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Gardner-Webb University

Mission Statement
Gardner-Webb University, a private, Christian, Baptist-related university, provides outstanding undergraduate and graduate education that is strongly grounded in the liberal arts while offering opportunities to prepare for various professions. Fostering meaningful intellectual thought, critical analysis, and spiritual challenge within a diverse community of learning, Gardner-Webb is dedicated to higher education that integrates scholarship with Christian life. By embracing faith and intellectual freedom, balancing conviction with compassion, and inspiring a love of learning, service, and leadership, Gardner-Webb prepares its graduates to make significant contributions for God and humanity in an ever-changing global community.

Statement of Values

Christian Heritage
Acknowledging One God—Creator and Sustainer of life, and Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord; committing to self-giving service displayed in Christ-like moral action that respects the dignity and value of every person.

Baptist Heritage
Affirming historic Baptist values such as the freedom of individual conscience and the right of people to worship God as they choose, the authority of Scripture in matters of faith and practice, the priesthood of every believer, the autonomy of the local church, and the separation of church and state.

Academic Excellence
Encouraging visible enthusiasm for knowledge, intellectual challenge, continuous learning, and scholarly endeavors; inviting pursuit of educational opportunities within and beyond the classroom for the joy of discovery; and inspiring accomplishment within one’s field of study.

Liberal Arts
Offering broad-based exposure to the arts, humanities and sciences and to each field’s unique challenges, contributions, and life lessons; complementing the acquisition of career-related knowledge and skills with well-rounded knowledge of self, others, and society.

Teamwork
Working collaboratively to support and promote shared goals, assuming responsibility willingly, meeting commitments dependably, handling disagreement constructively, and persevering despite distraction and adversity.

Student-Centered Focus
Providing students an environment that fosters intellectual and spiritual growth; encourages physical fitness, service, social and cultural enrichment; strengthens and develops moral character; and respects the value and individuality of every student.

Community Engagement
Assisting campus, local, national, and global communities through education, outreach, and research; fostering dialogue and action in support of human welfare and environmental stewardship.

Diversity
Studying and celebrating our world’s rich mix of cultures, ideologies, and ethnicities; respecting and welcoming students without regard to ethnicity, gender, religious commitment, national origin, or disability.
## Program Assessment (by Division)

### Academic Programs

**Provost and Senior Vice President (Leslie)**

1. General Education Core Curriculum

**Associate Provost for Arts and Sciences (Dire)**

2. Communication Studies  
3. English  
4. Fine Arts  
5. Mathematical Sciences  
6. Natural Sciences  
7. Physical Education, Wellness and Sports Studies  
8. Religious Studies and Philosophy  
9. Social Sciences  
10. World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures

**Associate Provost for Schools (Price)**

11. Undergraduate Program  
12. Graduate Program  
13. Divinity, School of  
14. Education, School of  
15. Graduate School  
16. Associate in Arts  
17. Bachelor of Science  
18. Psychology, School of

**Non-Academic Programs**

**Provost and Senior Vice President (Leslie)**

19. Distance Learning and Continuing Education  
20. Library  
21. Registrar  
22. Service Learning  
23. Technology Services  
24. Undergraduate Research

**Associate Provost for Arts and Sciences (Dire)**

25. First-Year and Senior Programs  
26. Honors Program  
27. International Programs  
28. Learning Assistance Program  
29. Noel Program  
30. Writing Center

**Vice President for Athletics (Burch)**

31. Academic Advising  
32. Athletic Training  
33. Baseball  
34. Basketball (Men's)  
35. Basketball (Women's)  
36. Compliance  
37. Cross Country and Track and Field (Men's)  
38. Cross Country and Track and Field (Women's)  
39. Football  
40. Golf (Men's)  
41. Golf (Women's)  
42. Soccer (Men's)  
43. Soccer (Women's)  
44. Softball
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sports Information</td>
<td>Rabb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Strength and Conditioning</td>
<td>Sibley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Swimming (Men's)</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Swimming (Women's)</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Tennis (Men's)</td>
<td>Griffith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tennis (Women's)</td>
<td>Corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>C Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>Wince</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vice President for Business and Finance (Hardin)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Fund Accounting</td>
<td>McFarland, Parris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Payroll (Regular)</td>
<td>McCurry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Payroll (Work Study)</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Business Services (Ingle)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Business Office</td>
<td>Pyron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Campus Shop</td>
<td>Merritt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>Brannon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plant Operations (Johnson)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Custodial Services</td>
<td>Dellinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Dining Services (pending)</td>
<td>Glasscock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Hollifield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Facility Services</td>
<td>Hinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vice President for Development (Varley)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Bulldog Club</td>
<td>Diffenderfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Campaign (Annual)</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Academics- Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Greene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Academics- Schools</td>
<td>McInnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Development (Athletics)</td>
<td>Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Foundations / Grant Writing</td>
<td>Elliott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Donor Services</td>
<td>McSwain, Robbins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vice President for Enrollment Management (Hughes)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Admissions (GOAL)</td>
<td>Setzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Admissions (Graduate School of Business)</td>
<td>Stimpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Admissions (Graduate School)</td>
<td>Zoellner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Admissions (School of Divinity)</td>
<td>Chapman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Admissions (School of Nursing)</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Financial Planning</td>
<td>Hintz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Retention and Student Success</td>
<td>Theokas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vice President for University Relations/Marketing (Dixon)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Alumni Relations</td>
<td>Fern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Church Relations</td>
<td>Bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Marketing and Promotion (Athletics)</td>
<td>Corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>University &amp; Media Relations</td>
<td>Manning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vice President and Dean of Student Development (Moore)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Campus Ministries</td>
<td>Jessup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>Sweat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Counseling Services</td>
<td>Whitlow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>Ingram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Student Leadership &amp; Activities</td>
<td>Weir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>University Police</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Assessment Plan

Gardner-Webb University is committed to a comprehensive, functional, and meaningful program of institutional assessment, the goal of which is to present an accurate picture of the University’s operational effectiveness as well as to provide a solid foundation for institutional planning within the context of the University’s Christian mission and related statement of values.

OVERVIEW

The University plan consists of three distinct units, each of which incorporates a 15-point assessment initiative. Each unit is also characterized by five assessment targets and five assessment sources. Three of the targets are personnel-related while two deal with program and policy considerations. All of the assessment sources are driven by individuals, groups, or agencies. The following provides a brief description of the scope of each unit:

1) Academic Program Unit - used for all schools, departments, and programs whose main focus relates directly to the academic arm of the University

2) Non-Academic Program Unit - incorporates all University support programs that are not directly tied to academics

3) Executive Unit - addresses the executive level of Gardner-Webb; involves the Board of Trustees, the president, and all members of the Senior Staff

All programs assessed within each unit will have established a working mission statement, detailed operational goals, and desired measurable outcomes. Within units, each of the fifteen numbered evaluation items is a stand-alone entity, with the assessment methodology, frequency of administration, and utilization of results to be determined, developed, and implemented by the person responsible for the program being assessed in consultation with the Vice President of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.

UNIT SPECIFICS

Academic Program

The five assessment targets in this unit are self-explanatory.

Included as one of the assessment sources, “External Agencies” refer to any national or regional accrediting organization, national testing association, or any established peer review program. The remaining assessment sources are self-explanatory.

Many of the numbered assessment items have been in place for several years at Gardner-Webb. These instruments are under regular review in order to determine their validity and reliability for future use. Assessment reciprocity occurs in two situations in this unit—between students and faculty and between director/dean/chair and faculty. This is the only unit where self-evaluation is a comprehensive part of the assessment model (#13, faculty).
Non-Academic Program

The five assessment targets in this unit are self-explanatory.

Included as one of the assessment sources, “External Agencies” refer to any established or proposed peer review program. The remaining assessment sources are self-explanatory.

Programs and policies are reviewed by all five assessment sources. Although some of the instruments used to access various numbered items in this unit have been in place for several years, a revamping of the entire area, as well as a philosophical shift relating to the importance and utilization of assessment, is necessary. Assessment reciprocity occurs in one situation in this unit—between director and staff.

Executive

Included as one of the assessment targets, “University Operations” include such components as strategic planning, resource management, budgeting, relationship with external constituencies, and personnel management. The remaining assessment targets in this unit are self-explanatory.

Included as one of the assessment sources, “External Agencies” refer to any national or regional accrediting organization, foundations, or church-related governing bodies. “University Community” references any number of special-interest groups, including students, faculty, staff, or alumni, who, at a particular point in time from either a temporal or long-term perspective, have a vested interest in University operations. The three remaining assessment sources are self-explanatory.

Although some numbered assessment items are functional, all need to be formalized, regulated and documented. Assessment reciprocity occurs in one situation in this unit—between the President and the Vice Presidents/Provosts.

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Areas Other Than Student-Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Courses</td>
<td>Exit Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Assessments</td>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>Institutional Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Inventories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Peer Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios</td>
<td>Performance Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- and Post-Tests</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items listed under “Student-Learning Outcomes” are specific to Academic Program Unit, Item 14. Items listed under “Areas Other Than Student-Learning” are appropriate for all other assessment units, including all fourteen other areas identified in the “Academic Program Unit.”
Within the University’s three defined assessment areas, assessment targets have been defined for each program’s operations, policies, and personnel. By the very nature of organizational functioning, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine clear lines of distinction between these targets when utilizing a specific assessment instrument. Even when an instrument appears to be clearly dedicated to one target, the influence of the others cannot be ignored.

As such, the various assessment methodologies that follow have been strategically identified with the source/target category which holds the greatest relational significance with the understanding that some assessment overlap among units is inevitable, even desired.

