

University of New Hampshire

University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

NEASC

UNH Publications and Documents

1-1-2003

University of New Hampshire NEASC self-study report 2003. Part 2: The area reports. Executive Summary: reports of "Area of Focus" committees

University of New Hampshire

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/neasc>

Recommended Citation

University of New Hampshire, "University of New Hampshire NEASC self-study report 2003. Part 2: The area reports. Executive Summary: reports of "Area of Focus" committees" (2003). *NEASC*. 6. <https://scholars.unh.edu/neasc/6>

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the UNH Publications and Documents at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in NEASC by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact nicole.hentz@unh.edu.

Executive Summary -- Reports of “Areas of Focus” Committees.

Self-Study Steering Committee

Chair: Stephen Hardy – Professor of Kinesiology

Ann Weaver Hart - President (ex officio)

Andrew Lietz - Trustee

David Hiley – Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (to July 2003)

Candace Corvey – Vice President for Financial Affairs

Kevin Charles – Vice President for Student Affairs (to July 2003)

Mark Rubinstein – Vice President for Student and Academic Services (as of July 2003)

Donald Sundberg – Vice President for Research and Public Service (to July 2003)

John Aber - Vice President for Research and Public Service (as of July 2003)

Karol Lacroix – Dean, UNH-Manchester

Bruce Mallory – Dean of the Graduate School; Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (as of July 2003)

Victor Benassi – Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies; Professor of Psychology

Sally Ward – Professor of Sociology

Michael Merenda – Professor of Management

Julie Williams - Associate VP, Research and Public Service

Roy Torbert, - Professor of Physics

Barbara Krysiak – Associate Professor of Education and Chair of Faculty Senate

Sean Kay – Undergraduate Body President (2002-03)

Chris Kean - Undergraduate Body President (2003-04)

For more information on the history of this alternative self-study, see the “Preface” on our web site:

<http://www.unh.edu/neasc/reports.htm>. Below are summaries of three area reports (full draft reports are also available on the web site):

- **undergraduate experience**
- **engagement through research and scholarship**
- **institutional effectiveness**

The Undergraduate Experience

Committee Members:

Chair: Sally K. Ward, Professor of Sociology,
Bryan Ames, Junior Communication Major, student member
Kelly Black, Associate Professor of Mathematics
Donna Brown, Director of Undergraduate Research
Denny Byrne, Director of Campus Recreation
Bill Condon, Professor of Animal and Nutritional Sciences
Val Harper, Associate Professor, Library
Gavin Henning, Director of Assessment, Office of Student Life
Ted Howard, Professor of Forestry and Director, Center for International Education
Anne Lawing, Senior Vice-President of Student Affairs
Pam McPhee, Director, Browne Center
Bob Mennel, Professor of History and Director of Honors Program
Susanne Paterson, Assistant Professor of English, UNH-Manchester
Mark Rubinstein, Vice Provost for Academic Achievement and Enrollment Management
Janet Sable, Professor of Recreational Management and Policy
Marty Scarano, Director of Athletics
Judy Spiller, Associate Provost for Academic Achievement and Support
Katie Whittlemore, Sophomore English/IA Major, student member

Description and Appraisal

The vision of the University of New Hampshire is to combine “the living and learning environment of a New England liberal arts college with the breadth, spirit of discovery, and civic commitment of a land-grant research institution.” This mission sets high expectations for our work, and there are inherent tensions in fulfilling the ambitious goals of creating the desired learning environment for students and maintaining the quality and intensity of research and engagement of a major land-grant research university. There is much to praise in our efforts to meet the objectives implied in our mission, and yet there are areas where we can improve. The committee on The Undergraduate Experience has identified several areas for close examination. We have been guided in this effort by the Academic Plan, by our understanding of important trends in higher education, and by our collective sense of areas where we can move forward over the next several years. These areas are advising; undergraduate research; internships; international education; and student life. We have also identified general themes that cut across these areas and that suggest important recommendations for strategies to move us closer to the ideal embodied in the goal of creating an undergraduate experience that is “innovative, high quality, coherent, and integrated.”

