology

UVM Vice Presidents were contacted in February of 2008 and asked to identify relevant units within their respective divisions for a survey of assessment activities. Responses generated a list of 54 offices, and in March of 2008, a survey instrument was e-mailed to each office director/head. By May 27, 2008, all 54 offices had responded. (See Appendix D for a list of service/program/offices in this study.) The questions were modeled after those typically used to audit learning outcome assessment activities within academic programs:

- Does your service/program/office have a mission statement or published statement of purpose?
- Have formal goals for your service/program/office been developed?
- If yes to (1) and/or (2), how is your mission or goals communicated to your unit and primary constituents?
- How does your service/program/office support the institutional mission and strategic goals?
- What methods are used to gather data/evidence regarding whether or not your service/program/office achieves its goals or mission?
- List specific conclusions you have drawn from this data/evidence about your service/program/office’s effectiveness in achieving its goals or mission.
- List specific examples from the past five years of how you have used this data/evidence to improve your service/program/office.

Data were aggregated for the purpose of offering an institution-wide view of office/program/service assessment.

Caveats: (1) Vice Presidents were asked to define potential respondent offices in terms of those that “seem to have a coherent, well-defined scope of activities, often supervised by an individual with the title “Director” or something similar.” This generated a list of services/programs/offices that varies widely in terms of size, scope, and complexity. (2) Categories were developed for items 3, 5, 6, and 7 based on coding of the open-ended responses. It must be noted that respondents offered varying levels of detail, so the aggregation of these responses cannot be viewed as a rigorously exhaustive portrait of the
state of assessment activities in campus offices. (3) Virtually every service/program/office linked its work to the university’s mission statement or one or more of its strategic goals. As a result, no further analysis of the responses to the question of how the program supports the institutional mission was conducted.

Findings

- 51 of the 54 offices (94%) indicated that they had a mission statement or statement of purpose. Of the three that did not, two indicated that such a statement was under development.

- 49 of the 54 offices (91%) responded that they had developed formal goals for their unit. Of the five that did not, three indicated that goal statements were under development.

- 52 of the 54 offices (96%) identified at least one mechanism for communicating mission statements and/or goals. 26 of 54 (48%) identified one means of communication; 19 of 54 (35%) identified two means; 7 of 54 (13%) identified three means. Of the various types of mechanisms identified, 44 offices (81%) posted these documents on their websites, 20 (37%) communicated and discussed these documents in office meetings, workshops, or retreats, 13 (24%) listed these statements in brochures, publications, or manuals, 6 (11%) published them in special reports, and 2 (4%) posted them on bulletin boards.

- Ten types of assessment methods were identified: 51 of 54 offices (94%) used at least one method; 24 of 54 (44%) used two methods; 19 of 54 (35%) used three or more methods. The number and proportion of all offices using each method is as follows:

  - Client/User Surveys 25 (46%)
  - Service Usage/Participation/Transaction Data 21 (39%)
  - Focus Group/Individual Interviews with Users/Constituents 21 (39%)
  - External Benchmarking via National Surveys or Data Clearinghouses or External Consultants 16 (30%)
  - Evaluation of Workshops, Special Programs, or Events 10 (19%)
  - Staff Meeting/Annual Retreat Discussions Among Staff 8 (15%)
  - Client/User Profile Data 7 (13%)
  - Internal Audits and “Undercover” Operations 6 (11%)
  - Formal Recognition and Awards 4 (7%)
  - Input from Advisory or Governance Boards 4 (7%)

- 48 of 54 offices (89%) could provide specific conclusions that had been drawn from the analysis of assessment data. 32 of 54 (59%) offered conclusions that suggested they had gained a broad understanding of the general effectiveness
of their program/service/office. 25 of 54 (46%) drew conclusions related to the quality of the services they provided. 21 of 54 (39%) listed specific recommendations for improvement that had emerged from their assessment activities. 10 of 54 (19%) provided comments that suggested they had gained a deeper understanding of the process(es) of service delivery that their clients experienced. Almost one-half of the 54 offices (26 of 54; 48%) listed an array of conclusions that provided them with insights into two or more of the four “conclusion” categories.

- 47 of 54 offices (87%) listed specific actions taken in response to an analysis of assessment findings. 42 of 54 offices (78%) described specific improvements in existing services or programs. 32 of 54 offices (59%) listed actions that implied broader reforms of or innovations in their service delivery systems. 16 of 54 (30%) described changes relating to staff hiring, training, and/or development. 9 of 54 (17%) made modifications to their physical environments. More than one-half of the offices (33 of 54: 61%) listed an array of actions that addressed two or more of the four “action” categories.

**Conclusions**

- Almost all service/programs/offices have locally-produced statements that define mission and/or goals. These statements are communicated electronically, in written form, and in face-to-face interactions. Over one-half of the offices use multiple means to communicate these statements. Goal setting and communication is widespread.

- Virtually all offices with formal goals assess their work. The vast majority employ multiple methods of assessment. The most commonly used methods involve direct questioning of users/clients through surveys, interviews, or focus groups and analysis of client experience and/or staff performance from quantitative data on client profiles, transaction histories, or participation rates, and often in relation to external benchmarks. Discussions among staff members and with constituent or governance groups about service quality and needs are also used for assessment purposes.