With that in mind, the basic assessment objectives of each of the general units are as follows:

**Program** - the effectiveness of the operation of the unit; the appropriate use of the unit’s available resources; clearly defined goals to insure the unit’s stability and serve as a guide for future advancement

**Policies** - the suitability of the regulations and procedures that drive the unit’s operation

**Personnel** - the performance of the individual members of the unit in light of their written job description and, where appropriate, articulated personal goals
Assessment Model (Academic Programs)

Assessment Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Source

→ indicates assessment reciprocity
Assessment Plan Details
(Academic Programs)

Academic Division
General Education Core Curriculum

Arts and Sciences

Communication Studies
  English
  Fine Arts
Mathematical Sciences
  Natural Sciences
Physical Education, Wellness and Sport Studies
Religious Studies and Philosophy
Social Sciences
World Languages, Literatures and Cultures

Schools

Business
  Divinity
  Education
Graduate School
  Nursing
  Psychology

For purposes of clarification, references to Program relate to the operations of specific departments and schools. Evaluation of Policies considers the entire academic division as a single entity.

1 External Agencies Evaluation of Program

Agencies
  Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)
  Various national accrediting agencies for each of the University’s Schools
  An external reviewer as part of the five-year self-study for all Arts and Science departments

Assessment Type/Administration
  A comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documents and an on-campus visit

Frequency of Review
  Every ten years for SACS accreditation and the national accreditation of schools; department reviews are conducted every five years
Description

SACS – includes 14 items directly related to the effectiveness of the institution’s academic programs (Section 2: Core Requirements – 2.7.1; 2.7.2; 2.7.3; 2.8; 2.9 and Section 3: Comprehensive Standards – 3.3.1; 3.4.1; 3.4.10; 3.4.12; 3.4.13; 3.4.14; 3.5.1; 3.6.1; 3.6.2)

Accrediting Agencies and External Reviewers – format is specific to the entity conducting the review

Results

Compliance (SACS), certification (accrediting agencies) and effectiveness (external reviewer) is affirmed when the university receives its comprehensive response from the appropriate entity following the off-site review and the on-site visit.

Archival

The SACS report is maintained for at least ten years and is housed in the library as well as in various administrative offices (in both hard copy and electronic format); reports from accrediting agencies and external reviewers are maintained indefinitely in the offices of the Provosts and the appropriate Dean or Chair of the school/department being reviewed.

2  External Agencies Evaluation of Policies

Agencies

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

Assessment Type/Administration

A comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documents

Frequency of Review

Conducted every ten years; most recently 2006-07

Description

Seven items are addressed which relate directly to the appropriateness of the institution’s academic policies (Section 2: Core Requirements – 2.7.4 and Section 3: Comprehensive Standards – 3.4.4; 3.4.5; 3.4.6; 3.4.8; 3.5.2; 3.6.3)

Results

Compliance is affirmed when the university receives its comprehensive response from the appropriate entity following the off-site review and the on-site visit.

Archival

The report is maintained for at least ten years and is housed in the library as well as in various administrative offices (in both hard copy and electronic format).

3  External Agencies Evaluation of Students

Agencies

Educational Testing Service (ETS)
Professional organizations specific to the student’s field of licensure

Assessment Type/Administration

Pencil and paper tests administered at on-campus and off-campus sites

Frequency of Review

ETS – annually
Licensure examinations – variable; dependent upon student’s course of study timetable

Description

ETS – the MAPP test is a 36-item, multiple choice assessment instrument with a 40 minute time limit. It is administered in the fall to the entering freshman class and again in the spring to undergraduate candidates for graduation. The test purports to measure college-level reading,
mathematics, writing, and critical thinking skills developed through the general education core curriculum.

**Licensure examinations** – PRAXIS II tests (administered to Elementary Education and English as a Second Language majors, and to specialty area majors with less than 24 hours in the content area); tests specific to the disciplines of Nursing, School Administration, and School Counseling that are required for licensure certification

**Results**

**ETS** – provides a summary report for student sub-groups at the conclusion of each testing period. Longitudinal results allow a comparative analysis of basic academic skills gained by students after having completed the university’s core curriculum.

**Licensure examinations** – final scores are provided to the student and to appropriate university administrators and faculty

**Archival**

Aggregate MAPP results are maintained indefinitely in the office of the Director of Assessment and the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. Individual licensure examination scores are maintained indefinitely in the office of the appropriate dean or department chair.

### 4 University Administration Evaluation of Program

**Responsible Individual / Group**
- Provost
- Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
- Ad hoc committee consisting of faculty and administration

**Assessment Type/Administration**
- Checklist reviewed in a focus group setting

**Frequency of Review**
- To be determined

**Description**

The instrument to be used is still under construction; however, the following areas will be reviewed: internal and external demand; quality of program inputs, processes, and outcomes; size, scope and productivity; costs and expenses; and impact, justification, and essentiality of the program.

**Results**

The results of the assessment will be used to determine the short- and long-term viability of each program in addition to serving as a guide for resource allocation.

**Archival**

Documents associated with the review will remain on file in the Office of the Provost for an indefinite period of time.

### 5 University Administration Evaluation of Dean, Chair

**Responsible Individual / Group**
- Provost
- Associate Provost (specific to the resident school)

**Assessment Type/Administration**
- Individual conference
Frequency of Review
Annually

Description
Faculty evaluations of the dean/chair are reviewed and constitute the major component of the session. Informal observations of the dean’s/chair’s performance by members of the academic administration is also included in the assessment.

Results
The results of the assessment are used to support the administrative efforts of the dean/chair and to address areas of concern within the school/department.

Archival
No formal records of these conferences are maintained.

6 University Administration Evaluation of Faculty, Staff

Responsible Individual / Group
Provost
Associate Provost (specific to the resident school)
Dean or Chair of the specific School / Department
Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

Instrument
Administrative Evaluation of Faculty

Assessment Type/Administration
Summary sheet completed by the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness during the conference involving the dean/chair of the school/department and the Provosts.

First-Utilized
1997

Revised
2006; further revision planned for 2007

Frequency of Review
Annually, during the fall semester (encompasses previous academic year – August to July)

Description
The assessment includes the following components as a percentage of the final evaluation:

- **Teaching** (50%, of which student surveys and administrative input each contribute 25%)
- and 10% of each of the following categories: **Academic Advising, Preparation and Conduct, Professional Development, Department / School Service**, and **University Service**

Results
Individual reports are forwarded electronically to the faculty member and the dean/chair of school/department. The results of the assessment are used in decision-making processes involving promotion, tenure, and salary increases.

Archival
Individual reports are permanently maintained in the faculty member’s personal file in the office of the Administrative Assistant to the Associate Provosts. Additionally, the Associate Provosts are provided with a detailed statistical breakdown of the evaluation results. All records associated with the process are stored permanently in the office of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.
Dean, Chair Evaluation of Program

Instrument
School / Departmental Annual Report

Assessment Type/Administration
Comprehensive inventory completed by the dean / chair and submitted electronically to the office of the Administrative Assistant to the Associate Provosts

First-Utilized
Circa 1980

Revised
2007

Frequency of Review
Annually; deadline for submission is May 25

Description
The inventory includes quantitative questions related to the number of student majors, minors, and faculty members, and asks for qualitative assessment in the areas of school / department meetings, past and projected programmatic goals, and unit strengths / weaknesses.

Results
Reports are reviewed by the appropriate Associate Provost; strengths and weaknesses are noted and addressed in an appropriate manner

Archival
Reports are maintained in the office of the Administrative Assistant to the Associate Provosts for an indefinite period of time.

Dean, Chair Evaluation of Policies

Assessment Type/Administration
Regular council meetings of Schools and of Arts and Sciences

Frequency of Review
Monthly

Description
Current policies and operating procedures are reviewed and suggestions for changes or modifications are considered.

Results
Suggestions for modification in academic policy are presented to the Educational Policies and Standards Committee (EPSC) for review. Procedural changes receiving the endorsement of the council are implemented only after being communicated to the members of the faculty in the next day’s school / department meetings.

Archival
Council meeting minutes are recorded and maintained by the Administrative Assistant to the Associate Provosts.
9  Dean, Chair Evaluation of Faculty, Staff

**Instrument(s)**
Dean / Department Chair Evaluation of Faculty Member

**Instrument Type/Administration**
Paper and pencil, narrative assessment supported by selected quantitative data

**Frequency of Administration**
Annually (due by October 1st)

**First-Utilized**
Circa 1980

**Revised**
2006

**Description**
Deans / chairs are asked to evaluate their faculty in seven areas of performance during the most-recently completed academic year:

- **Teaching**
- **Advising**
- **Preparation and Conduct**
- **Professional Development**
- **Department/School Service**
- **University Service**

Within each category, the dean / chair is asked to assess whether the expected level of performance was exceeded, met, or not met as well as to provide narrative support for each determination.

**Results**
A copy of the review is to be forwarded to the office of the appropriate Associate Provost. This assessment provides valuable supporting documentation when determining the faculty member’s final score during the Administrative Evaluation of Faculty.

**Archival**
The evaluation becomes part of the faculty member’s personal file and is housed permanently in the Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Associate Provosts.

10  Faculty, Staff Evaluation of Program

**Instrument(s)**
Evaluation of the Chair; Evaluation of the Dean

**Instrument Type/Administration**
Both are web-based surveys, constructed in PDF format and submitted via email

**Frequency of Administration**
Annually (due by October 1st)

**First-Utilized**
Circa 1980

**Revised**
2007
**Description**

Although the purpose of these surveys is to evaluate the performance of the dean or chair, several questions relate to the effective operation of the school or department. A section for open-ended comments is provided on each form for faculty to express programmatic perspectives.

**Results**

Evaluations are submitted to, and tabulated by, the Office of Planning and Institutional Research. Results are then forwarded to the Provost and the appropriate Associate Provost to be used as needed in the overall program review process.

**Archival**

All records are maintained permanently in the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. Each year’s summary becomes part of the dean’s or chair’s personal file and is housed permanently in the Office of the Associate Provosts.

---

**11 Faculty, Staff Evaluation of Policies**

**Assessment Type/Administration**

- Regularly scheduled school / department, committee, and faculty meetings

**Frequency of Review**

- Monthly

**Description**

Questions and concerns relating to current university policies and operating procedures may be addressed by any faculty member during any of the structured meetings listed above.

**Results**

In most cases, interpretation, modification, abolition, or establishment of academic policy is handled through the legislative action of the Educational Policies and Standards Committee. Faculty approval is required before any change is implemented.