The initial charge to the Committee on The Undergraduate Experience was to:

- Describe and examine current standards for academic excellence for all students and students’ goals, attitudes and behaviors as they relate to academic expectations. Recommend strategies for recruiting and retaining the highest possible quality students and for clarifying goals for all students.
- Describe and appraise how well we integrate learning across all environments from classroom to lab, dorm, playing fields, internships and beyond, from the first year to graduation. This will include identifying the key change agents at UNH. Evaluate opportunities to improve the integration of General Education, International Education, and Undergraduate Research. Develop other recommendations for better integration of learning.
- Recommend measures and a structure for assessing the integrated UG Experience, in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

The work of our subcommittee has been greatly aided by several recent efforts to address and improve the quality of the undergraduate experience. In particular, we have benefited from the excellent work of the General Education Study Committee and its report advocating a new general education curriculum; the

Task Force on the Undergraduate Experience; and the Task Force on the Integration of the University Advising Center and Career Services. Whether utilizing these works or conducting our own inquiry, we have sought to base our conclusions on documentary evidence.

Projections

Advising

Recommendation: Provide incentives for faculty advising and tie those rewards to regular evaluation and participation in training on advising.

Recommendation: Simplify the process of advising to encourage advisor understanding of University-wide requirements and policies and student accountability for meeting requirements and following policies. Specific steps include: user-friendly on-line technology that provides degree audits and listings of students' advisors with advisor e-mail links; adoption of the revised General Education program (the Discovery Program) which is more easily explained, understood, and fulfilled because it incorporates linked and/or interdisciplinary courses that intentionally integrate the undergraduate experience; and closer monitoring of the academic progress of first semester students.

Undergraduate Research

Recommendation Recognize and reward faculty mentoring of undergraduate research. Undergraduate Research is heavily dependent upon faculty supervision and one-on-one mentoring. To preserve and strengthen this faculty responsibility, faculty mentoring must be appropriately recognized and rewarded. This involves, at a minimum, mention in P&T Guidelines; inclusion of work with undergraduates on research as part of teaching and research responsibilities rather than as part of "service;" specific formula to count mentoring as part of faculty workload; public recognition for such work; and encouragement of mentoring through workshops for junior faculty and graduate students by senior faculty.

Recommendation Undergraduate Research should be more clearly integrated in the undergraduate curriculum. Better integration will provide some relief to the time commitment of one-on-one mentoring of individual students and the expense of funding individual student projects. Moreover, integration has its own intrinsic merits and should be guided by two fundamental objectives: 1) to introduce students to the research skills, methodology, and scholarly and creative practices of the respective disciplines, and 2) to offer students more opportunities to participate directly in research and scholarly and creative activities following the model of professionals within their fields of study.

Recommendation Analyze the ways in which the new decentralized budgeting system -- Responsibility Center Management (RCM) -- *may* affect the ability to enhance undergraduate research. There is a perception that the implementation of RCM has created a centrifugal effect on the flow of funds away from the Office of Academic Affairs and to the colleges. To the extent that this is the case, this undermines the ability of UROP, IROP, Honors, and the other academic support programs that are housed in Academic Affairs, to carry out their work. The implementation of the recommendations in this report, as well as the goals of the Academic Plan, will depend on the college deans assuming a leadership role in this endeavor and on a reward structure across disciplines that recognizes the value of engagement in undergraduate research. The potential impact of RCM on academic experiences such as undergraduate research should be studied carefully. It makes good sense to carry out this study in the context of the 5-year review of RCM, as discussed in the report on Institutional Effectiveness.

Internships and Other Practical Experiences

Recommendation There is such a wide range of experiences that are labeled "internship" that the term does little to communicate what the experience entails. It is important for us to clarify what we mean by an "internship" and to develop some common expectations about what is entailed in an internship, both in terms of academic expectations and faculty involvement. A common definition and common course numbering would greatly clarify what is now a confusing reality.

Recommendation All programs need to carefully examine the possibility of and expectation for practical experiences for their students. Practical experiences are obvious for some programs, but not for others, and in these less obvious cases, faculty should consult with programs that do offer model internship opportunities both within UNH and in their discipline at other institutions. To the maximum extent possible, all academic programs should have an identified, credit-bearing internship course. A campus-

wide workshop to share ideas and practices would be a good vehicle for both communication and faculty development.

