

**Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B
Response to Recommendations 4 and 5**

Marketing

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	Students will be able to effectively manage the marketing mix across the stages of the Product Life Cycle (PLC).	Pre-test of knowledge in MKTG 3131 (Principles) and a post-test in MKTG 4137 (Marketing Management – the capstone course)	<p>70% for students leaving the Principles of Marketing class; 90% for the Marketing Management class.</p> <p>Pre-test grade average on a 25 item multiple choice test was 67.2%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Knowledge of PLC: 69.2% o Marketing mix changes: 70.5% o Application questions: 61.2% <p>Pre-test: 49.1% made less than 70% on the test.</p> <p>Pre-test: Students were asked to identify the stages of the PLC and its axes. 25% of students did both correctly, 43% identified the stages but not the axes, and 32% could do neither.</p> <p>Post-test: 70% scored 70% or greater on a written exam question about the PLC.</p>	<p>In these initial assessments, the department found that students were not meeting the desired outcomes.</p> <p>The department will ensure that MKTG 3131 instructors specifically cover the PLC in terms of content and application. This will take place in a MKTG 3131 orientation/coordination exercise before the beginning of Fall 2006. Greater emphasis will be placed on explanations of the axes as well as the stages in the model.</p> <p>The department will continue to refine the set of multiple choice, short answer, and essay questions for assessment of this outcome in both the pre- and post-test scenarios.</p> <p>Encourage other MKTG instructors in all other marketing classes to incorporate discussion of key PLC concepts in their courses as appropriate.</p> <p>The department will identify additional classes where direct assessment of concept takes place.</p> <p>The department will modify its exit survey to incorporate questions related to the PLC.</p> <p>Department faculty will incorporate application of the PLC into the major project in MKTG 4137 beginning Fall 2006.</p>

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	Students will be able to effectively manage the Marketing Mix in relation to the stages of the consumer decision-making process (CDMP).	<p>Pre-test of knowledge in Principles of Marketing MKTG 3131.</p> <p>Application-oriented pre-test under development.</p> <p>Application-oriented post-test under development.</p>	<p>70% for students leaving the principles of marketing class; 90% for the Marketing Management class.</p> <p>Pre-test: 47% of students in MKTG 3131 were able to correctly identify at least 4 of the stages of the CDMP.</p>	<p>In this initial assessment, the department found that students were not meeting the desired outcome at the pre-test level. The students had been exposed to the material, but had not mastered the material at the level desired by the faculty.</p> <p>The department ensure that MKTG 3131 instructors specifically cover the CDMP in terms of content and application. This will take place in a MKTG 3131 orientation/coordination exercise before the beginning of Fall 2006. The department will agree on a standard list of stages used to illustrate the CDMP.</p> <p>The department will continue to refine the set of multiple choice, short answer, and essay questions for assessment of this outcome in both the pre- and post-test scenarios.</p> <p>Encourage other MKTG instructors in all other marketing classes to incorporate discussion of key CDMP concepts in their courses as appropriate.</p> <p>The department will identify additional classes where direct assessment of concept takes place.</p> <p>The department will modify its exit survey to incorporate questions related to the CDMP.</p> <p>Department faculty will incorporate application of the CDMP into the major project in MKTG 4137 beginning Fall 2006.</p>
Student centeredness	Provide regular advising opportunities for program and career guidance.	<p>Number of advisees assigned to each faculty member.</p> <p>Senior surveys about satisfaction with advising.</p> <p>Senior surveys on satisfaction with job placement help.</p>	<p>Faculty have, on average, about 35 advisees.</p> <p>Less than 10% of seniors are not satisfied with the advising they received.</p> <p>About 25% of seniors are satisfied with job placement services; 45% are neutral, and 30% are dissatisfied.</p>	<p>Encourage faculty to remain committed to advising duties.</p> <p>Have new faculty attend an advising orientation session.</p> <p>Encourage faculty to have Career Services personnel as guest speakers in classes. Have faculty encourage student attendance at Career Fairs. Expand the scope and number of recruiters at the LIT/ Retail Career Fair.</p>
Academic distinction	New Outcomes: Marketing students will be able to use data effectively in the creation of an appropriate marketing mix and in the implementation of a marketing research study.	To be developed by faculty teaching Marketing Research MKTG 4131 and Marketing Management MKTG 4137, incorporating projects from real-world scenarios.		