**Archival**

Minutes of all above meetings are recorded by an individual designated by the organization; a copy is forwarded to the Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Associate Provosts for permanent filing.

---

**12 Faculty, Staff Evaluation of Dean, Chair**

**Instrument(s)**

- Evaluation of the Chair; Evaluation of the Dean

**Instrument Type/Administration**

- Both are web-based surveys, constructed in PDF format and submitted via email

**Frequency of Administration**

- Annually (due by October 1st)

**First-Utilized**

- Circa 1980

**Revised**

- 2007

**Description**

**Chair Evaluation** - survey includes 20 questions related to administrative and leadership performance and two questions related to adequacy of departmental meetings.
**Dean Evaluation** - survey consists of 14 items that assesses leadership characteristics and includes a section for open-ended comments.

**Results**
Evaluations are submitted to, and tabulated by, the Office of Planning and Institutional Research. Results are then forwarded to the Provost and the appropriate Associate Provost to be used as supporting documentation in the annual overall administrative assessment of deans and chairs.

**Archival**
All records are maintained permanently in the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. Each year’s summary becomes part of the dean’s or chair’s personal file and is housed permanently in the Office of the Associate Provosts.

### 13 Faculty, Staff Evaluation of Faculty, Staff

**Instrument(s)**
Faculty Self-Evaluation Form (full-time teaching faculty)

**Instrument Type/Administration**
Paper and pencil, narrative assessment supported by selected quantitative data

**Frequency of Administration**
Annually (due by October 1st)

**First-Utilized**
Circa 1980

**Revised**
2006

**Description**
Faculty members are asked to evaluate seven areas of personal performance during the most-recently completed academic year:

- **Teaching**
- **Advising**
- **Preparation and Conduct**
- **Professional Development**
- **Department/School Service**
- **University Service**

Within each category, the individual is asked to assess whether the expected level of performance was exceeded, met, or not met as well as to provide narrative support for each determination.

The faculty member is also to address the outcomes of his or her previous year’s goals and is to identify relevant and realistic goals for the upcoming year.

**Results**
The faculty member is expected to submit one copy of the self-evaluation to his or her department chair and/or school dean and one copy to the office of the appropriate Associate Provost. This assessment provides valuable supporting documentation when determining the faculty member’s final score during the Administrative Evaluation of Faculty.

**Archival**
Each year’s self evaluation becomes part of the faculty member’s personal file and is housed permanently in the Office of the Associate Provosts.
Facility, Staff Evaluation of Students

The evaluation umbrella involving student performance is complex and specific to each school / department. The identification of student learning outcomes is the foundation from which all assessment is based. A detailed list of outcomes may be found in each school’s / department’s section of the respective academic catalog. Specific assessment methodologies used by each program may be somewhat transitional from year to year, but may be found, along with the results of such assessment, in the school’s / department’s internal documentation.

Student Evaluation of Faculty, Staff

**Instrument(s)**
Student Opinion of Instruction (distinct forms for undergraduate, graduate, and School of Divinity populations)

**Instrument Type/Administration**
All are web-based surveys

**Frequency of Administration**
Each semester (including summer)

**First-Utilized**
1980 (graduate); 1994 (School of Divinity); 1997 (undergraduate)

**Revised**
2007 (undergraduate)

**Description**
- **Undergraduate** - survey includes 21 questions related to teacher performance and classroom experience; seven questions relating to the student’s class involvement, preparation, and expectations; and an opportunity for open-ended comments.
- **Graduate** - survey is comprised of 11 questions relating to instructor performance with an opportunity for responders to enter comments specific to each question.
- **School of Divinity** - a 44 item survey which addresses professor performance, the course, student involvement and preparation, and the school’s support services. A section is also provided for open-ended comments.

**Results**
Survey summaries are distributed to the faculty member, the dean or chair of the school or department, the appropriate Associate Provost, and the Provost within three weeks of the closing of the evaluation session. The results of the survey are factored into the overall Administrative Evaluation of Faculty, contributing 50% of the teaching component and 25% of the final score.

University-wide analysis of the undergraduate survey is provided to the Provost and Associate Provosts, including the comparison of full-time to part-time faculty, regular DAY faculty to GOAL instructors, on-line to traditional face-to-face courses, and the summary performance of departments and schools. The twelve highest scoring faculty members for each survey item are also identified.

The 12 members of the full-time teaching faculty who receive the highest scores for the entire academic year receive recognition at the annual August faculty retreat. The GOAL program’s 15 highest rated adjunct professors are recognized at the annual summer GOAL workshop. Yearly awards recognizing the outstanding Graduate School, School of Divinity, and Graduate School of Business professor are based, in part, on the results of this survey.

**Archival**
All records are maintained permanently in the Office of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.
Additional Assessment Initiatives Specific to the Academic Division

Graduate Assistants

**Instrument(s)**
Graduate Assistant Evaluation Form

**Instrument Type/Administration**
A paper and pencil survey given to all graduate assistants; completed forms are returned to the Graduate School office in person or via campus mail.

**Frequency of Administration**
Annually, near the end of the spring semester

**Description**
The two-page survey asks the student to evaluate the graduate assistantship opportunity by answering five quantitative/qualitative questions, providing general comments about the experience, and offering suggestions for program improvement.

**Results**
Survey summaries are reviewed by the Dean of the Graduate School before being distributed to the appropriate supervisor for informational purposes.

**Archival**
All forms are maintained permanently in the office of the Dean of the Graduate School.

**Instrument(s)**
Graduate Assistant Supervisor Evaluation Form

**Instrument Type/Administration**
A paper and pencil inventory distributed to all supervisors of graduate assistants; completed forms are returned to the Graduate School office via campus mail.

**Frequency of Administration**
Annually, near the end of the spring semester

**Description**
The one-page survey asks the supervisor to rate the graduate assistant in seven basic job-related performance categories. A space for general comments is provided.

**Results**
The completed inventory is submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School. Additionally, the supervisor is encouraged to share the evaluation results with the graduate assistant

**Archival**
All surveys are maintained permanently in the office of the Dean of the Graduate School.
Graduate School - Recent Graduates

Instrument(s)
Assessment of Graduate Programs

Instrument Type/Administration
A paper and pencil inventory mailed to current-year (May and August) graduates of all programs offered by the Graduate School; completed forms are returned by mail to the Graduate School office.

Frequency of Administration
Annually; surveys are requested to be returned by the first week in November.

Description
Two surveys comprise this assessment; a fourteen-item, Likert-scale instrument which addresses general components (library, curriculum, policies) of the Graduate School and a program-specific questionnaire relating to the student’s major field of study.

Results
Survey summaries are processed by the office of the Dean of the Graduate School before being forwarded to the appropriate school dean for review. Programmatic changes are made when deemed necessary.

Archival
All results are maintained permanently in the office of the Dean of the Graduate School.

Graduate School – Five and Ten-Year Alumni

Instrument(s)
Graduate School Alumni Survey

Instrument Type/Administration
A paper and pencil inventory mailed to five and ten-year graduates of all programs offered by the Graduate School; completed forms are returned by mail to the Graduate School office.

Frequency of Administration
Annually, during the fall semester

Description
A four-item, Likert scale questionnaire which asks the student to assess the value of his or her degree experience. A section for open-ended comments is also provided.

Results
Survey summaries are processed by the office of the Dean of the Graduate School and are shared with other university officials when deemed appropriate.

Archival
All results are maintained permanently in the office of the Dean of the Graduate School.
**Regular Program Academic Advisors**

**Instrument(s)**  
Advisor Survey

**Instrument Type/Administration**  
Web-based; accessible to all undergraduate DAY students through MYWebb

**Frequency of Administration**  
Annually—first administered in March 2007 prior to registration for summer and fall courses; future sessions will occur in December prior to release of final fall semester grades.

**Description**  
The ten-item, Likert-scale instrument asks students for their opinion as to the availability, helpfulness, and knowledge of their academic advisor.

**Results**  
Survey summaries are processed by the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness before being given to the Director of Academic Advising for review and distribution to each advisor.

**Archival**  
All results are maintained permanently in the office of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.

---

**Standing Faculty Committees**

**Instrument(s)**  
Committee Annual Report

**Instrument Type/Administration**  
Web-based; constructed in PDF format and submitted via email

**Frequency of Administration**  
Annually (due by May 25th)

**Description**  
The committee chair is asked to submit a detailed overview of the committee’s work during the recently-completed academic year, addressing such items as committee membership, major issues considered, identification of unfinished business, unit strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for improvement.

**Results**  
Completed surveys are submitted for review to the Associate Provost for Arts and Sciences.

**Archival**  
All results are maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Associate Provost for Arts and Sciences.
Assessment Model (Non-Academic Programs)

![Diagram of assessment model with nodes labeled Program, Policies, External Agencies, University Administration, Students, Director, and Staff.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Source</th>
<th>External Agencies</th>
<th>University Administration</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ indicates assessment reciprocity
Assessment Plan Details
(Non-Academic Programs)

**Academic Division**
Distance Learning and Continuing Education
Library
Registrar
Service Learning
Technology Services
Undergraduate Research

**Arts and Sciences**
First-Year and Senior Programs
Honors Program
International Programs
Learning Assistance Program
NOEL Program
Writing Center

1. **External Agencies Evaluation of Programs**

**Agencies**
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

**Assessment Type/Administration**
A comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documentation

**Frequency of Review**
Conducted every ten years (most recent 2007)

**Description**
Eight SACS principles relate directly to programs supported by this division:
2. 10. (Student support programs)
3. 3. 1 (Outcomes for educational support services)
3. 4. 9 (Appropriate academic support services)
3. 4. 11 (Security and back up of student records)
3. 4. 14 (Technology enhances student learning)
3. 8. 1 (Appropriate learning/information resources)
3. 8. 2 (Access to library and learning/information resources)
3. 8. 3 (Sufficient library and learning/information staff)

**Results**
Compliance in each of the above principles is affirmed when the university receives its comprehensive response from SACS.