Recommendation Greater centralization of information and resources for internships and more collaboration between academic programs and the Internship Office would facilitate student access to internships. We do not advocate less programmatic autonomy for handling internships, but we do advocate greater sharing of information about options and opportunities. We also advocate more centralization of data on internships; nationwide 77% of students graduate with at least two internships. What is the figure at UNH? We do not know since the data are not collected in any systematic way. This is an activity that the Internship Office could develop and thus make a significant contribution to the assessment of internships. The Task Force on Integrating Advising and Career Services (July 2001) recommended that programs identify a liaison to work with the Internship Office to facilitate communication and knowledge about internships, and the new University Advising and Career Center has begun this work. Consistent, sustained communication is a key for successful integration.

Recommendation Faculty work with students on internships must be recognized and counted in faculty workload and in the reward structure. In the majority of cases, internship supervision is not counted as part of the faculty load; it is unrecognized and thus marginalized. There are some notable exceptions, and models need to be shared about how to do this. There is no reason an internship should not be counted if it is “generating credits.” What are the formulas and strategies that are working in this regard? Programs should study this, in conjunction with their Deans and the Provost’s office. If the reward structure does not recognize and reward work with internships, it is doubtful that we can make substantial progress.

International Education

Recommendation Expand study abroad opportunities and exchange programs, targeting institutions whose stature is comparable with that of UNH, especially in countries where UNH does not have existing study abroad or exchange programs. The exchange programs would have the dual intent of expanding study abroad opportunities for UNH undergraduates and of expanding the enrollment of international students (and the diversity of the student body).

Recommendation Develop permanent faculty staffing for the IA core courses by joint appointments or other suitable means.

Recommendation Increase awareness of the IA program and improve access to the program through better coordination with college and faculty advising systems.

Cultivating Community

Enhancing a sense of community at UNH is a difficult challenge. It requires a commitment from all levels and a belief that creating a sense of community is a value worth the investment of time, energy and resources. Contributions to this sense of community must be recognized and valued.

Recommendation Create a centralized communication infrastructure for co-curricular activities. This clearinghouse would develop a communication strategy and implementation plan for communicating the varied happenings that occur at UNH. One specific possibility would be a university wide website that reports daily/hourly updates of events on campus. There is also a need to have accurate mail and email addresses for students both on and off-campus to support the dissemination of information to students. The current process for providing and maintaining accurate mail and email addresses is ineffective.

Recommendation Plan themes for large-scale campus activities and develop and implement a university-wide conversation on relevant topics in classrooms, the residence halls, and other campus venues. As the Task Force on Undergraduate Experience Committee articulated, developing these activities requires coordination and communication. The report suggests a coordination of event scheduling would allow longer range planning for major events and better incorporation of those events in the curriculum, where appropriate. Centralization adds coherence to planning large-scale events and provides the necessary promotion to assure success. This committee supports the Task Force Action Plan to establish a University-wide dialog that: a) begins with new students’ first days at the University, b) plans events around a theme that can be incorporated into the curriculum and is identified at least one year in advance, and c) uses the centralized clearinghouse to announce thematic happenings throughout the year.

Recommendation Initiate a yearlong program for first-year students, which integrates them to the academic priorities of the institution. A model for this program, First year Interdisciplinary Seminar Institute, has been developed by the Task Force on the Undergraduate Experience. This program should

include all first year students and utilize teams of faculty and staff to develop small learning communities that will allow students to explore issues and concepts while building relationships with other students, faculty, and staff. A fuller description is available in the report of the Task Force on the Undergraduate Experience Committee. The First Year Discovery seminars recommended by the General Education Study Committee are a similar vehicle for achieving the integration desired. It is clear the community has an interest in seminars as part of the first year experience; we need to implement these ideas. It would be beneficial to link such a first year seminar with the efforts in the residence halls (such as the First Year Integration program) so that the first year experience is truly coherent and integrated.

Recommendation Increase the diversity of students, faculty, and staff and address the feeling of isolation of multicultural students. Improving diversity also needs to be an integrated effort among campus offices.