- Overall, the vast majority of respondents use assessment data to draw conclusions about performance and effectiveness and then translate those conclusions into subsequent action steps. “Full-cycle assessment” appears to be the rule rather than the exception at UVM. The raw data on “actions taken in response to assessment activities” provides dramatic evidence of the extent to which continuous quality improvement is lived and valued in the academic, administrative, and student support sectors of the university.
Appendix A

Currently Active Academic Degree Programs
(Multi-College Sponsored Degree Programs Listed Only Once)
(Total n = 169)

BACHELOR’S DEGREE MAJORS (95):

**College of Agriculture and Life Sciences**
Animal Science
Community Entrepreneurship
Community and International Development
Public Communication
Microbiology
Molecular Genetics
Dietetics, Nutrition and Food Sciences
Nutrition and Food Sciences
Plant Biology
Ecological Agriculture
Sustainable Landscape Horticulture
Self-Designed Major
Integrated Biological Science (Multi-School/College)

**College of Arts and Sciences**
Anthropology
AIS: Asian Studies
AIS: Canadian Studies
AIS: European Studies
AIS: Latin America Studies
AIS: Russia/E European Studies
Art History
Art-Studio
Biochemistry (Multi-School/College)
Biology
Zoology
Chemistry
Classical Civilization
Greek
Latin
Communications Sciences
Computer Science
Economics
English
Film and Television Studies
Geography
Geology      BA  
Geology      BS  
German      BA  
Russian      BA  
History      BA  
Mathematics      BA  
Music      BA  
Music      BMUS  
Philosophy      BA  
Physics      BA  
Physics      BS  
Plant Biology      BA  
Political Science      BA  
Psychology      BA  
Psychology      BS  
Religion      BA  
French      BA  
Italian Studies      BA  
Spanish      BA  
Sociology      BA  
Theatre      BA  
Women's and Gender Studies      BA  
Individual Design      BA  

School of Business Administration  
Business Administration      BS  

College of Education and Social Services  
Art Education      BS  
Elementary Education      BS  
Secondary Education      BS  
Individually Designed      BS  
Middle Level Education      BS  
Music Education      BS  
Physical Education      BS  
Human Development and Family Studies      BS  
Teacher Education: Early Childhood Education (Birth-Gr.3)      BS  
Teacher Education: Early Childhood Special Education (Age 3-6)      BS  
Teacher Education: Family and Consumer Sciences Education (5-12)      BS  
Social Work      BS  

College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences  
Civil Engineering      BS  
Electrical Engineering      BS  
Engineering Management      BS  
Environmental Engineering      BS  
Mechanical Engineering      BS  
Computer Science      BS  
Computer Science: Computer Science and Information Systems      BS
Mathematics  
Mathematics: Statistics  

**The Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources**  
Environmental Sciences (Multi-School/College)  
Forestry  
Natural Resources  
Recreation Management  
Wildlife and Fisheries Biology  
Environmental Studies (Multi-School/College)  
Environmental Studies (Multi-School/College)  

**College of Nursing and Health Sciences**  
Medical Laboratory Science  
Nuclear Medicine Technology  
Radiation Therapy  
Nursing  
Nursing (for Registered Nurses)  
Athletic Training Education  
Exercise and Movement Science  

**MASTER’S DEGREES (52):**

**College of Agriculture and Life Sciences**  
Animal Science  
Community Development and Applied Economics  
Public Administration  
Microbiology and Molecular Genetics  
Dietetics  
Nutrition and Food Sciences  
Plant Biology  
Field Naturalist (Botany)  
Plant and Soil Science  
Biochemistry (Multi-School/College)  

**College of Arts and Sciences**  
Biology  
Biology  
Chemistry  
Greek and Latin  
Greek and Latin  
Communications Sciences  
English  
Geology  
German  
Historic Preservation  
History  
Materials Science (Multi-School/College)  
Physics  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics: Statistics</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences (Multi-School/College)</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Management</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Fisheries Biology</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies (Multi-School/College)</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies (Multi-School/College)</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Nursing and Health Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Laboratory Science</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine Technology</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Therapy</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (for Registered Nurses)</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Training Education</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise and Movement Science</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MASTER’S DEGREES (52):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Agriculture and Life Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development and Applied Economics</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>MPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology and Molecular Genetics</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietetics</td>
<td>MSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and Food Sciences</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Naturalist (Botany)</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant and Soil Science</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry (Multi-School/College)</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Arts and Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>MST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Latin</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek and Latin</td>
<td>MAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Sciences</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science (Multi-School/College)</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psychology  MA  
French  MA  

**School of Business Administration**  
Business Administration  MBA  

**College of Education and Social Services**  
Curriculum and Instruction  MEd  
Curriculum and Instruction  MAT  
Educational Leadership  MEd  
Educational Studies  MEd  
Reading and Language Arts  MEd  
Counseling  MS  
Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration  MEd  
Interdisciplinary  MEd  
Special Education  MEd  
Social Work  MSW  

**College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences**  
Biomedical Engineering  MS  
Civil and Environmental Engineering  MS  
Electrical Engineering  MS  
Mechanical Engineering  MS  
Computer Science  MS  
Biostatistics  MS  
Mathematics  MS  
Mathematics  MST  
Statistics  MS  

**College of Medicine**  
Molecular Physiology and Biophysics (Multi-School/College)  MS  
Pathology (Multi-School/College)  MS  
Pharmacology (Multi-School/College)  MS  
Neuroscience (Multi-School/College)  MS  
Cell and Molecular Biology (Multi-School/College)  MS  

**College of Nursing and Health Sciences**  
Nursing  MS  

**The Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources**  
Natural Resources  MS  

**DOCTORAL DEGREES (22):**

**College of Agriculture and Life Sciences**  
Animal, Nutrition and Food Science  PhD  
Plant Biology  PhD  
Plant and Soil Science  PhD  

**College of Arts and Sciences**  
Biology  PhD  
Chemistry  PhD  
Materials Science (Multi-School/College)  PhD
Psychology

**College of Education and Social Services**
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies  Ed.D

**College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences**
Civil and Environmental Engineering  PhD
Computer Science  PhD
Electrical Engineering  PhD
Mathematical Sciences  PhD
Mechanical Engineering  PhD

**College of Medicine**
Biochemistry (Multi-School/College)  PhD
Cell and Molecular Biology (Multi-School/College)  PhD
Medicine  MD
Microbiology and Molecular Genetics (Multi-School/College)  PhD
Molecular Physiology and Biophysics (Multi-School/College)  PhD
Neuroscience (Multi-School/College)  PhD
Pharmacology (Multi-School/College)  PhD

**College of Nursing and Health Sciences**
Physical Therapy  DPT

**The Rubenstein School of Environment and Natural Resources**
Natural Resources  PhD
Appendix B

Academic Program Review Inventory

Academic Program Reviews
Total number of program review clusters = 66*
(*A cluster is defined by the array of programs covered in a particular set of
review recommendations.)