**Archival**
Maintained for at least 10 years as a part of the permanent SACS documentation; housed in the library and in many administrative offices.
2  **External Agencies Evaluation of Policies**

Although the programs in this division are not subject to regular formal external review, the NOEL Program adheres to policies and procedures as outlined by Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

3  **University Administration Evaluation of Program**

**Assessment Type/Administration**  
Review of end-of-year report submitted by program director

**Frequency of Review**  
Annually, at the end of the fall semester

**Description**  
The Provost or the Associate Provost for Arts and Sciences meet with the program director in a one-on-one conference to access the current status of the program and to review past and projected operational goals. Additionally, informal observations during the course of the academic year will factor into the assessment.

**Results**  
The results of the assessment are used to ascertain the effectiveness of each program in addition to serving as a guide for resource allocation.

**Archival**  
Reports will remain on file in the offices of the Provosts, and in the office of the specific program director, for an appropriate period of time.

4  **University Administration Evaluation of Policies**

Except in rare situations, the review, evaluation, and modification of policies and procedures is left to the discretion of the specific program.

5  **University Administration Evaluation of Directors**

**Responsible Individual / Group**  
Provost  
Associate Provost for Arts and Science

**Assessment Type/Administration**  
Individual conference

**Frequency of Review**  
Annually, at the end of the fall semester

**Description**  
When available and appropriate, staff evaluations of the director are reviewed and constitute a significant component of the session. Informal observations of the director’s performance by members of the academic administration are also included in the assessment.

**Results**  
The results of the assessment are used to support the administrative efforts of the director and to address areas of concern within the program.

**Archival**  
No formal records of these conferences are maintained.
University Administration Evaluation of Staff

No formal assessment of the support staff is conducted by the Provost or the Associate Provost for Arts and Sciences. Each program director has the latitude to evaluate his or her staff members in an appropriate and comprehensive manner.

Director Evaluation of Program

Informal, ongoing assessment of program operations characterizes most of the units within the division. A significant number of directors use weekly or biweekly staff meetings to gather performance information in consultation with their staff. End-of-year program reports submitted to the Provost or the Associate Provost for Arts and Sciences formalize the assessment initiative.

Director Evaluation of Policies

Discretionary policies and procedures unique to the program are under constant review in an informal manner as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.

Director Evaluation of Director (Self-Assessment)

Currently, none of the program directors in the division complete a self-assessment review.

Director Evaluation of Staff

Although the particular instrument varies, the Library, Registrar, Technology Services, and NOEL Program have similar mechanisms in place to accomplish this assessment. The director completes an evaluation of each staff member under his or her direct supervision, provides feedback to that individual in an appropriate manner, and uses the assessment results in determining future salary adjustments and job responsibilities.

This assessment area is not applicable for all programs within the division due to the fact that some programs either do not have support staff or have staff consisting entirely of faculty not under the supervision of the program director.

Staff Evaluation of Policies

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the support staff of any program in the division to evaluate the policies and procedures of that program.

Staff Evaluation of Director

Although the particular instrument varies, the Library, Registrar, Technology Services, and NOEL Program have similar mechanisms in place to accomplish this assessment. Each staff member that reports to a director completes an evaluation of that supervisor and submits the form to the office of the Provost or Associate Provost for Arts and Sciences. Feedback is provided to the director during his or her end-of-year review with the appropriate administrative official.

This assessment area is not applicable for all programs within the division due to the fact that some programs do not have support staff. In other programs, the staff consists entirely of faculty who do not report to the program director.
13 **Staff Evaluation of Staff (Self-Assessment)**

Library, Technology Services, and NOEL Program staff complete an annual self-assessment which is then submitted to the program director in advance of end-of-year performance review. Although the instrument varies between programs, all ask that the employee address goal outcomes and projections.

14 **Students Evaluation of Program**

**Instrument(s)**
- First-Year and Senior Programs – UNIV 101 Course and Peer Leader Evaluation
- LAP – Learning Assistance Program Services Evaluation
- NOEL Program – NOEL Program Evaluation
- Writing Center – End of Year Student Evaluation

**Assessment Type/Administration**
- First-Year and Senior Programs – web-based; accessed and submitted through MyWebb
- LAP – paper and pencil survey
- NOEL Program – web-based; constructed in PDF format and submitted via email
- Writing Center – paper and pencil survey

**Frequency of Review**
- First-Year and Senior Programs – annually, at the end of the fall semester
- LAP – annually, at the conclusion of the spring semester
- NOEL Program – at the conclusion of each semester
- Writing Center – at the conclusion of each semester

**Description**
- First-Year and Senior Programs – the 27-item questionnaire addresses the student’s perception of the beneficial aspects of the course and the role of the peer leader. There is not an option for open-ended comments.
- LAP – a 13-item, quantitative-response questionnaire that addresses instructor effectiveness in addition to academic improvement as a result of participating in the program. Five questions are included asking for open-ended comments.
- NOEL Program – the survey consists of 14 quantitative-response items that address program effectiveness, several questions dealing with campus accessibility, and three questions asking for open-ended comments.
- Writing Center – the survey consists of 15 quantitative-response items that address the student’s writing center experience in addition to providing multiple sections for open-ended comments.

**Results**
- First-Year and Senior Programs – summaries are tabulated by the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness and forwarded to the Director of First-Year and Senior Programs for review and distribution to course instructors.
- LAP – surveys are reviewed by the Director of the Learning Assistance Program; changes in policy and procedures are considered when deemed necessary.
- NOEL Program – programmatic changes are implemented based on the concerns that students address on the submitted surveys.
- Writing Center – submitted surveys are reviewed by the Director of the Writing Center; programmatic changes are made when necessary.
Archival

**First-Year and Senior Programs** – survey results are maintained permanently in the office of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness and for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Director of First-Year and Senior Programs.

**LAP** – survey results are maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Director of the Learning Assistance Program.

**NOEL Program** – survey results are maintained permanently in the office of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness and for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Director of the NOEL Program.

**Writing Center** – surveys, and the statistical analysis of the results, are maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Director of the Writing Center.

---

**15 Students Evaluation of Director**

No formal assessment procedures are currently in place for this area for any program in this unit.

---

**Additional Assessment Initiatives Specific to the Academic Division**

**Honors Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Instrument(s)</strong></th>
<th>Honors Course Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Instrument Type/Administration**

A paper and pencil survey given to all honors students; completed forms are returned in a sealed envelop to the Honors Program Coordinator.

**Frequency of Administration**

At the conclusion of every honors course

**Description**

The survey consists of 20 quantitative-response items that address course content and instructor performance in addition to providing several sections for open-ended comments.

**Results**

Survey summaries are reviewed by the Honors Program Coordinator and are used to determine the future composition of the program in terms of courses offered and faculty members invited to teach.

**Archival**

All surveys are maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Honors Program Coordinator.
**Instrument(s)**
Honors Course Evaluation (Faculty)

**Instrument Type/Administration**
A paper and pencil survey completed by all faculty who teach Honors courses

**Frequency of Administration**
At the conclusion of every honors course

**Description**
The survey consists of 16 quantitative-response items that address course content and student performance in addition to providing several sections for open-ended comments.

**Results**
Survey summaries are reviewed by the Honors Program Coordinator; adjustments relating to course offerings, teaching assignments, and program structure are made when deemed necessary.

**Archival**
All surveys are maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Honors Program Coordinator.

---

**Learning Assistance Program**

**Instrument(s)**
Peer Tutoring Evaluation

**Instrument Type/Administration**
A paper and pencil survey given to all students utilizing the services of a peer tutor; completed forms are returned to the Director of the Learning Assistance Program via an attached envelope through campus mail.

**Frequency of Administration**
At the conclusion of each semester

**Description**
The survey consists of 11 quantitative-response items which address the competence and effectiveness of the peer tutor. Five open-ended questions are provided to solicit the student’s comments concerning the peer tutor experience.

**Results**
Survey summaries are reviewed by the Director of the Learning Assistance Program; decisions concerning the continued employment of specific peer tutors are made based, in part, on the results of the questionnaire.

**Archival**
Survey results are maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Director of the Learning Assistance Program.
**NOEL Program**

**Instrument(s)**
- Captionist
- Disability Specialist
- Interpreter
- Lab Assistant
- Note Taker
- Reader

**Instrument Type/Administration**
- Each survey is web-based; constructed in PDF format and submitted via email

**Frequency of Administration**
- At the conclusion of each semester

**Description**
- Each survey addresses a specific service offered by the program and is distributed via email only to those students utilizing that resource. A combination of quantitative-response items and open-ended questions characterize each of the instruments.

**Results**
- Survey summaries are processed by the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness before being forwarded to the Director of the NOEL Program for review.

**Archival**
- All results are maintained permanently in the offices of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness and the Director of the NOEL Program.

**Writing Center**

**Instrument(s)**
- Faculty Writing Center Survey

**Instrument Type/Administration**
- A questionnaire available to faculty whose students utilize the services of the Writing Center

**Frequency of Administration**
- Non-specific

**Description**
- The questionnaire asks four open-ended questions relating to the student’s improvement in writing skills following his or her involvement with the Writing Center.

**Results**
- Responses are used to validate the contribution of the Writing Center as an academic support service.

**Archival**
- All surveys are maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Director of the Writing Center.
Assessment Plan Details
(Non-Academic Programs)

Division of Athletics

Academic Advising
Athletic Training
Baseball
Basketball (Men’s)
Basketball (Women’s)
Compliance
Cross Country/Track and Field (Men’s)
Cross Country/Track and Field (Women’s)
Football
Golf (Men’s)
Golf (Women’s)
Soccer (Men’s)
Soccer (Women’s)
Softball
Sports Information
Strength and Conditioning
Swimming (Men’s)
Swimming (Women’s)
Tennis (Men’s)
Tennis (Women’s)
Volleyball
Wrestling

For purposes of clarification, the following titles/references apply to this Division:

University Administration – the Vice President for Athletics
Director – the head coaches or supervisors of support programs (i.e. Athletic Training)
Staff – the assistant coaches or other administrative support personnel under the
direction of a supervisor (i.e. Sports Information staff or athletic trainers)
Students – the athletes

1 External Agencies Evaluation of Programs

Agencies
National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documentation

Frequency of Review
Conducted every ten years; most recent--NCAA (2004-05), SACS (2006-07)
Description

**NCAA** – an extensive review of the institution’s athletic program in the areas of: 1) Governance and commitment to rules compliance; 2) Academic integrity; 3) Equity and student-athlete welfare

**SACS** – one principle (3.2.11) referring to the chief executive officer’s responsibility for the administration and control of the athletic program.