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	Students will demonstrate an appreciation for Marketing’s responsibility to consumers, including (a) the right of consumers to all relevant information before a transaction; (b) doing no harm to consumers; all parties should benefit from a marketing exchange; (c) adhering to all applicable laws and regulations; (d) protection of consumers’ freedom to choose; (e) responding promptly and appropriately to consumer concerns and grievances; (f) the societal marketing concept; organizations should satisfy the needs of consumers in a way that provides for society’s well-being; and (g) appreciation of cross-cultural/international influences on the marketing mix.	To be developed and implemented by Marketing faculty in academic year 2006-07.		
Academic distinction	Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of how the operational systems of both manufacturing and service firms can be used to provide a competitive advantage in an expanded marketplace.	Course embedded projects in MGNT 3430 (Operations Management) and MGNT 3437 (Service Operations Management)		

Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B
Response to Recommendations 4 and 5

Master of Education in Higher Education

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-centeredness	Candidates who complete the program are competent and knowledgeable educational leaders who can define and demonstrate the theoretical and practical foundational basis of informed, ethical leadership behavior in diverse and complex post-secondary institutions.	Multicultural College Environments Activity Technology Proficiency Project Professional Practice Evaluation Professional Development Plan	Multicultural College Environments Activity (2004-05): 88% of students enrolled in COUN 9231 met or exceeded expectations (n=11) Technology Proficiency Project (2004-05): 90% of students enrolled in EDLD 7432 met or exceeded expectations (n=7)	Data were used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the curriculum. For instance, evidence collected from a variety of sources indicated that significant changes were needed to make the program more viable for candidates. These changes have been approved and will be implemented during the 2006-07 academic year.
Academic distinction Student-centeredness Technological advancement Transcultural opportunities	Candidates who complete the program are competent and knowledgeable educational leaders who facilitate positive and effective instructional programs incorporating the rights and the varied needs of all students in diverse and complex post-secondary institutions.	Historical Monograph Portfolio	Professional Practice Evaluation (2004-05): 100% of students enrolled in EDLD 7430 met or exceeded expectations (n=6) Professional Development Plan (2004-05): 100% of students enrolled in EDLD 7431 met or exceeded expectations (n=5)	Specifically: Less than 25% of the candidates were able to prepare a portfolio according to the learning outcomes specified. Less than 25% of the candidates were able to prepare an appropriate professional development plan. About 75% of the candidates were able to present a proficient historical monograph; likewise, 75% were able to meet proficiency in the multicultural college environment assessment.
Academic distinction Student-centeredness Transcultural opportunities	Candidates who complete the program are competent and knowledgeable educational leaders who can develop and implement policies that promote research, scholarship, professional development, and technology utilization as appropriate in diverse and complex post-secondary institutions.		Historical Monograph (2004-05): 100% of students enrolled in EDLD 7432 met or exceeded expectations (n=7) Portfolio (2004-05): 100% of candidates met expectations (n=3)	In reviewing the data and results, faculty concluded that the assessments were not properly aligned within courses to most effectively evaluate candidate performance. A new Higher Education Administration Program Coordinator was appointed to mediate the needed program changes. Program changes include a formal practicum experience and increased field-based components in courses. Advisors suggest appropriate course sequencing to students. The program is also more content driven to adequately focus on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed.