Recommendation There seems to be an obvious disconnect between students living off-campus and the UNH community. While other recommendations made in this section may help to dissolve that disconnect, the issue needs to be explored further. The university needs to find out what off-campus students want and need to make them feel more connected and satisfied. A comprehensive study of off-campus students would provide the answer to these and more questions.

General Recommendations

Recommendation: Work to enhance communication across campus. While we do good work across campus in many respects, we too often work in separate spheres without communicating with each other. The five working groups identified many examples of this. We do not need new initiatives in many cases, but greater attention to communicating with each other about the initiatives we have already developed. There is no central vehicle for learning about campus events and activities, for example. There are separate listings on various websites and in various publications, but there is no central, integrated source of information. This impedes students from learning about productive activities and it impedes the ability of faculty to plan the integration of campus events with their courses. We do not communicate sufficiently within and across academic programs about our academic standards and expectations for students. While we produce reports on grade distributions each semester, for instance, we do not systematically use these to create a campus conversation about expectations. Nor do we communicate sufficiently between the Durham and Manchester campuses; students on each campus cannot easily identify opportunities for further work on the other campus, and in many respects the campuses operate independently rather than collaboratively.

Recommendation: Work to enhance collaboration across programs and between academic and student affairs. Because we work in separate spheres, we often miss opportunities to work collaboratively to meet our common goals. On the academic side, we have addressed this issue through the development of interdisciplinary programs, but there are many opportunities for more collaboration. Greater communication is necessary but not sufficient to enhance collaboration. In addition, we need to recognize the value of collaboration and develop ways of rewarding the successes of collaborative efforts. As is, our verticality works against us in this regard. Another of the self-study committees is addressing the theme of outreach; but we believe the concept is useful for discussing greater collaboration on campus as well.

The First Year Integration program is an example of an effort to work together to enhance the undergraduate experience. It will be important to analyze the outcomes of this program and to identify factors that make the collaboration problematic. Similarly, the creation of the University Advising and Career Center, merging the work of The Advising Center and Career Services, is an example of how we can work across academic and student affairs to improve services for students. It is also an example of the strains inherent in changing the way we work. It will be important to identify the problems in achieving the integration and in using this as a model of collaboration in other efforts. Co-location in Hood House has helped collaboration between the Honors Programs and the office of Undergraduate Research and between Undergraduate Research and the Center for International Education. Space issues may prohibit more of this type of co-location in the near term, but it would be desirable to bring together more student services and university wide programs in one location or one area of campus.

Simultaneous with the self-study, we have been working with Kubler-Wirka consultants to study the relationship between academic and student affairs. Their report was delivered to the President late in the spring, and it contains many excellent observations and suggestions for ways in which to further this

integration. The President has already begun to act on some of these recommendations, so we are encouraged about the progress already made and the opportunities ahead. We recommend that the newly appointed Vice President for Student and Academic Services work on implementing these recommendations as a top priority.

Finally, we have mentioned the perception that the implementation of RCM has undesirable centrifugal forces that decentralize the budget in ways that work against some of our academic goals (e.g., undergraduate research or the Honors Program). There is a similar perception that RCM may also work against collaborative efforts across the schools and colleges, the units of RCM. We need to analyze the extent to which these perceptions are accurate, if we hope to advance collaboration across units in the future. The creation of a University Curriculum and Planning Committee was meant to be a vehicle for addressing the impact of RCM on the curriculum and the inclusion of university-wide values in a decentralized budgetary system. We urge that this group pay attention to the areas of the undergraduate experience that we have identified as areas that would profit from further collaborative work. The 5-year review of RCM, discussed in the Institutional Effectiveness report of the self-study, is an opportunity to study the extent to which these perceptions about RCM are accurate and to address any unintended consequences along these lines.

It is crucial for us to work together, not only to improve our working relationships but to model for students the connections between their academic work and other aspects of life at UNH. Students don't often see the connections, and we need to provide positive examples by the way we work together.