Results

Certification (NCAA) and compliance (SACS) is affirmed when the university receives its comprehensive response from each agency following the off-site review and the on-site visit.

Archival

Each report is maintained for at least ten years and is housed in the library as well as in various administrative offices (in both hard copy and electronic format).

2 External Agencies Evaluation of Policies

Agencies

Atlantic Sun Conference

Assessment Type/Administration

On-campus visit by the Associate Commissioner for Compliance and Legal Affairs

Frequency of Review

Annually, during the summer

Description

Individual and groups meetings (primarily the Athletic Certification Committee) are conducted with various members of athletic administration and others involved with NCAA compliance efforts. Specifically, this typically includes the President, the Vice President for Athletics, the Senior Women’s Administrator, the Faculty Athletic Representative, the Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance, the Assistant Athletic Director for Academics, the Registrar and the Associate Registrar (the individual charged with the certification of athletic eligibility), the Assistant Vice President for Financial Aid, the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions, and selected head coaches.

Results

Within a month of the compliance visit, a written summary of the proceedings, outlining strengths and weaknesses and offering suggestions for modification of athletic policies and procedures, is mailed to the President, the Vice President for Athletics, the Faculty Athletic Representative, and the Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance.

Archival

Reports are maintained permanently in the Atlantic Sun Conference office in Macon, GA and in each office of the university officials named above.

3 University Administration Evaluation of Program

Responsible Individual(s)

Vice President for Athletics

Assessment Type/Administration

Conference with head coach along with on-going informal observation

Frequency of Review

Formal meeting is conducted annually at the end of the sport season
Description
Head coaches complete a short questionnaire addressing issues related to the operation of their specific sport and submit this document to the Vice President for Athletics prior to the end-of-season conference. This serves as the foundation for the formal program review. Additionally, information gleaned from observations made over the course of the year is factored into the overall assessment.

Results
When needed and appropriate, program modifications are implemented.

Archival
Appropriate documentation is maintained permanently in the office of the Vice President for Athletics.

4 University Administration Evaluation of Policies

Responsible Individual / Group
Vice President for Athletics
Athletic Certification Committee (AAC)

Assessment Type/Administration
Compliance meetings along with on-going informal monitoring

Frequency of Review
Vice President for Athletics – conducts monthly compliance meetings of all coaches
AAC – a minimum of four annual sessions coinciding with the periods of athletic eligibility certification

Description
The Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance, at the direction of the Vice President for Athletics, conducts information-sharing meetings relating to NCAA and conference legislative regulations. Current practices are reviewed in order to determine effectiveness, efficiency, and adherence.

The AAC, whose membership consists of representatives from the following university offices: Admissions, Advising, Athletics, Financial Planning, and Registrar and is chaired by the Faculty Athletics Representative, evaluates and proposes policies relating to the certification of athletic eligibility of current students as well as the recruiting and admission of prospective athletes.

Results
Modifications of existing policies or implementation of new procedures are incorporated as needed.

Archival
Agenda items specific to the coaches’ compliance meetings are kept on file in the office of the Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance. Minutes of ACC meetings are kept in the permanent files of the Faculty Athletic Representative.

5 University Administration Evaluation of Directors

Responsible Individual / Group
Vice President for Athletics

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire along with a personal conference

Frequency of Review
Annually, at the end of the sport season before the conclusion of the academic year
Description

The Vice President for Athletics completes a four page inventory, evaluating each head coach’s performance in the following areas: adherence to NCAA, conference, and university rules and regulations; academic performance of team members; communication skills; on-field team success; and the student-athletes’ development while members of the campus community. This document provides the foundation for the performance review which occurs during each coach’s individual conference.

Results

The inventory is signed by both the head coach and the Vice President for Athletics and is considered in salary and related contract negotiations.

Archival

All documents are maintained permanently in the office of the Vice President for Athletics. A copy is provided, upon request, to the coach for his or her records.

6 University Administration Evaluation of Staff

No formal assessment of the assistant coaches or support staff is conducted by the Vice President for Athletics. It is left to the discretion of each head coach and the supervisor to evaluate the performance of his or her staff members in an appropriate and comprehensive manner.

7 Director Evaluation of Program

Responsible Individual / Group

Head coach of each university-sponsored sport

Assessment Type/Administration

Narrative survey

Frequency of Review

Annually, at the end of the sport season before the conclusion of the academic year

Description

A seven-item survey, to be completed by each head coach and submitted to the Vice President for Athletics, asks for comments and suggestions related specifically to improving intradepartmental communication and administrative support.

Results

The comments included on the survey are addressed during the head coach’s end-of-year performance conference with the Vice President for Athletics. Each party signs the document affirming that the issues were discussed. Programmatic changes are made when deemed feasible.

Archival

All documents are maintained permanently in the office of the Vice President for Athletics. A copy is provided, upon request, to the coach for his or her records.

8 Director Evaluation of Policies

Responsible Individual / Group

Head coach of each university-sponsored sport

Assessment Type/Administration

Focus group format
**Frequency of Review**
Three or four meetings per semester

**Description**
The Vice President for Athletics is the only division administrator present at these meetings involving the various head coaches. Suggestions relating to improvement of athletic department policies and procedures are discussed.

**Results**
Programmatic changes are made when deemed feasible.

**Archival**
No formal documentation of these sessions is maintained.

9 **Director Evaluation of Director (Self-Assessment)**

No formal procedure exists for head coaches or supervisors to complete a self-assessment review.

10 **Director Evaluation of Staff**

It is left to the discretion of each head coach or supervisor to evaluate the performance of his or her staff members in an appropriate and comprehensive manner.

11 **Staff Evaluation of Policies**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the assistant coaches or other support staff to evaluate the policies and procedures of the athletic program.

12 **Staff Evaluation of Director**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the assistant coaches or other support staff to evaluate the head coach of their respective sport or their supervisor.

13 **Staff Evaluation of Staff (Self-Assessment)**

No formal procedure exists for assistant coaches or support staff to complete a self-assessment review.

14 **Students Evaluation of Program**

**Instrument(s)**
Student–Athlete Exit Questionnaire
Student-Athlete Exit Conference

**Assessment Type/Administration**
A pencil and paper survey sent to the campus mailboxes of all senior athletes. Completed surveys are returned via campus mail. A selected number of athletes are identified by the Vice President for Athletics to participate in a formal exit conference involving the Vice President for Athletics, the Senior Women’s Administrator, the Assistant Athletic Director for Compliance, the Assistant Athletic Director for Academics, and the Faculty Athletic Representative.

**Frequency of Administration**
Annually, in April and May
First-Utilized
Circa 1991

Revised
No major revisions of the original document have occurred

Description
The four-page survey contains questions dealing with the major areas of campus life, the athletic experience (in the context of both the team setting and the overall program), and suggestions for enhancing the athlete’s experience at Gardner-Webb University. The majority of the questions included in the athletic experience section reference the performance of the head coach. Students selected to participate in exit conferences are asked to expound on answers to selected survey questions.

Results
Surveys are collected and tabulated by the Assistant Athletic Director for Academics. The Vice President for Athletics uses information gleaned from these questionnaires as supportive documentation during the assessment of head coaches as described above (Item #5).

Archival
All records are maintained permanently in the office of the Assistant Athletic Director for Academics. Questionnaires completed by students selected to participate in exit conferences are provided, in advance, to all participants in the conference. These documents are maintained permanently in the office of the Faculty Athletics Representative as well as other administrative offices.

15 Students Evaluation of Director

Instrument(s)
Student–Athlete Evaluation of the Department of Athletics

Assessment Type/Administration
Pencil and paper survey administered by the Faculty Athletics Representative at a team meeting (without the coaches present)

Frequency of Administration
Annually, at the conclusion of each team’s competitive season

First-Utilized
2006

Revised
Not applicable

Description
The survey contains 13 questions which address the performance of the team’s head coach in addition to nine questions asking the athlete to rate various athletic department personnel and administrative services.

Results
Surveys are collected and tabulated by the Faculty Athletic Representative. A summary of each team’s evaluation is provided to the Vice President for Athletics, the Senior Women’s Administrator, and the head coach of the specific sport.

Archival
All records are maintained permanently in the office of the Faculty Athletic Representative.
Assessment Plan Details
(Non-Academic Programs)

**Division of Business and Finance**

*Accounting and Finance*
- Fund Accounting
- Payroll (Regular)
- Payroll (Work Study)

*Business Services*
- Business Office
- Campus Shop
- Post Office

*Plant Operations*
- Custodial Services
- Dining Services
- Facilities Maintenance
- Facility Services
- Grounds

---

1. **External Agencies Evaluation of Programs**

   **Agencies**
   - Cherry, Beckert, and Holland, L.L.P.
   - Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

   **Assessment Type/Administration**
   - The firm of Cherry, Beckert, and Holland conducts the University’s audit; SACS requires a comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documentation.

   **Frequency of Review**
   - The audit is conducted annually at the end of the fiscal year; the SACS review (most recent 2007) is scheduled on a ten-year cycle.

   **Description**
   - **Audit** – traditional
   - **SACS** – survey consists of 14 items that assesses leadership characteristics and includes a section for open-ended comments.

   **Results**
   - Compliance in each of the above areas is affirmed when the university receives its final report from the specific agency.

   **Archival**
   - SACS documentation is maintained for at least 10 years in the library and various administrative offices; the annual audit becomes a permanent part of the university’s records and is housed in the office of the Vice President for Business and Finance.
2 **External Agencies Evaluation of Policies**

Because of the numerous federal and state laws and guidelines in existence that dictate the policies and operating procedures of certain programs within this division, there is no significant formal assessment under this heading.

3 **University Administration Evaluation of Program**

By the very nature of the division’s operating procedures, informal assessment occurs on a daily basis as the Vice President for Business and Finance interacts with various program directors.