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student-centeredness</p> <p>Transcultural opportunities</p> <p>Public-private partnerships</p>	<p>Candidates who complete the program are competent and knowledgeable educational leaders who have the skills and ability to effectively communicate in both written and verbal formats and collaborate with the institution’s constituents and stakeholders to respond to community needs and interests as appropriate in diverse and complex post-secondary institutions.</p>	<p>Multicultural College Environments Activity</p> <p>Technology Proficiency Project</p> <p>Professional Practice Evaluation</p> <p>Professional Development Plan</p> <p>Historical Monograph</p> <p>Portfolio</p>	<p>Multicultural College Environments Activity (2004-05): 88% of students enrolled in COUN 9231 met or exceeded expectations (n=11)</p> <p>Technology Proficiency Project (2004-05): 90% of students enrolled in EDLD 7432 met or exceeded expectations (n=7)</p>	<p>Data were used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the curriculum. For instance, evidence collected from a variety of sources indicated that significant changes were needed to make the program more viable for candidates. These changes have been approved and will be implemented during the 2006-07 academic year.</p> <p>Specifically: Less than 25% of the candidates were able to prepare a portfolio according to the learning outcomes specified. Less than 25% of the candidates were able to prepare an appropriate professional development plan. About 75% of the candidates were able to present a proficient historical monograph; likewise, 75% were able to meet proficiency in the multicultural college environment assessment.</p>
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student-centeredness</p> <p>Transcultural opportunities</p> <p>Public-private partnerships</p>	<p>Candidates who complete the program are competent and knowledgeable educational leaders who have the ability to manage the organization, resources, and operations for the efficiency and effectiveness of diverse and complex post-secondary institutions.</p>		<p>Professional Practice Evaluation (2004-05): 100% of students enrolled in EDLD 7430 met or exceeded expectations (n=6)</p> <p>Professional Development Plan (2004-05): 100% of students enrolled in EDLD 7431 met or exceeded expectations (n=5)</p> <p>Historical Monograph (2004-05): 100% of students enrolled in EDLD 7432 met or exceeded expectations (n=7)</p> <p>Portfolio (2004-05): 100% of candidates met expectations (n=3)</p>	<p>In reviewing the data and results, faculty concluded that the assessments were not properly aligned within courses to most effectively evaluate candidate performance. A new Higher Education Administration Program Coordinator was appointed to mediate the needed program changes. Program changes include a formal practicum experience and increased field-based components in courses. Advisors suggest appropriate course sequencing to students. The program is also more content driven to adequately focus on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed.</p>

**Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B
Response to Recommendations 4 and 5**

Information Systems

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	An ability to analyze a problem and identify and define the business and system requirements appropriate to its solution.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Course projects 2) Exam questions 3) National IS Exit Exam 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) In Spring 2006, 73% of graduating seniors who took the National IS Exit Exam passed and qualified for the Information Systems Analyst (ISA) Certification. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) The National IS Exit Exam enables us to benchmark the performance of our students against that of students from IS programs across the nation. We first offered the Exit Exam in Spring 2004. The average score for our students was 44.1 (as compared to 47.6 nationwide). In Spring 2006, our average increased to 53.3. Although the nationwide average for this exam period is not yet available, based on previous results, we expect to be above the national average. We plan to utilize the results of this exam to identify areas of strength and weakness in our program by working through the appropriate departmental and college-level committees.
Academic distinction	An ability to design, implement or evaluate a computer-based information system, process, component, or program to meet specified goals.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Course projects 2) Exam questions 3) National IS Exit Exam 4) Course exit surveys 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) In Spring 2006, 73% of graduating seniors who took the National IS Exit Exam passed and qualified for the Information Systems Analyst (ISA) Certification. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) The National IS Exit Exam enables us to benchmark the performance of our students against that of students from IS programs across the nation. We first offered the Exit Exam in Spring 2004. The average score for our students was 44.1 (as compared to 47.6 nationwide). In Spring 2006, our average increased to 53.3. Although the nationwide average for this exam period is not yet available, based on previous results, we expect to be above the national average. We plan to utilize the results of this exam to identify areas of strength and weakness in our program by working through the appropriate departmental and college-level committees.