Complete through CAC approval = 47 clusters (as of May 8, 2008) [71% complete after
seven academic years]

**Completed within the last year and excluded from the assessment study of
recommendation dispositions (n = 9).

CAS = 26:
History
Physics
Economics
Classics
Philosophy
English/Film
Anthropology
Communication Sciences
Religion
Sociology
Women’s Studies
Music/Music Ed
Art/Art Ed
Romance Languages
Chinese
Japanese
Area and International Studies
Political Science
Theatre
Geology
Psychology
Historic Preservation
ALANA**
Biology/Zoology**
Chemistry**
Geography**
CESS = 7:
 Education Programs
 Educational Studies
 Social Work
 Interdisciplinary Studies
 HESA
 Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
 Human Development and Family Studies

CNHS = 5:
 Medical Laboratory and Radiation Sciences
 Radiation Therapy
 Medical Laboratory Science
 Nuclear Medicine
 Nursing**

CALS = 3:
 Botany and Agricultural Biochemistry
 Plant and Soil Science
 Public Administration

CEMS = 1:
 Computer Science

SBA = 1:
 Business

COM = 4:
 Pathology**
 Biochemistry**
 Pharmacology**
 Molecular Physiology and Biophysics**

Still to Complete = 19 clusters (all excluded from APR assessment study) [29% still to complete after seven academic years]

In Subcommittee = 14

CDAE
 Curriculum and Instruction
 German and Russian
 Rubenstein School
 Cell and Molecular Biology
 Medicine
 Microbiology and Molecular Genetics
 Nutrition and Food Science
Mathematics
Statistics
Biostatistics
Engineering
Vermont Studies
Materials Science

To be Assigned = 5

Environmental Studies
Rehabilitation and Movement Science (Physical Therapy)
Ecological Economics and Ecological Design
Biomedical Engineering
Biological Sciences (BISC)

-----

Not included in total (cancelled or indefinitely postponed for various reasons; status unknown)

Individually Designed Majors (IDMs) -- 3 colleges
Counseling
Animal Science
Environmental Sciences
Anatomy and Neurobiology
Appendix C

Assessment Standards for UVM Academic Program Review

Standard I: The program has a clear and publicly stated purpose that contributes to the mission of the University.

Standard II: The program has qualified faculty and students as well as resources appropriate to accomplish its purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness.

Standard III: There is demand for the program.

Standard IV: The program provides graduates who contribute to social institutions.

Standard V: The program accomplishes its educational and related purposes.

Standard VI: The program effectively organizes its processes and resources to accomplish its purposes.

Standard VII: The program uses an identified plan for systematic evaluation and assessment of goals and purposes.
Appendix D

Respondents for the Assessment Study of Campus Services, Programs, and Offices

1. Academic Support Programs
2. ALANA Student Center
3. Athletics
4. Budget and Resource Management
5. Campus Planning Services
6. Capital Planning and Management
7. Career Services
8. Cat Card Office
9. Center for Cultural Pluralism
10. Center for Health and Wellbeing
11. Center for Student Ethics and Standards
12. Computing and Information Technology
13. Conference and Event Services
14. Continuing Education
15. Custodial Services
16. Davis Center
17. Dean of Students Office
18. Development and Alumni Relations
19. Dining Services
20. Extension
21. Facilities Design and Construction
22. Federal, State, and Community Relations
23. Fleming Museum
24. General Counsel Office
25. Graduate College Office
26. Human Resource Services
27. Institutional Risk Assessment and Audit Services
28. Instrumentation and Technical Services
29. LGBTQA Services
30. Libraries and Learning Resources
31. Living and Learning Center
32. Office of Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity
33. Office of Community-University Partnerships and Service Learning
34. Office of International Education
35. Office of Sponsored Programs
36. Physical Plant
37. Police Services
38. Print and Mail Center
39. Procurement Services
40. Radiation Safety Office
41. Registrar’s Office
42. Residence Life
43. Residential Learning Communities
44. Risk Management
45. Student and Community Relations
46. Student Financial Services
47. Student Life
48. Technology Transfer/UVM Ventures
49. Transportation and Parking Services
50. Undergraduate Admissions Office
51. University Communications
52. University Financial Services
53. University Store
54. Women’s Center
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About the UVM Assessment Council

Initial Charge: To assist the Provost’s Office with
(a) data collection related to learning outcome assessment within the various schools and colleges.
(b) interpretation of collected data in an effort to understand learning outcome assessment practices at UVM.
(c) the ongoing development and refinement of an institutional assessment approach.

Membership:

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
ASSESSMENT COUNCIL

Dale Jaffe, Assessment Council Chair
Professor of Sociology and
Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment
Office of the Provost

Fred Curran
Director of Institutional Studies
Office of the Provost

Janet Bossange
Lecturer in Education
Associate Dean
College of Education and Social Services

Kelvin Chu
Associate Professor of Physics
Interim Associate Dean
Honors College

Judy Cohen
Professor of Nursing
College of Nursing and Health Sciences

Mary Cox
Lecturer in Mathematics and Statistics
College of Engineering and Mathematics

Josie Davis
Lecturer in Animal Science
Associate Dean
College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Joel Goldberg  
Associate Professor of Chemistry  
Associate Dean  
College of Arts and Sciences  

Michael Gurdon  
Professor of Management  
Associate Dean  
School of Business Administration  

Karen Richardson-Nassif  
Research Associate Professor of Family Medicine  
Associate Dean  
College of Medicine  

Margaret Shannon  
Associate Professor  
Associate Dean  
Rubinstein School of Natural Resources
Introduction
FORM E1A
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

As part of the self study process, the Assessment Council, an ad hoc committee consisting of school/college representatives formed to advise and assist the Associate Provost for Planning and Assessment, chose to use Form E1A as the template for their scan and study of the assessment work in all the academic programs. The data recorded on the form are discussed in greater detail in Section II.c. of “Institutional Assessment at the University of Vermont, 2007-2008” (pages 14-21) and referred to throughout the main body of the self-study document. Definitions of and notes regarding row and column entries follow:

Row 1: A new mission statement has been approved by the UVM Board of Trustees in 2008. This statement includes educational outcomes for all UVM students, but there is no formal university-wide program in place as of yet to assess the extent to which students achieve these outcomes.