4 **University Administration Evaluation of Policies**

Discretionary policies and procedures unique to the institution are under constant review as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.

5 **University Administration Evaluation of Directors**

There is no formal instrument currently being utilized; however, the performance of each of the program’s directors is regularly assessed in an informal manner by the Vice President for Business during the normal course of business and through regular daily contact.

6 **University Administration Evaluation of Staff**

No formal assessment of the support staff is conducted by the Vice President for Business and Finance. It is left to the discretion of each supervisor to evaluate the performance of his or her staff members in an appropriate and comprehensive manner.

7 **Director Evaluation of Program**

**Assessment Type/Administration**

Focus group format conducted as part of the Plant Operations planning retreat

**Frequency of Review**

Annually, in the fall

**Description**

General assessment sessions of plant operations and initiatives are conducted; each director summarizes the outcomes of the previous year’s goals for his or her program and presents a planning strategy for the upcoming year.

**Results**

Modifications in operating procedures are made when deemed necessary.

**Archival**

All relevant documentation is maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the Associate Vice President for Operations.

8 **Director Evaluation of Policies**

Discretionary policies and procedures unique to each program within the division are under constant review as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.
9  **Director Evaluation of Director (Self-Assessment)**

No formal procedure exists for supervisors to complete a self-assessment review.

10  **Director Evaluation of Staff**

**Instrument(s)**

*Plant Operations Evaluation Form*

**Assessment Type/Administration**

A paper and pencil survey completed by each supervisor in *Plant Operations*

**Frequency of Review**

Annually, during the spring semester

**Description**

Eight job-related performance attributes are rated on a numerical scale; a section is also included for the supervisor to access the staff member’s improvements and goals and list general notes and comments.

**Results**

The supervisor references this document during his or her end-of-year personnel evaluation conference with the Associate Vice President for Operations. Adjustments in salary and job-related responsibilities occur as deemed necessary.

**Archival**

The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Associate Vice President for Operations and in the office of the appropriate supervisor.

11  **Staff Evaluation of Policies**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the support staff to evaluate the policies and procedures of the division.

12  **Staff Evaluation of Director**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the support staff to evaluate the performance of their supervisor.

13  **Staff Evaluation of Staff (Self-Assessment)**

**Instrument(s)**

*Plant Operations Evaluation Form*

**Assessment Type/Administration**

A paper and pencil survey completed by each member of the staff of *Plant Operations*

**Frequency of Review**

Annually, during the spring semester

**Description**

Eight job-related performance attributes are rated on a numerical scale; a section is also included for the staff member to identify improvements made, goals, and list general notes and comments.
Results

The document is submitted to the appropriate Plant Operations program supervisor for review during a one-on-one conference. Each party signs the evaluation affirming that all inventory items were adequately discussed. The supervisor will then reference this document during his or her end-of-year personnel evaluation conference with the Associate Vice President for Operations. Adjustments in salary and job-related responsibilities occur as deemed necessary.

Archival

The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Associate Vice President for Operations and the appropriate supervisor. The staff member is also provided a copy of the document.

14 Students Evaluation of Program

With the exception of rudimentary instruments that may originate from time to time from various campus offices and address specific programs within the division, the only assessment in this area would take the form of informal comments made to various university officials.

15 Students Evaluation of Director

Because of the limited amount of interaction between students and the directors of the Division of Business and Finance, no formal assessment procedure has been developed for this area.
Assessment Plan Details
(Non-Academic Programs)

Division of Development

Bulldog Club
Campaign (Annual)
Campaign (Capital)
Development (Academics)
Development (Athletics)
Donor Services
Foundations / Grant Writing

1  External Agencies Evaluation of Programs

Agencies
Cherry, Beckert, and Holland, L.L.P.

Assessment Type/Administration
The firm of Cherry, Beckert, and Holland conducts the University’s audit

Frequency of Review
Annually

Description
Appropriate management of monetary gifts is the focal point of the audit for this division

Results
Compliance is affirmed when the university receives its final report from the auditing agency

Archival
Maintained permanently as part of the university’s financial records; housed specifically in the office of the Vice President for Development and the Vice President for Business and Finance.

2  External Agencies Evaluation of Policies

The division is not subject to policy review by any external agency.

3  University Administration Evaluation of Program

The assessment of the effectiveness of each program in the division is directly tied to the Vice President for Development’s evaluation of the director of each program (see item #5).

4  University Administration Evaluation of Policies

Discretionary policies and procedures unique to the institution are under constant review by the Vice President for Development as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.
5 University Administration Evaluation of Directors

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Staff meetings; on-going monitoring of director performance goals

**Frequency of Review**
Weekly

**Description**
A review of the previous week’s project goals is presented by each director; short-term and long-range goals are reviewed

**Results**
A director’s target goals may be adjusted based on information provided; changes in solicitation strategy and/or director responsibility may result

**Archival**
A spreadsheet detailing the progress each director is making toward reaching annual performance goals is maintained in the office of the Vice President for Development.

6 University Administration Evaluation of Staff

Due to the limited number of support staff in this division, no formal assessment is conducted by the Vice President for Development.

7 Director Evaluation of Program

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Individual meetings with the Vice President for Development

**Frequency of Review**
Weekly

**Description**
The effectiveness of fund-raising strategies and overall program efficiency is addressed by each director during this time.

**Results**
Adjustments are made in solicitation strategy when necessary

**Archival**
No formal documentation is maintained

8 Director Evaluation of Policies

No formal assessment is conducted in this area; the division’s operations are not dependent on adherence to established policies.

9 Director Evaluation of Director (Self-Assessment)

No formal procedure exists for directors to complete a self-assessment review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Director Evaluation of Staff</td>
<td>Due to the fact that most directors in this division do not have a support staff, formal assessment is not applicable for this criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation of Policies</td>
<td>Not applicable for this division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation of Director</td>
<td>Not applicable for this division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Staff Evaluation of Staff (Self-Assessment)</td>
<td>No formal procedure exists for staff to complete a self-assessment review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Students Evaluation of Program</td>
<td>Not applicable for this division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Students Evaluation of Director</td>
<td>Not applicable for this division.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External Agencies Evaluation of Programs

**Agencies**
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)
- Cherry, Beckert, and Holland, L.L.P.
- North Carolina State Education Assistance Authority (NCSEAA)

**Assessment Type/Administration**
SACS requires a comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documentation. Cherry, Beckert, and Holland (the university’s auditing firm) and NCSEAA each conduct on-campus reviews.

**Frequency of Review**
Every ten years for SACS accreditation (most recent 2007); the comprehensive audit is conducted annually and the NCSEAA review, previously administered every three years, will be on a two-year cycle beginning in 2007.

**Description**
- **SACS** – includes one item which directly references a program housed within the division: *(Section 3: Comprehensive Standards - 3.10.3 - Auditing of financial aid programs)*
- **Audit and NCSEAA** - format is agency-specific

**Results**
Compliance in each of the above principles is affirmed when the university receives its comprehensive response from the specific agency.

**Archival**
SACS documentation is maintained for at least 10 years in the library and various administrative offices; the annual audit becomes a permanent part of the university’s records and is housed in the office of the Vice President for Business and Finance; the NCSEAA report is housed in the office of the President and in the office of the Assistant Vice President of Financial Planning.

2. **External Agencies Evaluation of Policies**

With the exception of the North Carolina State Assistance Authority’s (NCSEAA) review of the Office of Financial Planning’s operating policies, none of the programs in this division are subject to review by an external agency.
3 University Administration Evaluation of Program

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Focus group format (directors’ staff meeting)

**Frequency of Review**
Biweekly

**Description**
A basic component of each meeting is the review of each program’s progress toward meeting established performance goals. Concerns related to specific program effectiveness is addressed by the Vice President for Enrollment Management in a one-on-one meeting with the director.

**Results**
Programmatic changes are made when deemed necessary.

**Archival**
Notes of each staff meetings are recorded and maintained by the Administrative Assistant to the Vice President for Enrollment Management.

4 University Administration Evaluation of Policies

Discretionary policies and procedures unique to this division are under constant review as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.

5 University Administration Evaluation of Directors

**Assessment Type/Administration**
A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire along with a personal conference

**Frequency of Review**
Annually, at the end of the academic year in late May or early June

**Description**
The Vice President for Enrollment Management completes an annual performance review of each director in the division. The division-wide instrument employed consists of thirteen quantitatively-evaluated performance items, the listing of prior year accomplishments, the identification of current year goals, and a section for open-ended comments.

**Results**
During the director’s end-of-year performance conference with the Vice President for Enrollment Management, the results of the inventory are reviewed in harmony with the director’s self-assessment. Each party signs the final composite document affirming that all survey items were discussed. Adjustments in salary and position responsibilities may result.

**Archival**
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for Enrollment Management. A copy is provided to the director for his or her private records.

6 University Administration Evaluation of Staff

No formal assessment of the support staff is conducted by the Vice President for Enrollment Management. It is left to the discretion of each program director to evaluate the performance of his or her staff members in an appropriate and comprehensive manner.
7 **Director Evaluation of Program**

**Assessment Type/Administration**
A comprehensive narrative with supporting statistical documentation

**Frequency of Review**
Annually, at the end of the academic year in late May

**Description**
Specific to each program within the division, the review includes the following: status of the previous year’s goals; the year in review; program strengths and weaknesses; supporting statistical data (where appropriate) and goals for the upcoming year.

**Results**
The document is submitted to the Vice President for Enrollment Management for review during the end-of-year conference with each program director. Programmatic changes are made when deemed necessary.

**Archival**
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for Enrollment Management and in the office of the specific program director.

8 **Director Evaluation of Policies**

Policies and procedures unique to each program are under constant review as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.

9 **Director Evaluation of Director (Self-Assessment)**

**Assessment Type/Administration**
A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire

**Frequency of Review**
Annually; during the spring semester

**Description**
The division-wide instrument is employed which consists of thirteen quantitatively-evaluated performance items, the listing of prior year accomplishments, the identification of current year goals, and a section for open-ended comments.