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	An ability to contribute positively to the accomplishment of a team goal.	1) Team projects 2) Peer evaluations 3) Instructor evaluations 4) Pre-tests/post-tests	Fall 2006: Collect and analyze data for outcomes; identify and discuss any problems that become apparent; define and develop program/curriculum changes to address problems.	Spring 2007: Implement changes identified in Fall 2006; collect and analyze data to verify that changes are effective.
Academic distinction	An ability to use current techniques, skills, and tools appropriate to the discipline.	1) Course projects 2) Exam questions 3) Course exit surveys	Fall 2006: Collect and analyze data for outcomes; identify and discuss any problems that become apparent; define and develop program/curriculum changes to address problems.	Spring 2007: Implement changes identified in Fall 2006; collect and analyze data to verify that changes are effective.
Academic distinction	New Outcomes Identified: An ability to apply knowledge of computing and mathematics appropriate to the discipline.	Assessment methods to be developed by faculty during 2006-07.		
Academic distinction	An understanding of professional, ethical, and social responsibilities.	Assessment methods to be developed by faculty during 2006-07.		
Academic distinction	An ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences.	Assessment methods to be developed by faculty during 2006-07.		
Academic distinction Technological advancement Transcultural opportunities	An ability to analyze the impact of computing on individuals, organizations, and society, including ethical, legal, security, and global policy issues.	Assessment methods to be developed by faculty during 2006-07.		
Academic distinction Technological advancement	Recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in, continuing professional development.	Assessment methods to be developed by faculty during 2006-07.		
Academic distinction	An understanding of processes that support the delivery and management of information systems within a specific application environment.	Assessment methods to be developed by faculty during 2006-07.		
Academic distinction	An ability to identify and analyze organizational needs and take them into account in the selection, creation, evaluation, and administration of computer-based information systems.	Assessment methods to be developed by faculty during 2006-07.		
Academic distinction	An ability to assist in the creation of an effective project plan.	Assessment methods to be developed by faculty during 2006-07.		

**Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B
Response to Recommendations 4 and 5**

Nursing—Nursing Program

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student centeredness</p> <p>Technological advancement</p> <p>Transcultural opportunities</p>	<p>When compared with peers on a national level, students who graduate from the Bachelor of Science in Nursing program will: (a) apply critical thinking in the provision and evaluation of therapeutic nursing interventions with persons, families, groups, and communities; (b) incorporate research findings in nursing practice based on critical analysis of research; (c) integrate ethical principles in the nursing care of persons, families, groups, and communities; and (d) employ therapeutic communication in the provision of nursing care.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: Standardized, nationally normed tests (Educational Resources, Inc., Total Testing Program) will be administered in each conceptual knowledge area across the curriculum.</p> <p>A comprehensive exit examination (Educational Resources, Inc. – RN Assesstest) will be administered prior to graduation.</p> <p>Indirect Methods: The number (and areas of focus) of students admitted to and graduate from graduate school will be analyzed every 5 years. (Last completed in 2005.)</p> <p>Surveys of student and graduate achievements will be conducted every 5 years. (Last completed in 2005.)</p>	<p>ERI standardized test scores averaged at or above the national norm on 13 of 17 exams.</p> <p>94% graduating BSN students passed the RN-Assestest.</p> <p>12% of alumni (from the last 5 years) are currently enrolled in or have completed graduate school (75% in Nurse Practitioner programs; 25% in Nurse Anesthesia programs).</p> <p>70% of BSN graduates are working in rural areas; 60% belong to professional organizations; 26% are certified in specialty areas; numerous examples of exemplary service/awards were cited.</p>	<p>Curriculum reviews for the BSN program were conducted to assure appropriate content areas were being addressed. Comparisons to the <i>Essential of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice</i> (AACN, 2005) and the test plan for the NCLEX-RN licensure examination were completed. Modifications to the curriculum plan were initiated to address areas demonstrating lower student test scores. Revisions for the first semester course of study were identified and will be addressed in the next academic year. The ERI testing data for the year was evaluated and norm and trend data for our students was analyzed and used to establish acceptable risk pass scores on ERI exams. All exams were converted to internet/computer-based delivery. Increased emphasis was placed on transcultural competence in learning experiences. More aggressive faculty/student mentoring practices were put into place to encourage graduate school enrollment for alumni.</p>