Row 2: School- or college-wide requirements are typical at the undergraduate level at UVM. Although there is no campus-wide general education requirement, the analysis of school/college requirements contained in our Assessment Report suggests several “commonalities” across the university.

Rows 3ff: Although learning outcome assessment is appropriate for any programmatic structure that is organized around a set of learning goals (i.e., undergraduate major, minor, concentration, certificate program, graduate degree), this inventory defined the universe of study as all active undergraduate majors and graduate degree programs. At the time of this data collection, the UVM program array consisted of 95 undergraduate majors, 52 master’s degree programs, and 22 doctoral degree programs. Not included are programs that had received approval but had not yet been implemented. Multi-college sponsored programs are listed and counted only once under the school/college tenure-home of the program director. Programs are listed alphabetically within their school/college administrative homes.

Column 1: Have formal learning outcomes been developed? Assessment Council members were responsible for gathering the data on each program within their respective schools/colleges during the early summer of 2008. Because of the seasonal timing of the data collection, we did not receive a 100% response rate, so possible responses are “yes,” “no,” and “data not reported.” Subsequent analysis in our Assessment Report focused on those that replied affirmatively.

Column 2: Where are these learning outcomes published? We interpreted this to mean, “Where would students find the expected learning outcomes for a particular program?” We asked for a website address and up to three examples of non-electronic sources.
Column 3: Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree?

Column 4: Who interprets the evidence? What is the process?

Column 5: How are the findings used? Note changes that have been made as a result of using the data/evidence.

The early stage of data collection generated voluminous detail for these columns, so the Assessment Council used that detail to inductively create a smaller number of code categories that encompassed all of the empirical findings. That analysis allowed us to specify the possible array of direct and indirect assessment measures for Column 3, the kinds of interpretive processes for Column 4, and the types of changes that resulted from the assessment process for Column 5. Code categories rather than the specific details were entered for each program in these columns. We should also note that the open-ended questions in the template (columns 3 & 5) produced responses that varied greatly in terms of level of detail and specificity. A reasonable interpretation is that some respondents offered only illustrative examples of assessment work whereas others provided exhaustive accounts. Therefore, the aggregation of these responses cannot be viewed as a rigorously exhaustive portrait of the state of assessment activities in academic programs.

Column 6: Web address for full documentation. Some campuses utilize a standardized template for the periodic reporting and updating of assessment plans, findings, and actions taken. UVM added this column at the time of the data collection in the event that such systems and practices had developed within our schools and colleges. The large number of empty cells suggests that “full documentation” of the assessment process is not electronically available at this time for many programs.