**Results**
The completed inventory is submitted to the Vice President for Enrollment Management for consideration during the director’s end-of-year performance review.

**Archival**
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for Enrollment Management.

10 **Director Evaluation of Staff**

No formal, division-wide structure is in place as to how program directors are to assess their support staff; however, the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions meets individually with each of his staff members on an annual basis to informally discuss the completed self-assessment.
11 **Staff Evaluation of Policies**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the support staff to evaluate the policies and procedures of the division.

12 **Staff Evaluation of Director**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the support staff to evaluate the performance of their supervisor.

13 **Staff Evaluation of Staff (Self-Assessment)**

**Instrument(s)**
Quarterly Performance Review

**Assessment Type/Administration**
A paper and pencil survey completed by each member of the staff of the Office of Undergraduate Admissions

**Frequency of Review**
Annually, at the end of the academic year in late May

**Description**
Nine job-related performance attributes are rated using a traditional qualitative scale with a space provided for comments specific to the attribute; general comments may also be included as deemed necessary.

**Results**
The document is submitted to the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions for review during the end-of-year conference with each staff member. Each party signs the document affirming that all issues of concern were addressed.

**Archival**
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Assistant Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions and in the office of the specific staff member.

14 **Students Evaluation of Program**

Not applicable for this division.

15 **Students Evaluation of Director**

Not applicable for this division.
Assessment Plan Details
(Non-Academic Programs)

Division of Student Development

Academic Advising
Campus Ministries
Career Services
Counseling Services
Residence Life
Student Leadership and Activities
Student YMCA
University Police

1 External Agencies Evaluation of Programs

Agencies
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documentation

Frequency of Review
Conducted every ten years (most recent 2007)

Description
Four SACS principles relate directly to programs supported by this division:
3. 9.1 (Statement of student rights)
3. 9.2 (Student records)
3. 9.3 (Qualified personnel for student affairs)
3.10.6 (Secure environment)

Results
Compliance in each of the above principles is affirmed when the university receives its comprehensive response from SACS.

Archival
Maintained for at least 10 years as a part of the permanent SACS documentation; housed in the library and in many administrative offices.

2 External Agencies Evaluation of Policies

Although not subject to regular formal evaluations, the majority of the programs in the division adhere to policies as outlined in the Book of Professional Standards for Higher Education (CAS). Additionally, the Academic Advising Program holds membership in the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and functions according to the nationally-held standards of that organization. The Student YMCA follows the standards set forth by the national YCMA organization.
3 University Administration Evaluation of Program

No formal program of assessment is currently in place. The Vice President for Student Development reviews the year-end reports submitted by each program director and considers information presented at the year-end retreat and regular staff meetings to determine program effectiveness.

4 University Administration Evaluation of Policies

Assessment Type/Administration
Focus group format; individual conferences

Frequency of Review
Weekly (Dean’s Council meetings); biweekly (individual director conferences)

Description
Operating policies are reviewed and evaluated as a basic, ongoing component of each type of regularly-scheduled staff meeting involving the division directors and the Vice President for Student Development.

Results
Programmatic changes are made when deemed necessary.

Archival
Informal agenda notes are recorded by, and maintained in the office of, the Vice President for Student Development.

5 University Administration Evaluation of Directors

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire along with a personal conference

Frequency of Review
Annually, at the end of the academic year in late May

Description
The Vice President for Student Development completes an annual performance review of each director in the division. The instrument consists of three sections: a quantitative assessment using various descriptor statements, a review and development of performance objectives, and narrative commentaries relating to specific attributes of the director’s job responsibilities.

Results
During the director’s end-of-year performance conference with the Vice President for Student Development, the results of the inventory are reviewed in harmony with the director’s self-assessment. Each party signs the final composite document affirming that all survey items were discussed. Adjustments in salary and position responsibilities may result.

Archival
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for Student Development. A copy is provided to the director for his or her private records.

6 University Administration Evaluation of Staff

No formal assessment of the support staff is conducted by the Vice President for Development. Each program director evaluates his or her staff members using the division-wide performance review inventory/questionnaire (see item #9).
7  Director Evaluation of Program

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive narrative with supporting statistical documentation

Frequency of Review
Annually, at the end of the academic year in late May

Description
Specific to each program within the division, the review includes the following: status of the previous year’s goals; the year in review; program strengths and weaknesses; supporting statistical data (where appropriate) and goals for the upcoming year.

Results
The document is submitted to the Vice President for Student Development and reviewed during an end-of-year conference with each program director. Programmatic changes are made when deemed necessary.

Archival
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for Student Development and in the office of the specific program director.

8  Director Evaluation of Policies

Policies and procedures unique to each program are under constant review as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.

9  Director Evaluation of Director (Self-Assessment)

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire

Frequency of Review
Annually; presently during the spring semester

Description
The division-wide standard instrument is used consisting of three sections: a quantitative assessment using various descriptor statements, a review and development of performance objectives, and narrative commentaries relating to specific attributes of the director’s job responsibilities. A critical incident report form is available for documenting outstanding successes or failures encountered when performing job-related tasks.

Results
The completed inventory is submitted to the Vice President for Student Development for consideration during the director’s end-of-year performance review.

Archival
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for Student Development.

10  Director Evaluation of Staff

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire along with a personal conference

Frequency of Review
Annually; presently during the spring semester
**Description**

Each program director completes an annual performance review of each of his or her staff members. The division-wide standard instrument consists of three sections: a quantitative assessment using various descriptor statements, a review and development of performance objectives, and narrative commentaries relating to specific attributes of the staff member’s job responsibilities.

**Results**

During the staff member’s end-of-year performance conference with the program director, the results of the inventory are reviewed in harmony with the staff member’s self-assessment. Each party signs the final composite document affirming that all survey items were discussed.

**Archival**

The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the program director. A copy is provided to the staff member for his or her private records.

---

**11 Staff Evaluation of Policies**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the support staff to evaluate the policies and procedures of the division.

---

**12 Staff Evaluation of Director**

**Assessment Type/Administration**

A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire

**Frequency of Review**

Annually; presently during the spring semester

**Description**

Each staff member completes an annual performance review of his or her program director. The division-wide standard instrument is used consisting of three sections: a quantitative assessment using various descriptor statements, a review and development of performance objectives, and narrative commentaries relating to specific attributes of the director’s job responsibilities.

**Results**

The completed inventory is used as supporting documentation during the program director’s end-of-year conference and performance review with the Vice President for Student Development.

**Archival**

The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for Student Development.

---

**13 Staff Evaluation of Staff (Self-Assessment)**

**Assessment Type/Administration**

A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire

**Frequency of Review**

Annually; presently during the spring semester

**Description**

The division-wide standard instrument is used consisting of three sections: a quantitative assessment using various descriptor statements, a review and development of performance objectives, and narrative commentaries relating to specific attributes of the director’s job responsibilities.
Results
The completed inventory is submitted to the program director for consideration during the staff member’s end-of-year performance review.

Archival
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the appropriate program director.

14 Students Evaluation of Program

Instrument(s)
Educational Benchmarking Institute (EBI)
Your First College Year (YFCY)
College Student Survey (CSS)

Assessment Type/Administration
Paper and pencil (currently); web-based (future administrations)

Frequency of Review
EBI - every two years
YFCY and CSS - annually

Description
Each of the nationally-based survey instruments listed above includes a number of questions that ask for student input on issues relating to each program within the division. The EBI is directly related to the Association of College and University Housing Officers – International (ACUHO-I); the YFCY and CSS are broad-based surveys that deal with all aspects of student life.

Results
Each agency provides a final report to the appropriate university contact. Information is then disseminated internally to the appropriated program director to be used in an appropriate fashion.

Archival
Reports are maintained permanently in the office of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, the office of the Vice President for Student Development, and in other appropriate offices for period of time to be determined.

15 Students Evaluation of Director

No formal assessment procedures are currently in place for this area.
Assessment Plan Details
(Non-Academic Programs)

**Division of University Relations / Marketing**

*Alumni Relations*
*Church Relations*
*Human Resources*
*Marketing and Promotion (Athletics)*
*University & Media Relations*

1. **External Agencies Evaluation of Programs**
   
   None of the programs in this division are subject to review by an external agency.

2. **External Agencies Evaluation of Policies**
   
   None of the programs in this division are subject to review by an external agency.

3. **University Administration Evaluation of Program**

   **Assessment Type/Administration**
   Focus group format (directors’ staff meeting)

   **Frequency of Review**
   Biweekly

   **Description**
   A basic component of each meeting is the review of each program’s progress toward meeting established performance goals. Concerns related to specific program effectiveness is addressed by the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing in a one-on-one meeting with the director.

   **Results**
   Programmatic changes are made when deemed necessary.

   **Archival**
   Notes of each staff meetings are recorded and maintained by the Administrative Assistant to the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing.

4. **University Administration Evaluation of Policies**
   
   Discretionary policies and procedures unique to this division are under constant review as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.
5 University Administration Evaluation of Directors

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire along with a personal conference

Frequency of Review
Annually, at the end of the academic year in late May or early June

Description
The Vice President for University Relations and Marketing completes an annual performance review of each director in the division. The division-wide instrument employed consists of thirteen quantitatively-evaluated performance items, the listing of prior year accomplishments, the identification of current year goals, and a section for open-ended comments.

Results
During the director’s end-of-year performance conference with the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing, the results of the inventory are reviewed in harmony with the director’s self-assessment. Each party signs the final composite document affirming that all survey items were discussed. Adjustments in salary and position responsibilities may result.

Archival
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing. A copy is provided to the director for his or her private records.

6 University Administration Evaluation of Staff

No formal assessment of the support staff is conducted by the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing. It is left to the discretion of each program director to evaluate the performance of his or her staff members in an appropriate and comprehensive manner.

7 Director Evaluation of Program

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive narrative with supporting statistical documentation

Frequency of Review
Annually, at the end of the academic year in late May

Description
Specific to each program within the division, the review includes the following: status of the previous year’s goals; the year in review; program strengths and weaknesses; supporting statistical data (where appropriate) and goals for the upcoming year.