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student centeredness</p> <p>Technological advancement</p>	<p>Bachelor of Science in Nursing graduates will demonstrate mastery of nursing science knowledge by achieving or exceeding national averages on the NCLEX-RN licensure examination.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: National Council of State Boards of Nursing Examination for Registered Nurses pass rate for first time takers will be reviewed on an annual basis.</p> <p>National Council of State Boards of Nursing NCLEX-RN Program Reports will be reviewed to determine graduate performance on each element of the NCLEX-RN test plan.</p>	<p>2004: National NCLEX-RN pass rate for first time takers = 84%.</p> <p>December Grads = 95% May Grads = 94%</p> <p>2005 National NCLEX-RN pass rate for first time takers = 85%</p> <p>December Grads = 91% May Grads = 97%</p> <p>2005 graduates scored above the national median on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and Infection Control • Psychological Integrity • Basic Care and Comfort • Pharmacological & Parental Therapies • Reduction of Risk Potential • Physiological Adaptation <p>2005 graduates were below the national median on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management Care (-4 pts.) • Health Promotion & Maintenance (-4 pts.) 	<p>A curriculum review for the BSN program was conducted to assure appropriate content areas were being addressed. Comparisons to the test plan for the NCLEX-RN licensure examination were completed. Modifications to the curriculum plan were initiated to address areas demonstrating lower student test scores. Faculty instituted a remediation plan for licensure preparation (including passing of a required standardized nationally normed exit exam) in order to improve NCLEX pass rates. All exams were converted to computer-based administration to approximate NCLEX-RN licensure examination procedures. Faculty-to-student ratios in clinical practica were analyzed to assure more comprehensive feedback and evaluation for students. Pass rates have improved significantly since the implementation of this program.</p>

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student centeredness</p>	<p>Bachelor of Science in Nursing graduates will indicate satisfaction with their academic program of study and readiness to assume their professional Registered Nurse role.</p>	<p>Indirect Methods: Student course evaluations will be completed in each course, each semester. An aggregate annual and longitudinal analysis of findings will be conducted.</p> <p>Educational Benchmark, Inc., surveys of graduating students will be conducted each semester. An aggregate annual and longitudinal analysis of findings will be conducted.</p> <p>Educational Benchmark, Inc., surveys of alumni will be conducted every 5 years. A longitudinal analysis of findings will be conducted.</p>	<p>2005 Student ratings annual aggregate average = 4.0.</p> <p>91% above 3.5 62% above 4.0</p> <p>2005 Teaching ratings annual aggregate average = 4.23.</p> <p>69% at or above 4.0</p> <p>2005 Graduating Student Educational Benchmark, Inc., Surveys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratings ranged from 4.3 to 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. • 100% of students indicated satisfaction levels at above average. <p>Educational Benchmark, Inc., alumni survey not available until Fall 2006.</p>	<p>Faculty development sessions were conducted to improve clinical teaching strategies used by faculty. Faculty conducted 2 workshops dedicated to improving faculty-student interactions in the classroom and clinical environments. The mean ratings for faculty teaching effectiveness rose from 4.02 to 4.23 over the prior year.</p>