Column 7: Date of most recent program review. There are several stages to the program review process at UVM. Once a review has been approved by the Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, an “MOU Meeting” is scheduled. Attendees include representatives from the Provost’s Office, the academic program under review, its sponsoring school/college administration, and the Curricular Affairs Committee. The date recorded in Column 7 is the date of the MOU meeting. If the program review has not yet reached that point, the statement “MOU Meeting not yet held” has been inserted.
### E1b. Inventory of Specialized and Program Accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Professional, specialized, State, or programmatic accreditations currently held by the institution (by agency or program name)</th>
<th>(2) Date of most recent accreditation action by each listed agency</th>
<th>(3) Summary (“bullet points) of key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report</th>
<th>(4) Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board, or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.)*</th>
<th>(6) Date and nature of next scheduled review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Accreditation for Dietetic Education (CADE) of the American Dietetic Association- Masters in Dietetics Demonstration Program</td>
<td>August, 2006</td>
<td>The Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education conducted a site visit in October 2008, the MSD Program responded to the site visit report in January 2009. The program was asked to provide additional outcome measures regarding graduate performance, additional information to assure that all student meet the Foundation Knowledge and Competencies, a written plan for ongoing assessment of competencies/student learning outcomes, and a process for formal ongoing review of the curriculum. Additionally, policies related to selecting and evaluating supervised practice sites, maintaining affiliation agreements, and an injury/illness policy for students in supervised practice needed to be formalized. The program will be formally reviewed by the Commission at their April meeting recognizes the Program's compliance with the accreditation standards and encourages you to continue your efforts in providing quality dietetics education</td>
<td>Key performance indicators include 80% of students entering the program in Track 1 will complete the program in three years (2 years typically) and 80% of the students entering the program in Tracks 2 and 3 will complete the program in four and one-half years, 90% of students will achieve a first-time pass rate on the RD exam over a five-year period, 70% of graduates seeking employment in dietetics will be employed within three months of program completion; 80% of employers and graduates (one year post-graduation) will indicate that graduates have a &quot;good&quot; to &quot;excellent&quot; level of competency in: communication skills, critical thinking, problem solving,</td>
<td>Fall 2008- Full review (self-study and site visit)The Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education will formally vote on the self-study and site visit report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission on Accreditation for Dietetic Education (CADE) of the American Dietetic Association- Didactic Program in Dietetics</strong></td>
<td>May, 2004</td>
<td>The Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education recognizes the Program's compliance with the accreditation standards and encourages you to continue your efforts in providing quality dietetics education. Key performance indicators include: 90% of students declaring dietetics as their major in the fall of their junior year will graduate as dietetics majors in two years; at least 18 students will graduate with a dietetics major each year, 80% of program graduates setting for the RD exam will pass on the first attempt, 80% of program graduates applying to dietetic internships will be accepted, 50% of graduates will be employed at one-year post graduation, 80% of employers and DI directors will rank individuals as average to superior compared to others.</td>
<td>The program submitted a five year review in November 2008 and have not heard back from the Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education. The program is accredited until May 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Arts and Sciences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Chemical Society</strong></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  |  | - limited number of fume hoods for teaching labs  
- no women faculty members |  
- Institutional environment  
- Faculty and staff  
- Infrastructure  
- Curriculum  
- Undergraduate research  
- Development of student skills | Five year Reevaluation due to ACS June 2009 |
| **American Psychological Association** | July, 2003 | • Provide accurate work report of the time each faculty devotes to the doctoral program.  
• Develop a strategic plan to assess all expected competencies. | • Licensure  
• Employment rates  
• Research productivity for those accepting academic positions | Reaccreditation site visit 2010 |
| **American Speech-Language-Hearing Association** | August, 2004; Most recent action was annual report approval on Aug. 25, 2008 | 8-25-08: Alignment of website language for contacting CAA about complaints to language for Standard 4.3--completed Sept., 2008; there were no conditions for approval just comments & concerns are noted each year in annual report approval letter | • NESPA (praxis) pass rates  
• Employment rates; graduate rates  
• Certification held by all faculty/supervisors training students clinically | • Annual Report submitted August 1, 2008  
• Reaccreditation visit date 2012 |
| **School of Business Administration** | | | | |
| **Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)** | Reaffirmed April 2005 | All issues raised in 2002 report addressed and satisfactorily resolved in 2005 report | • Mission statement  
• Mission appropriateness  
• Student mission  
• Continuous improvement objectives  
• Financial strategies  
• Student admission  
• Student retention  
• Staff sufficiency  
• Faculty sufficiency  
• Faculty qualifications  
• Faculty management and support  
• Aggregate faculty and staff education responsibility  
• Individual faculty education responsibility  
• Student educational responsibility | Visit 2011-2012 |
### Management of curricula
- Undergraduate learning goals
- Undergraduate educational level
- Master’s level general management learning goals
- Specialized Master’s degree learning goals
- Master’s educational level
- Doctoral learning goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Education and Social Services</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)</strong></td>
<td>July 20-22, 2006 (letter dated Aug. 9, 2006) removed 2-year conditional status, extended accredited status until Oct. 31, 2012</td>
<td>Full compliance.</td>
<td>Adhere to the CACREP Standards concerned with curriculum, faculty resources, clinical experience requirements, supervisor qualifications, and program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Academic Accreditation, American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA)</td>
<td>Dec. 7, 2004, until July 31, 2012.</td>
<td>Full compliance.</td>
<td>Standards-based preparation (ASHA standards). E.g., Candidate Assessments: • GPA, cumulative, content-specific, professional sequence • PRAXIS I (or SAT) • PRAXIS II • Clinical Evaluations • Licensure Portfolio • Performance Standards addressed in the minimum of 400 clinical practicum hours. Hours include minimum externship in public school setting. • All students qualify for Clinical Licensure as Speech Language Pathologist in the State of Vermont upon completion of masters program and clinical fellowship year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Candidates have limited opportunity to work with faculty from diverse backgrounds (Standard 4)  
- Candidates have limited opportunities to work with other candidates from ethnically and racially diverse backgrounds (S4)  
- The unit does not adequately evaluate the curriculum and experiences through which candidates learn to teach all students (S4)  
- *(Advanced Preparation)* Candidates in the educational leadership program are not required to participate in field and clinical experiences in which they work with diverse students (S4)  
- *(Advanced)* The unit lacks the authority and structure to approve and manage all of its advanced programs. (S6)  
**Candidate Assessments:**  
- GPA, cumulative, content-specific, professional sequence  
- PRAXIS I (or SAT)  
- PRAXIS II  
- Professional Attributes and Dispositions Assessment  
- Clinical Evaluations  
- Licensure Portfolio  
**Program Assessments:**  
- Specialized Program Association (SPA) reviews  
- Surveys undergoing revision, to be implemented S09: Advising, Exit, Alumni, Employer  
NCATE site visit Oct. 24-28, 2009.  
Specialized Professional Association (SPA) program reviews submitted Sept. 2008. (standards-based performance assessment data by program)  
NCATE /SPA reviews of program reports rec’d Feb. 1, 2009.  
Response to Conditions reports due April 15, 2009. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vermont Standards Board for Professional Educators (VSBPE) Results Oriented Program Approval (ROPA)</th>
<th>October, 2006</th>
<th>Art Education. VSBPE granted full approval June 21, 2007, although cited concern re: program’s supervision of student teachers (UVM faculty-candidate contact hours in field). Update provided fall 2008. Early Childhood Special Education. VSBPE granted full approval (June 25, 2007 letter), although cited concern re: student faculty ratio. Update approved June 27, 2008, noting concern remains and requested update spring 2009. Level I Licensure Portfolios play important role in providing evidence to the State for program approval. (Reg. 5911.2 requires each candidate seeking initial licensure to complete a Level I Licensure Portfolio.) Standards-based preparation. Candidate Assessments: • GPA data: cumulative, content-specific, professional sequence • PRAXIS I (or SAT) • PRAXIS II • Professional Attributes and Dispositions Assessment • Clinical Evaluations • Licensure Portfolio • Program Assessments: • Specialized Program Association (SPA) reviews Surveys undergoing revision, to be implemented S09: Advising, Exit, Alumni, Employer</th>
<th>Full review of all initial and advanced licensure programs, 2009 (excluding the SLP program per State/ASHA agreement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering and Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET) - Environmental Engineering | 2005-2006 | Requirement that faculty must be of sufficient number to cover all curricular areas of the program | • Pass percentage on FE exam in comparison to national averages.  
• Percentage of students engaging in internship or other type of experiential learning activities.  
• Percentage of graduates either getting a job or enrolling in a graduate school 3 months following graduation.  
• Starting salary of our graduates.  
• Types and significance of activities led by our alumni.  
• Job titles and awards won by alumni  
• Overall perception of design education quality indicated by external evaluators at senior design night, as indicated by their evaluation of students "ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints". | Program accredited to 9/2010. Next general review will be Fall, 2009. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET) - Civil Engineering | 2005-2006 | • Better monitor student contributions in the secondary design component of CE 175  
• Improve storage of surveying equipment. | • Pass percentage on FE exam in comparison to national averages.  
• Percentage of students engaging in internship or other type of experiential learning activities. | Program accredited to 9/2010. Next general review will be Fall, 2009. |
| Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET)-Mechanical Engineering | 2005-2006 | - Results of hiring a lab technician, purchases of equipment, and fundraising on funding and recruitment of faculty  
- Implementation of assessment of course outcomes | - Percentage of graduates either getting a job or enrolling in a graduate school 3 months following graduation.  
- Starting salary of our graduates.  
- Types and significance of activities led by our alumni.  
- Job titles and awards won by alumni.  
- Overall perception of design education quality indicated by external evaluators at senior design night, as indicated by their evaluation of students "ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints".  
- Pass percentage on FE exam in comparison to national averages.  
- Percentage of students engaging in internship or other type of experiential learning activities.  
- Percentage of graduates either getting a job or enrolling in a graduate school 3 months following graduation.  
- Starting salary of our graduates.  
- Types and significance of activities led by our alumni.  
- Job titles and awards won by alumni.  
- Overall perception of design education quality indicated by external evaluators at senior design night, as indicated by their evaluation of students "ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints".  
- Program accredited to 9/2010. Next general review will be Fall, 2009. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Medicine</th>
<th>Liaison Committee on Medical Education of the American Medical Association and the Association of American Medical Colleges</th>
<th>March, 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student Diversity: Provide a table summarizing the racial and ethnic diversity among applicants, accepted students, and entering students for each of the three most recent classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Career counseling: Provide a copy of the relevant actions from the results of the most recent AAMG Graduate Questionnaire regarding student satisfaction with career counseling activities. If internal surveys are conducted, please provide those as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial aid and debt management counseling: Provide a copy of the relevant sections of the most recent AAMC Graduate Questionnaire regarding student satisfaction with financial aid and debt management services and counseling. If internal surveys are done, please provide that information as well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student indebtedness: Provide a table showing the date for the 3 most recent years available: in-state tuition and fees, non-resident tuition and fees, total institutional funding for grants and scholarships, total external funding for grants and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutional Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Governance and administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation of program effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic and career counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial aid counseling and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health services and personal counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number, qualifications, and functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personnel policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clinical teaching facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information and library resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress Report sent September 1, 2008 
Full Survey, 2012-2013
- Scholarships, and average educational debt of indebted students. Also provide a copy of student responses from the most recent AAMC Graduation Questionnaire regarding the impact of indebtedness of career choice.
- Revision of faculty personnel policies: Provide an update on faculty approval of proposed revisions to personnel policies for medical college faculty.
- Faculty recruitment, development, and retention: Summarize any initiatives implemented since the time of the limited survey to enhance faculty diversity, improve faculty mentoring, and develop future leaders.
- Impact of changes in departmental budgets on teaching efforts: Provide a table showing any further changes in department funding allocations for academic year 2007-2008. Describe any alterations in departmental teaching efforts to adjust for changes in departmental contributions to medical student education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Nursing and Health Sciences</th>
<th>8/1/2008</th>
<th>Documentation of electrical safeguards necessary for all sites</th>
<th>BOC first time pass rate</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Commission on Accreditation of Athletic Training Education | October, 2008 | • Too few core faculty  
• Insufficient appointment periods (ie, 9 vs 12 mos for a 12 month program) | • Licensure Pass rate  
• Employment within 6-mos of graduation  
• Graduate rates | 2018 |
| Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE) of American Physical Therapy Association | September, 2005 | B.S. and M.S. programs met all standards; No compliance concerns with respect to key elements | • Ongoing support from Parent Institution  
• Curriculum and program outcomes reflect professional nursing standards  
• Community interests considered  
• Program is effective and fulfilling its mission, goals, and expected outcomes | December, 2010 |
| Joint Review Committee on Education Programs in Nuclear Medicine Technology (JPCNMT) | November, 2007 | No major issues | Pass rates | 2014 |
| National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Science (NAACLS) | April, 2008 | No major issues | Pass rates  
Employment rates | April, 2015 |
PART II: DOCUMENTING STUDENT SUCCESS (THE S-SERIES)