Recommendation: Build more deliberately on previous work. We have referred throughout this report to the work of previous groups and committees that have studied the undergraduate experience in recent years. In particular, the work of the General Education Study Committee and the Task Force on The Undergraduate Experience represents tremendous time and effort and there are many recommendations in each report. We urge that these recommendations be implemented over the next several years. If this were done, the undergraduate experience would be enhanced, and many of the issues we have addressed in this self-study would be affected. For example, the General Education Discovery program recommends the creation in each academic program a capstone experience for students. This would be a great vehicle for including an undergraduate research opportunity, or an internship experience for some programs.

Many on campus do not know about the efforts of the Task Force, illustrating the communication issue addressed above. Many on campus have the perception that the efforts to implement the General Education Discovery Program are stalled. There is some urgency here to communicate the progress of these efforts and to move ahead. There is a great cost in increased cynicism if we do not communicate about and act on these important efforts.

The Provost's office, in conjunction with the Task Force, requested proposals during the spring semester for new First Year Seminars, to be offered during the spring 2004 semester. We are encouraged by this effort and by the response to it by faculty, who have proposed twelve courses

Engagement Through Research and Scholarship

Committee Members:

Co-Chair: Julie Williams, Associate VP, Research and Public Service

Co-Chair: Roy Torbert, Professor of Physics

Eleanor Abrams – Associate Professor of Education

Mike Gass – Professor of Kinesiology

Karen Graham – Professor of Mathematics

Marc Hiller – Associate Professor of Health, Management, and Policy

Ginger Lever – Director of Enrollment Management and College Relations, UNHM

Bruce Mallory - Vice Provost and Dean, Graduate School

John Pike – Dean and Director of Cooperative Extension

Bill Ross – Director of Special Collections, Dimond Library

Jim Varn – Assistant to the Provost

Engagement through Research and Scholarship (ETRS) is one of three focus areas of the University of New Hampshire accreditation self-study. This summary is the culmination of the efforts of a variety of faculty, staff and administrators. The executive summary is divided into three sections that reflect the overall structure of the larger report and includes a description of the process of the self study, the appraisal, and the projections.

Description and Process

For the purpose of the self study, the ETRS subcommittee agreed to focus its efforts in two primary areas and to utilize the prior year's work of the Engagement, Outreach and Public Service Advisory Board. After conducting its own deliberations and reviewing definitions used at other institutions, the subcommittee agreed to use the following definition for the purpose of this self-study and future planning initiatives:

Engagement through Research and Scholarship is a mutually beneficial collaboration between the University of New Hampshire (New Hampshire's land, sea, and space grant University) and community partners for the purpose of generating and applying relevant knowledge to directly benefit the public.

The NEASC self-study subcommittee on Engagement through Research and Scholarship developed an initial process to collect extensive data on current faculty, staff, extension educator and student activities that support engagement. Further, the committee developed a process for collecting additional data from the Deans/Directors of each college, school, Cooperative Extension, EOS, the library and other non-academic units.

Appraisal

This self study allowed the ETRS subcommittee to capture a subset of the current UNH outreach and engagement activities. Data were collected via a web-based survey. Results of the survey suggest a variety of academic and service units whose faculty and staff are involved in outreach/engagement activities. The quantity and quality of projects submitted was broad-based. Data submitted to the survey, included 120 faculty, staff extension educators and students submitting information on 238 projects. A few examples of these projects include theatrical productions with elementary school children, collaboration between high school girls and women scientists, grant activities between marine scientists and fisherman and collaboration with business and industry. Most of the information about these activities are located and disseminated in venues easily accessible to the public such as websites, public presentations, and newspaper articles. Faculty also published data results within their own scholarly journals and presented at disciplinary/professional conferences.

Projections:

Develop an organizational structure and institutional leadership that will actively promote and embody engagement through research and scholarship.

- Charge the Engagement, Outreach, and Public Service Advisory Board to serve as an advisory Board to the Office of the Vice President for Research and Public Service. Add two key community stakeholders to the Engagement, Outreach and Public Service Advisory Board.
- Under the leadership of the Associate Vice President for Research and Public Service, and in collaboration with faculty, staff, administrative leaders, and key community stakeholders, develop one or two high profile initiatives that promote ETRS.

Align engagement specifically with the recently completed Academic Strategic Plan and provide greater focus to community engagement activities to produce targeted results.