Results
The document is submitted to the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing for review during the end-of-year conference with each program director. Programmatic changes are made when deemed necessary.

Archival
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing and in the office of the specific program director.

8 Director Evaluation of Policies

Policies and procedures unique to each program are under constant review as to their feasibility, with modifications being made when necessary.
9 **Director Evaluation of Director (Self-Assessment)**

**Assessment Type/Administration**
A comprehensive inventory/questionnaire

**Frequency of Review**
Annually; during the spring semester

**Description**
The division-wide instrument is employed which consists of thirteen quantitatively-evaluated performance items, the listing of prior year accomplishments, the identification of current year goals, and a section for open-ended comments.

**Results**
The completed inventory is submitted to the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing for consideration during the director’s end-of-year performance review.

**Archival**
The evaluation summary is maintained for an indefinite period of time in the office of the Vice President for University Relations and Marketing.

10 **Director Evaluation of Staff**

Although no formal structure is in place as to how program directors are to assess their support staff, some utilize a modified version of the division-wide Annual Performance Worksheet to perform this evaluation.

11 **Staff Evaluation of Policies**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the support staff to evaluate the policies and procedures of the division.

12 **Staff Evaluation of Director**

Currently, there is no formal structure in place that allows the support staff to evaluate the performance of their supervisor.

13 **Staff Evaluation of Staff (Self-Assessment)**

No formal procedure exists for support staff to complete a self-assessment review.

14 **Students Evaluation of Program**

Not applicable for this division.

15 **Students Evaluation of Director**

Not applicable for this division.
Assessment Model (Executive-Level)

University Operations

Policies

External Agencies

University Community

Board of Trustees

President

Vice Presidents, Provosts

Assessment Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Target</th>
<th>External Agencies</th>
<th>University Community</th>
<th>Board of Trustees</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Vice Presidents, Provosts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Presidents, Provosts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ indicates assessment reciprocity
Assessment Plan Details
(Executive-Level)

Executive-Level

1  External Agencies Evaluation of University Operations

Agencies
National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documentation

Frequency of Review
Conducted every ten years; most recent--NCAA (2004-05), SACS (2006-07)

Description
NCAA – an examination of the University’s commitment to institutional control, specifically in regards to governance and rules compliance, as effected by the President and the Board of Trustees (Operating Principle 1.1).

SACS – includes nine items related directly to the chief executive officer’s and the governing board’s oversight of University operations (Section 3: Comprehensive Standards – Governance and Administration - 3.2; 3.3; 3.5; 3.6; 3.9; 3.11; 3.12; 3.13; and 3.14).

Results
Certification (NCAA) and compliance (SACS) is affirmed when the university receives its comprehensive response from each agency following the off-site review and the on-site visit.

Archival
Each report is maintained for at least ten years and is housed in the library as well as in various administrative offices (in both hard copy and electronic format).

2  External Agencies Evaluation of University Policies

Agencies
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

Assessment Type/Administration
A comprehensive self-assessment along with appropriate supporting documentation

Frequency of Review
Conducted every ten years; most recent (2006-07)

Description
SACS – includes five items related directly to the chief executive officer’s and the governing board’s oversight of University operations (Section 3: Comprehensive Standards – Governance and Administration - 3.4; 3.7; 3.8; 3.10; 3.15).

Results
Certification (NCAA) and compliance (SACS) is affirmed when the university receives its comprehensive response from each agency following the off-site review and the on-site visit.

Archival
The report is maintained for at least ten years and is housed in the library as well as in various administrative offices (in both hard copy and electronic format).
3 University Community Evaluation of University Operations

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Paper and paper survey distributed to full-time teaching faculty during its only previous employment; projected to be a web-based questionnaire for future administrations

**Frequency of Review**
Every three years (proposed)

**First-Utilized**
Spring 2001

**Revised**
2007, in preparation for its administration in March 2008

**Description**
Although the majority of questions on the survey deal with issues relating to the academic environment (department/school and classroom experiences), approximately 33% of the items solicit input concerning University operations in the areas of technology, the library, the campus shop, University police, administrative communication, admissions, compensation, athletics, and the strategic planning process.

**Results**
Survey summaries will be made available to the entire university community in various formats as information-only documents.

**Archival**
Results will be maintained permanently in the office of the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.

4 University Community Evaluation of Policies

There is currently no formal process in place for various constituencies within the University community (students, faculty or staff) to evaluate existing university policies.

5 University Community Evaluation of the President

There is currently no formal process in place for various constituencies within the University community (students, faculty or staff) to evaluate the performance of the President.

6 University Community Evaluation of Vice Presidents, Provosts

**Responsible Individual / Group**
Program supervisors, directors, deans, chairs or, in the case of the Associate Provosts, faculty within the applicable division or unit

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Paper and pencil survey

**Frequency of Review**
Annually
Description
Currently, two divisions employ this assessment methodology:

**Student Affairs** – a three-part instrument used to evaluate the performance of the Vice President and Dean of Student Development divided as follows: quantitative assessment using descriptor statements, review and development of performance objectives, and narrative commentaries

**Academic Programs** – similar 22-item surveys, with an opportunity for open-ended comments, is used to evaluate the performance of both the Provost and the Associate Provosts

Results

**Student Affairs** – completed surveys are forwarded to, and reviewed by, the Director of Human Resources. Significant issues which arise from the evaluation are addressed in an appropriate manner with the Vice President and Dean of Student Development

**Academic Programs** – completed surveys assessing the Associate Provosts are submitted to the office of the Provost; the Provost’s survey is forwarded to the office of the President

Archival

All submitted surveys and associated summary results are maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the administrative officials responsible for the assessment.

7 **Board of Trustees Evaluation of University Operations**

**Responsible Individual / Group**
Standing committees of the Board of Trustees

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Status reports from university officials during committee meetings

**Frequency of Review**
Twice annually, at the regular October and February board meetings

**Description**
Trustees comprising the following committees receive reports from appropriate administrative officials as to the status of University operations:

- **Financial Affairs**
- **Educational Affairs**
- **Student Affairs**
- **Development**
- **School of Divinity**
- **Intercollegiate Athletic**
- **Enrollment Management**

**Results**
Following committee action, information is commended to the full board for approval.

**Archival**
Committee and general board minutes are maintained permanently in the office of the President and the university administrator responsible to the specific committee.

8 **Board of Trustees Evaluation of University Policies**

There is currently no formal process in place to review existing university policies. New proposals, or modifications of those in existence, are brought to the board for approval, depending on their level of significance as determined by the President.
Board of Trustees Evaluation of the President

**Responsible Individual / Group**
The Board chair, with the endorsement of the full board

**Assessment Type/Administration**
A performance narrative written by the Board chair

**Frequency of Review**
Annually, in June

**Description**
The outcomes of the previous year’s goals established by the President are reviewed by the various officers of the Board and form the basis for the performance review.

**Results**
The review is used to determine the president’s compensation level for the upcoming year.

**Archival**
The narrative is kept on file in the office of the President for an indefinite period of time.

President Evaluation of University Operations

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Focus group format conducted as part of a planning retreat
Individual conferences with each Vice President following the retreat

**Frequency of Review**
Annually, in June; on occasion a mid-year planning retreat in December

**Description**
General assessment sessions of University operations and initiatives are conducted during the opening sessions of the retreat. At a later point, each Vice President summarizes the outcomes of the previous year’s goals for his or her division and presents a planning strategy for the upcoming year.

**Results**
The results of this review are summarized in the President’s various reporting opportunities to the Board of Trustees and are communicated to various university and community constituencies when appropriate. In addition, ongoing and future budgetary decisions are impacted by this assessment information.

**Archival**
All appropriate documentation is kept on file indefinitely in the office of the President.

President Evaluation of University Policies

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Senior staff meetings

**Frequency of Review**
Weekly

**Description**
A regular component of senior staff meetings is the examination of the effectiveness of current policies and the formulation and refinement of new procedures.
Results
Modifications are made as needed. When deemed of a significant nature, changes are approved by the Board of Trustees before being implemented.

Archival
All activity is appropriately recorded in the minutes of staff meetings and is kept on file in the office of the President.

12 President Evaluation of Vice Presidents, Provosts

Responsible Individual / Group
The President

Assessment Type/Administration
A performance narrative in conjunction with an individual conference

Frequency of Review
Annually, in June

Description
The outcomes of the previous year’s goals established by each Vice President for his or her division form the basis for the performance review. Additionally, goals for the upcoming year are established at this time.

Results
The review is used to define future performance expectations for each Vice President.

Archival
A copy of the performance review is kept on file in the office of the President; a copy is also provided to the Vice President.

13 Vice Presidents, Provosts Evaluation of University Operations

Assessment Type/Administration
Focus group format conducted as part of a planning retreat

Frequency of Review
Annually, in June; on occasion a mid-year planning retreat in December

Description
General assessment sessions relating to the effectiveness of University operations and initiatives are conducted during the opening sessions of the retreat.

Results
When appropriate, changes or modifications are made to existing operating procedures.

Archival
Documentation of the proceedings is maintained indefinitely in office of the President.

14 Vice Presidents, Provosts Evaluation of University Policies

Assessment Type/Administration
Focus group format (Senior Staff meetings)

Frequency of Review
Weekly
**Description**
Suggestions related to the modification of existing policies and/or the implementation of new policies are brought to the membership for consideration.

**Results**
Changes in policies and procedures are made when deemed feasible.

**Archival**
Minutes of all senior staff meetings are recorded by the Administrative Assistant to the President and maintained for an appropriate period of time in the office of the President.

### 15 Vice Presidents, Provosts Evaluation of the President

**Assessment Type/Administration**
Pencil and paper questionnaire

**Frequency of Review**
At the end of the President’s first year of service; every three years thereafter

**Description**
Instrument to be constructed by the Vice President for Planning and Institutional Effectiveness in consultation with the Provosts, divisional Vice Presidents, the President, and the chair of the Board of Trustees

**Results**
The chair of the Board of Trustees will determine the appropriate use of the information in the overall assessment of the performance of the President.

**Archival**
To be determined by the Board chair