S1. Retention and Graduation Rates. Here institutions are asked to provide information on their IPEDS-defined retention and graduation rates, along with their goals for these indicators. Institutions can also provide additional retention and graduation indices, depending on their mission, program mix, locations, and method of program delivery. For example, some baccalaureate institutions may also track 4- and 5-year graduation rates; some community colleges may find 4- and 5-year rates to complete an associate’s degree to be helpful in evaluating their success with their student population. Institutions can also track the success of students studying at a distance or in programs offered on-line.

S2. Other Measures of Student Achievement and Success. The measures recorded here are likely to be mission-related. For example, some institutions may track the success of students gaining admission into certain graduate- or first-professional degree programs. Community colleges may track the success of their students entering baccalaureate programs. For some institutions, the number of students who enter programs such as Teach for America, the Peace Corps, or public service law may also represent indicators of institutional effectiveness with respect to their mission.

S3. Licensure Passage and Job Placement Rates. Institutions that prepare students for specific careers will find it appropriate to record the success of their students in passing licensure examinations. Also included in this form is the provision to record the success of students – perhaps by their academic major – in finding employment in the field for which they were prepared.

Degree
Major
Time Period Following Graduation for Rate
Percentage of Graduates with Jobs in their Field
## Form S1. RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES

### Student Success Measures/ Prior Performance and Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Years Prior</th>
<th>1 Year Prior</th>
<th>Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Goal Next Year</th>
<th>Goal 2 Years Forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### IPEDS Retention Data

- **Associate degree students**: NA, NA, NA, NA, NA, NA
- **Bachelors degree students**: 84%, 86%, 86%

### IPEDS Graduation Data

- **Associate degree students**: 67%, 44%, 67%
- **Bachelors degree students**: 65%, 72%, 71%

### Other Undergraduate Retention Rates (1)

- **a One-Year Retention: All FTFY**
  - IPEDS: 84.2%
  - 2 Years: 85.6%
  - 1 Year: 85.5%
- **b Two-Year Retention: All FTFY**
  - IPEDS: 77.7%
  - 2 Years: 72.7%
  - 1 Year: 73.2%
- **c Three-Year Retention: All FTFY**
  - IPEDS: 66.8%
  - 2 Years: 71.4%
  - 1 Year: 71.0%