- Systematically collect and disseminate information about faculty, student, and staff engagement activities.
- Identify and target existing outreach-oriented centers to determine potential for high-profile initiatives.
- Promote and enhance the selected initiatives.
- Determine feasibility of establishing and developing future targeted initiatives.

Develop better linkages with the needs of external stakeholders

- Conduct an outreach needs assessment and develop a plan for meeting specific identified needs, based on institutional strengths and capacity.
- Align needs with institutional strengths. Develop responses that provide a multidisciplinary, multi-unit approach to address a broad yet targeted identified need.

Create a University culture that values and promotes engagement

- Develop a series of forums to promote dialogue and increase understanding of Engagement through Research and Scholarship.
- Identify internal Faculty Champions to participate and lead these efforts.
- Identify and target faculty in specific academic departments to develop learning communities that could develop, inform and support a variety of engagement models.
- Ensure that engagement efforts incorporate student involvement, especially at the graduate level.
- As part of the overall review of promotion and tenure criteria, consider revisions to the “Service” section more clearly defining “service” and include criteria for outreach through research and scholarship.
- Include scholarship and research-related engagement activities on faculty annual reports and evaluation of College and School success.
- Utilize existing and identify new grant funds to foster engagement activities.
- Create an annual faculty award recognizing excellence in engagement through research and scholarship.

Create more integration among UNH’s outreach service units and with academic units

- Develop a regular opportunity for meetings between New Hampshire Public Television (NHPTV), Cooperative Extension, the Division of Continuing Education, the University Library, and Computing and Information Services. Include these units as appropriate in the planning and implementation selected initiatives.
- Increase the number of extension faculty appointments within academic departments.
- Enhance connections and use of NHPTV, Cooperative Extension, DCE, the Library Computing and Information Services as a vehicle for disseminating UNH expertise.

- Enhance opportunities for faculty to learn about the internal capacity within outreach service units to expand opportunities for collaboration.

Strengthen community engagement through distributed and distance learning, the Center of graduate Professional Studies at UNH Manchester, and new partnerships with government, industry, and communities.

- Incorporate outreach and engagement in any long-term planning (e.g., strategic plans) pertaining to distributed and distance learning, the Center of graduate Professional Studies at UNH Manchester, and new partnerships with government, industry, and communities.

Provide stakeholders (e.g. alumni, the public-at-large, community partners, faculty, staff, and students) with a clear picture of the University's investment and commitment to outreach and engagement.

- Develop a strategic communication plan for engagement through the Office of the Vice President of Communications.
 - Develop a website specifically focused on outreach and engagement and an easily accessible web-based tool that provides external stakeholders with information about specific outreach and engagement activities.
 - Publish an outreach document depicting examples and analyzing the affects of outreach and engagement activities.
-

Institutional Effectiveness

Committee Members:

Chair: Michael Merenda - Professor of Management

Thomas Ballestero – Associate Professor of Civil Engineering

Victor Benassi – Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and Professor of Psychology

David Butler – Assistant VP of Human Resources

Pam Dinapoli – Assistant Professor of Nursing and Member of the Graduate Council

Taylor Eighmy – Research Professor of Civil Engineering

Allison Grappone – Undergraduate student, Whittemore School of Business and Economics

John Griffith – Assistant VP for Financial Planning and Budget

Linda Hayden – Assistant Director of Campus Recreation

Karol Lacroix - Dean UNH-Manchester

James McCarthy – Dean of the School of Health and Human Services

Leigh Anne Melanson – Assistant Provost for Academic Administration

Gay Nardone – Associate Professor and Chair of Theater and Dance

Peter Pekins – Professor of Natural Resources

Dan Reid – Associate Professor of Decision Sciences

The charge to the University Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) is to examine how current planning, resource allocation, implementation strategies, and assessment activities are integrated and how these processes enable the institution to meet its mission. The committee is charged with establishing an assessment procedure to ensure the integration of these four processes. This must be carefully developed and the components clearly described in order to assess our planning, resource allocation, and implementation initiatives. Performance indicators will establish a baseline against which future performance will be measured. In addition, there must be a clear feedback mechanism to ensure the information gained is used to improve the institution.

Self-Study Focus

The goal of the IE self-study was to address three related issues of critical importance to the university:

- How can we assure that academic and administrative units are engaged in effective strategic planning that is consistent with the University's Academic Plan?
- How can we assure that our budgeting process is used to achieve strategic priorities and that our processes result in fiscal integrity?
- How can we assure academic quality is inherent in the teaching learning process?

Approach to the Self Study

The IE committee conducted an audit to collect information on the current and proposed level of integration of planning, resource allocation, implementation strategies, and assessment. Specific objectives of the audit are to:

- Evaluate the strategic planning process.
- Determine if resource allocation is a function of thoughtful and inclusive planning.
- Describe how units have implemented the goals and objectives of their strategic plans.
- Describe the assessment processes that are in place and how the data that is generated is being used to strengthen academic and administrative units.
- Lay the groundwork and criteria for the 5th year review of the university's financial management system.
- Make recommendations and projections for the future.

The committee reviewed historical and current documents related to institutional effectiveness. In addition, the committee conducted four case studies to determine how well these representative units are working to “close the loop.”

Rather than provide a cursory view of all of the university’s schools and colleges and its administrative departments, four representative units were selected. The following units were not selected to present our best practices, but rather to represent the breadth of the institution’s missions and practices associated with teaching, scholarship, and service:

Academic Units

- The School of Health and Human Services is a professional school that offers undergraduate and graduate preparation in a number of health related disciplines. The curricula are highly prescribed and follow strict accreditation guidelines.
- The College of Engineering and Physical Sciences is a research-intensive unit with teaching loads that reflect research expectations, success in securing external funding, and a relatively large number of doctoral programs.
- As the largest college in the University, the College of Liberal Arts offers much of the general education instruction and a variety of majors at the baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral levels.

Administrative Units

- Central Administration—These units include offices of the President, Provost, the various Vice Presidents, Facilities Services, and Computing and Information Services.

The case studies focused on how the three academic units and central administration have used planning to determine the allocation of resources. Each case study also speaks to how the unit has assessed progress in meeting its objectives and used the results of assessments to effect needed changes. Information was obtained from interviews of faculty, staff, and administrators in each unit. The interview questions are provided in an appendix of the full report.

The case studies were conducted by subcommittees of the Institutional Effectiveness committee from October to December of 2003. An interview guide was mailed to Deans, Directors, Chairs and the Senior Central Administrators, and other individuals within the units that were selected. Committee members used information obtained from interviews, written responses to the interview guide, and-related documents to construct the case studies.

Projections

Development of a Master Schedule for Review of Implementation of Academic Plan

By December 1, 2003, the vice presidents and the president should have developed a master schedule that indicates the following for each action item in their area plan:

- The responsible person for ensuring implementation of the action item
- Steps involved in implementing the action item
- The target date for implementation of the action item
- The outcomes/measures used to assess whether the action item has been successfully implemented

The Office of Academic Affairs has already developed a master schedule for relevant action items. This schedule may be used as a template for other units.

Further Development of Strategic Plans

Now that the university academic plan is in place, **further work must be done in all academic and administrative units** of the university to prepare and implement unit level strategic plans that are clearly linked to the university plan. Some units are clearly further along in this process and, conversely, in some

units there is considerable work that is yet to be done. To accomplish this goal, the vice presidents should ensure that by June 30, 2004, for each unit in their area, there is substantial progress in the development of a strategic plan.

Institutional Effectiveness

The President should create a standing Institutional Effectiveness Committee in order to provide prominence and sustainability to activities that assure the continued integration and success of strategic planning, resource allocation, implementation, and assessment.

If the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is created, the Central Budget Committee should be disbanded. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee should assume the responsibility of overseeing the ongoing process of assessment undertaken at the vice-presidential and presidential levels and make recommendations to the President regarding the allocation of strategic initiative funds to the RC units.

Institution and Unit Level Review and Assessment

The Institutional Effectiveness Committee should review, evaluate, and recommend modifications to planning and assessment activities that occur at all levels and in all areas of the university as a mean of ensuring quality. This focus on ensuring that all units are engaged in ongoing systematic assessment will be a primary means of enhancing institutional effectiveness.