### Other Undergraduate Graduation Rates (2)

- **a Four-Year Graduation Rate: All FTFY**
  - IPEDS: 54.6%
  - 2 Years: 56.6%
  - 1 Year: 60.7%
- **b Five-Year Graduation Rate: All FTFY**
  - IPEDS: 69.3%
  - 2 Years: 68.4%
  - 1 Year: 70.5%
- **c Six-Year Graduation Rate: All FTFY**
  - IPEDS: 66.8%
  - 2 Years: 71.4%
  - 1 Year: 71.0%

### Graduate programs *

- **Retention rates first-to-second year (3)**
  - 83.4%
  - 82.9%
  - 84.1%
- **Graduation rates @ 150% time (4)**
  - 76.0%
  - 81.6%
  - 80.4%

### Distance Education

- **Course completion rates (5)**
- **Retention rates (6)**
- **Graduation rates (7)**

### Branch Campus and Instructional Locations

- **Course completion rate (8)**
- **Retention rates (9)**
- **Graduation rates (10)**

### Definition and Methodology Explanations

1. Differs from IPEDS in that it includes both full-time and part-time first-time first year (FTFY) students
2. Includes all FTFY full-time and part-time associate’s and bachelor’s students
3. Data for new fall-term master’s and doctoral students, both full-time and part-time, returning the following fall.
4. Combines graduation rates for master’s students entering five years earlier and doctoral nine years earlier

* An institution offering graduate degrees must complete this portion.
### Success of Students Pursuing Higher Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Student Achievement and Success/Institutional Performance and Goals</th>
<th>2 Years Prior</th>
<th>1 Year Prior</th>
<th>Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Goal for the Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) and UVM data for students receiving a bachelor’s degree in the spring of 2003</td>
<td>From the 1,306 UVM bachelor’s degree recipients in 2003, the NSC identified 630 students who were enrolled in a higher education institution. Of that 630, the NSC reports that 254 post-UVM degrees have been awarded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wall Street Journal ranks UVM’s among the top 30 public universities successfully placing students in the nation’s most prestigious medical, law, and business graduate programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#18 of 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definition and methodology explanations
1. Results from NSC study
2. There are over 500 public universities and colleges nationally. Harvard, Yale, Princeton, John Hopkins, University of Chicago, and MIT were among the 15 graduate programs whose admissions records were surveyed to develop WSJ’s top “feeder schools” list.

### Rates at Which Graduates Pursue Mission Related Paths (e.g., Peace Corps, Public Service Law)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures of Student Achievement and Success/Institutional Performance and Goals</th>
<th>2 Years Prior</th>
<th>1 Year Prior</th>
<th>Most Recent Year</th>
<th>Goal for the Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Students Stories</td>
<td>Please visit <a href="http://www.uvm.edu/~accredit/documentRoom/S2_data_UVM_outstanding_students.pdf">http://www.uvm.edu/~accredit/documentRoom/S2_data_UVM_outstanding_students.pdf</a> for a collection of stories highlighting what UVM students are doing in relation to liberal studies, the environment, health, and research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. News and World Report ranks Vermont College of Medicine among the best for primary care training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Definition and methodology explanations
1. Peace Corp Notes: The rankings may be found at:
2. Outstanding Students Notes: University Communications has begun collecting information and creating short stories about outstanding University of Vermont student that are displayed on the University’s home webpage. This collection is organized as the stories relate to liberal studies, the environment, health, and undergraduate research opportunities.
**Rates at Which Students Are Successful in Fields for Which They Were Not Explicitly Prepared**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definition and methodology explanations**

**Documented Success of Graduates Achieving Other Mission-Explicit Achievement (e.g., Leadership, Spiritual Formation)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>UVM Alumni serving as Vermont State Legislators</th>
<th>There are 37 UVM graduates currently actively serving in the VT State Legislature.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 | 2 Alumni are Nobel Peace Prize winners | - Jody Williams, recipient of the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize for the international campaign to ban landmines 
- John McGill, who was president of the U.S. section of Doctors Without Borders (Médecins Sans Frontières) when that organization won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1999. |

**Definition and methodology explanations**

1. Data collected from UVM’s Office of Development and Alumni Relations database. 
   [http://www.uvm.edu/~accredit/documentRoom/S2_data_on_Vermont_Legislator.pdf](http://www.uvm.edu/~accredit/documentRoom/S2_data_on_Vermont_Legislator.pdf) 

**Other (Specify Below)- Additional evidence (national rankings) of mission-related outcomes**

### Health

**The New York Times** highlighted the perspective of UVM softball coach Pamela Childs and her teams in exposing the challenge student athletes face balancing academics and athletics.

1. Childs' "strong mind, strong body ideal" and concern for both "learning and experiencing" are captured in photos and captions showing the UVM softball team on the road with bats, balls, and books.

**Men's Fitness** magazine in conjunction with The Princeton Review find UVM ranks among the top ten schools for fitness.

2. This top 10 ranking comes from a survey that looked for campuses with healthy meal programs, good access to fitness education and facilities — including fitness trainers and rehabilitative support for injuries — and high campus safety rates.

### Environment

The University of Vermont is one of 71 colleges and universities selected for "Making a Difference Colleges"

3. UVM's "green campus" and programs combining education with service are highlighted along with a university culture that "instills a combination of pragmatism and idealism necessary to have a positive impact on the world."
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>One of &quot;America's 10 Greenest Colleges and Universities&quot; by Forbes.com</td>
<td>UVM is cited for its commitment to ensuring that all new construction meets Green Building Council certifications, for its use of biodiesel shuttles, and for its signing of the Presidents Climate Challenge to go carbon-neutral. Six of these schools, including UVM, were given the highest ranking by the Sustainable Endowments Institute's recent annual College Sustainability Report Card.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Sierra</em> Magazine has ranked the University of Vermont in its annual Green College Guide for the number and quality of the university's environmental initiatives.</td>
<td>In a feature titled &quot;10 Coolest Schools,&quot; the magazine highlights UVM's Eco-Reps program, which trains students to offer &quot;green guidance&quot; to their peers, and its local food policy (the university buys 35 percent of its food from local growers). Other UVM green practices noted: 60 percent of campus power needs are supplied with renewable energy; 20 tons of food waste are composted each month; and campus transportation features alternatively fueled buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>College Sustainability Report Card 2008 put out by The Sustainable Endowments Institute</td>
<td>UVM among the top six schools nationally for green practices and policies. Specific programs helped boost UVM's score including a dedication to: local food purchasing, diverting waste from landfills, a green policy for new construction, clean transportation and administrative practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Named a &quot;Top 25 Environmentally Responsible Schools&quot; by the Kaplan College Guide 2009</td>
<td>UVM is cited its wide range of 'green' course offerings and initiatives among students, faculty and the administration; the Dudley H. Davis Center, the first student union to receive LEED Gold certification from the U.S. Green Building Council; a top 20 finish in RecycleMania, an intercollegiate recycling competition; and the use of biodiesel buses on a campus the guide called &quot;gorgeous.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Service**

*One of The Princeton Review's "Colleges with a Conscience: 81 Great Schools with Outstanding Community Involvement."

The University of Vermont has been chosen as one of the nation's best colleges at fostering social responsibility and public service.

**Accountable and Ethical Leaders**

Two University of Vermont alumnae were highlighted in a "50 Women to Watch" feature published in the *Wall Street Journal* on November 19, 2007.

Charlene Begley ('88), a senior vice president at General Electric and former chief executive and president of GE Plastics, and Diane Greene ('76), founder and CEO of the software firm VMware, were among the top executives the *Journal* list.

**Definition and methodology explanations**

2. *Men's Fitness* magazine in conjunction with *The Princeton Review* conducted a survey of more than 10,000 students representing 660 campuses nationwide, to find the fittest schools in the nation. [http://www.uvm.edu/admissions/undergraduate/why/?Page=acclaim.html](http://www.uvm.edu/admissions/undergraduate/why/?Page=acclaim.html)
3. "Making a Difference Colleges" is an annual guide to schools preparing students to make a better world. [http://www.uvm.edu/admissions/undergraduate/why/?Page=acclaim.html](http://www.uvm.edu/admissions/undergraduate/why/?Page=acclaim.html)
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>UVM named one of nation's most environmentally responsible schools <a href="http://www.uvm.edu/admissions/undergraduate/why/?Page=acclaim.html">http://www.uvm.edu/admissions/undergraduate/why/?Page=acclaim.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>&quot;50 Women to Watch&quot; feature published in the <em>Wall Street Journal</em> says the list is made up of &quot;a new generation of women leaders who grew up watching pioneering women break into the executive suite (and) has moved into the corner offices of some of the world's largest companies.&quot; <a href="http://www.uvm.edu/admissions/undergraduate/why/?Page=acclaim.html">http://www.uvm.edu/admissions/undergraduate/why/?Page=acclaim.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Description</td>
<td>2 Years Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**State Licensure Passage Rates *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Licensure Portfolio</td>
<td>216/216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**National Licensure Passage Rates *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Registry of Radiologic Technologists/Radiologic Technologist (ARRT/RT)</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Certification/Athletic Training (BOC/AT)</td>
<td>3/6 (first time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) General Exam</td>
<td>29/33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technologist/ American Society of Clinical Pathology (MT/ASCP)</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX)</td>
<td>80/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Credentialing Agency for Laboratory Personnel (NCA)</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Exam in Speech Pathology and Audiology (NESPA)- aka Praxis II</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Physical Therapy Exam (NPTE)</td>
<td>12/12 (first time, class of 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Medicine Technology Certification Board (NMTCB)</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAXIS I</strong></td>
<td>94/95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAXIS II- Aggregate Subject Assessment</strong></td>
<td>73/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRAXIS 11- Elementary Education</strong></td>
<td>38/38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Exam for Dietitians (Didactic Program in Dietetics)</td>
<td>12/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Exam for Dietetians (Master of Science in Dietetics)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step I</td>
<td>87/93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CK</td>
<td>64/101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USMLE Step 2 CS</td>
<td>98/98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Job Placement Rates**

CALS collects some data at the unit level but there is no central located data on job placements of the college’s graduates as it relates to the students’ occupation as it relates to their degree/major/minor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CNHS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ARRT/RT</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Athletic Training b</td>
<td>100% of survey respondents at 6 months post-graduation</td>
<td>100% of survey respondents at 6 months post-graduation</td>
<td>no survey yet</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MT e</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Physical Therapy a</td>
<td>100% of survey respondents at 6 months post-graduation</td>
<td>100% of survey respondents at 6 months post-graduation</td>
<td>no survey yet</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NMT</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>7/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rubenstein**

SBA has some results from a survey in 2001 from Benchmarking Institutes that examines the undergraduate and MBA experience. Additionally, the school collected information in 2003 about alumni salary information. Below are the results from this 2003 survey.

The average starting salary for graduates from the classes 1975-1980 $16,080
The average starting salary for graduates from the classes of 1999-2002 $30,760
Respondents with a graduate degree 28.3%
Respondents who say that the international element of business is important to their careers 47.9%
Respondents who say that environmental issues are important to their careers 43.8%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Salaries of Respondents</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$34,999 or less</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,000</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $124,999</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 to $149,000</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $174,000</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$175,000 to $199,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Salaries By Field of Respondents Remaining in First Job Area: |
|---|---|
| Finance | $125-149.9K |
| Operations Mgt. | $100-$124.9K |
| MIS | $75-$99.9K |
| Accounting | $50-74.9K |
| Marketing | $50-74.9K |
| General Mgt. | $50-74.9K |
| HRM | $35-$49.9K |
| Other | $75-$99.9K |
* For each licensure exam, give the name of the exam above along with the number of students for whom scores are available and the total number of students eligible to take the examination (e.g. National Podiatric Examination, 12/14). In following columns, report the passage rates for students for whom scores are available, along with the institution's goals for succeeding years.

** For each major for which the institution tracks job placement rates, list the degree and major, and the time period following graduation for which the institution is reporting placement success (e.g., Mechanical Engineer, B.S., six months). In the following columns, report the percent of graduates who have jobs in their fields within the specified time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Notes of Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Licensure Portfolio: Vermont's Licensure portfolio assessment tool is not commercially produced. Initial licensure candidates must submit a Licensure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>