Members of the university's Student Outcomes Assessment Committee should continue to work with colleagues in their units to introduce measures that will effectively assess student educational outcomes and that will be used to improve educational practice.

At the end of each academic year, the deans should include in their annual report to the Provost the degree of progress made in developing and implementing assessment tools within their unit. Similar approaches should be developed and implemented for all other areas of the university as well.

The current efforts to periodically review undergraduate and graduate academic programs should be continued and strengthened. As work in the area of student learning outcomes assessment progresses, there should be increased attention given to student learning in all self-study documents. The results of assessment should be used systematically to identify strengths and weaknesses of programs and to make changes intended to improve student learning. In addition, for those programs reviewed by a specialized accreditation agency, there is a need to better align those reviews with the academic program review process. The policies and guidelines for graduate and undergraduate program reviews provide guidance on how this alignment might occur (<http://www.unh.edu/ir/pr1.html>).

In the same way that formal academic program reviews of all academic programs are conducted on a regular basis, a periodic evaluation of all other administrative units should be done. The self-studies for these reviews should be undertaken by the units undergoing the review. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee should coordinate and oversee the process. Policies, guidelines, and timetables will need to be developed (<http://www.unh.edu/ir/pr1.html>).

All academic and administrative units in the university should identify benchmarks against which progress can be measured in achieving future goals. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee should periodically review these benchmarks to ensure that they relate directly to the university academic plan and to individual unit strategic plans. Assessment of performance relative to these benchmarks should be a central component of all formal academic program and administrative unit reviews.

As the group responsible for oversight of the components of institutional effectiveness, the newly established Institutional Effectiveness Committee should, by the end of its first year of operation, establish clear guidelines for processes to be followed by each unit as it assesses its effectiveness. One model for this task is the "Balanced Scorecard" approach which has been used in both academic and non-academic settings (see Robert S. Kaplan, David P. Norton, *The balanced scorecard : translating strategy into action*. Boston, Mass. : Harvard Business School Press, 1996).

Stakeholder Assessments

During the interviews with representatives of the three academic units and of the central administrative units, there was some indication of periodic or sporadic assessment of stakeholders important to those units. For example, the university routinely sends graduates a Recent Alumni Survey (<http://www.unh.edu/ir/alumni11.html>). Similarly, academic units undergoing program or accreditation reviews sample opinion of current and former students.

Assessments from key stakeholders are critically important if we are to identify strengths and weaknesses of our programs and services in advancing our collective mission. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee should work with the vice presidents to improve current efforts within their areas designed to assess stakeholders and to use the obtained information to make any needed changes in programs and service.

Roles and Responsibilities of Academic Department Chairs

The roles and responsibilities of academic department chairs have increased in number and complexity over the past decade. We recommend that recent efforts to provide professional development opportunities for academic department chairs be increased and made more routine. The Provost's Office and a group of department chairs who advise the Provost will be responsible for moving this initiative forward.

Improved Communication

The university should develop a strategic communication plan for institutional effectiveness through the Office of the Vice President of Communications.

5th Year Review of Responsibility Center Management

After the completion of the 5th year of Responsibility Centered Management (RCM), in FY 06, the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs will chair a committee to assess the effectiveness of RCM as the University's financial management system. The committee will prepare a report for the President that provides a description and analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of RCM and offers recommendations concerning any needed changes or improvements.

The review should have two major components:

- The committee will collect, analyze and evaluate data on a variety of measures. Data sources will include, but should not be limited to, student outcome learning measures, class sizes, grade distributions, interdisciplinary teaching and research activities, faculty productivity measures, RC unit fund balance levels, faculty/student ratios, the number of new faculty hires, and recommendations from internal and external program reviews. The committee will determine if there are any significant differences before and after the implementation of RCM using these and other indicators of academic quality.
- The committee will administer instruments such as interviews and surveys across the university to assess the understanding of RCM and the perceptions that exist regarding how RCM is working. The interviews should include Deans, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, President's Staff, Faculty Senate, Research Directors, Academic and Student Support Units, RC Unit Directors and other appropriate individuals and groups.