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student centeredness</p> <p>Public-private partnerships</p>	<p>Bachelor of Science in Nursing graduates will compare favorably with graduates from other institutions in their professional performance.</p>	<p>Employer satisfaction surveys mailed to all employers of Georgia Southern School of Nursing graduates in Georgia and in states where alumni have relocated.</p> <p>Alumni will be surveyed using the Educational Benchmark, Inc., <i>Alumni Survey</i> to determine their level of satisfaction with their educational experience and the degree to which they believed they were prepared to enter practice.</p> <p>A focus group interview will be conducted with employers and with student preceptors to determine levels of satisfaction with student/graduate preparation for practice.</p>	<p>Employer satisfaction surveys indicated that 95% of survey participants ranked students at 4.0 on a 5.0 scale.</p> <p>Alumni survey not available until Fall 2006.</p> <p>Focus group discussions with 30 members of School of Nursing Advisory Council indicated overwhelming satisfaction with student performance in clinical settings. 100% of attendees indicated a desire to employ additional Georgia Southern nursing graduates.</p> <p>Strengths identified were: Excellent work ethic Provision of holistic care Psychomotor skills Rural nursing focus Well-rounded classes Community focus Able to adapt to hospitals Professional practice Critical thinking Organization Time management Flexibility</p> <p>Area for improvement was supervision and delegation.</p>	<p>Data revealed a high level of employer and preceptor satisfaction with Georgia Southern School of Nursing graduates. Faculty revised curriculum to include additional clinical experiences with delegation and supervision of health team workers.</p>

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student centeredness</p>	<p>The School of Nursing will recruit, retain, and graduate appropriate numbers of qualified students in the Bachelor of Science in Nursing major.</p>	<p>Direct Methods: Yearly admission rates will be monitored.</p> <p>Student SATs and entering GPAs will be monitored.</p> <p>Yearly graduation rates will be monitored.</p>	<p>2004-05: Applications rose to 200 qualified candidates per admitting class (to fill a maximum of 55 available seats).</p> <p>SCHs rose from 4,834 to 5,834 (17% increase over prior year).</p> <p>Admission cumulative GPAs rose to a mean of 3.4.</p> <p>SAT scores were not available on all students, but majority were 1000 or above.</p> <p>Graduation rates were 86.9%.</p> <p>2005-06: Applications rose to 210 qualified candidates per admitting class (to fill a maximum of 55 available seats).</p> <p>SCHs for Fall 2005 were 2,997.</p> <p>Admission cumulative GPAs rose to a mean of 3.48.</p> <p>SAT scores were not available on all students; of those analyzed, the mean SAT is nearing 1050.</p>	<p>Data revealed a growing and improved qualified candidate pool matriculating into the major. Retention and graduation rates are satisfactory following interventions to improve advising and remediation resources. Faculty continue to monitor enrollment and retention records and participate actively in recruitment activities. Following an intense analysis of student candidate pools, admission requirements were revised. Students applying to the major now need a cumulative GPA of 3.0 to be considered for admission. They must also achieve scores above the national average on the Nurse Entrance Test. This change was made to reduce the non-accepted applicant pool.</p>

**Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B
Response to Recommendations 4 and 5**

Music

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	Each major will achieve appropriate skill levels in music theory and music sight-singing/ear training.	Exit exam	2004 – 2 failures 2005 – 0 failures 2006 – 1 failure 3 yr average = 1	Students are meeting the outcome established by the department. Theory course sequence content changes are being discussed to increase the complexity of content covered within the sequence.
Academic distinction	Each major will achieve appropriate skill levels in functional (group) piano.	Piano proficiency exam	2004 – 2 failures 2005 – 2 failures 2006 – 1 failure 3 yr average = 1.67	Students are currently meeting the outcome established by the department. The professor is currently developing a new textbook for this course. The piano lab was replaced in 2006 and the new technology will enable revisions of course material and enhancements to the course sequence.
Academic distinction	Each major will achieve appropriate skill levels in the primary applied area.	Jury rubric	Newly implemented	Preliminary results show much more feedback being provided to students using the new rubric.
Academic distinction	Each music education major will demonstrate the appropriate professional dispositions.	Key Assessment #6	Newly implemented in 2006. First year results indicate all students met this outcome	There were some discrepancies in the implementation of the assessment in the field. A document will be prepared to explain the use of this key assessment and when it should be administered.
Academic distinction	Each music education major will demonstrate appropriate lesson/rehearsal planning skills.	Key Assessment #3	Newly implemented in 2006. First year results indicate all students met this outcome.	There were some discrepancies in the implementation of the assessment in the field. A document will be prepared to explain the use of this key assessment and when it should be administered. Instrumental majors tended to receive lower scores than vocal majors. The source of this anomaly is being investigated.
Academic distinction	The department will produce and distribute a calendar of events each semester.	Timeline	Outcome partially met	Calendars were late Fall 2005 but on-time for Spring 2006. A form for calendar event scheduling needs to be developed. Fall 2006 process is starting earlier. Faculty are now asked for a two sentence description of their event.
Academic distinction	The department will improve the quality and methods of communication with event patrons.		Begin August 2006	N/A

Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B
Response to Recommendations 4 and 5

Mathematical Sciences

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student centeredness</p>	<p>Undergraduate students will attain the skills and knowledge required to pursue at least one of the following: a graduate degree; a career in a non-academic setting such as business, science or engineering; or a career as a secondary mathematics school teacher.</p>	<p>Alumni Survey (given every 5 years)</p> <p>Benchmark: An average response on Form B of at least 3.</p>	<p>Alumni indicated they were: well prepared in core mathematics courses and had basic knowledge in mathematics, scientific investigation/evaluation skills, critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Most responses were 4 or 5 with 5 being the highest score.</p> <p>Lower ratings were given for teaching mathematical communication (writing and presentation skills).</p> <p>Indicated that more emphasis on applications is desired.</p>	<p>Undergraduate Seminar (MATH 4910) was developed and will be taught Spring 2007 to assist in the development of critical thinking and communications skills.</p> <p>Faculty/students are encouraged to participate in undergraduate research projects, most of which tend to focus on applications of mathematics.</p>
<p>Academic distinction</p> <p>Student centeredness</p>	<p>Undergraduate students will demonstrate knowledge of the following areas of mathematics: Calculus, Linear Algebra, Differential Equations, Algebra, Analysis, and Probability.</p>	<p>Grade distributions</p> <p>Benchmark: Success Rates should be 60% or better in 2000 level or lower; 70% or better in 3000 level or above.</p>	<p>Fall 2004/2005 Success Rates (% Grades of C or better)</p> <p>MATH 1441: 46.8/46.2 MATH 2243: 62/58 MATH 2331: 71/73 MATH 2332: 32/24 MATH 3230: 88/60 MATH 3337: 46/77 MATH 5331: 64/33</p> <p>Spring 2005/2006 Success Rates (% Grades of C or better)</p> <p>MATH 2242: 53.7/63 MATH 2332: 61/57 MATH 3333: 96/85</p>	<p>Review of Minimal Learning Outcomes in Mathematics Courses (conducted Spring 2006 and continuing; will be placed on departmental website).</p> <p>Ways to improve success in MATH 2332 and 5331 to be addressed in 2006-07.</p>

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student centeredness	MS students will demonstrate a knowledge beyond the undergraduate level of the following areas of mathematics: Real Analysis, Linear Algebra, Numerical Analysis, and Statistical Methods.	Grade distributions Benchmark: Success Rates should be 90%.	Average success rates for Fall 2004 to Spring 2006 MATH 5332G: 100% MATH 5335G: 100% MATH 7231G: 89%* STAT 5531G: 100% *One student dropped the course.	Continued course revisions for improvement. Continued development of course components to distinguish G sections from undergraduate portion of courses.
Academic distinction Student centeredness	Improved student success in Core Math Courses.	Grade Distributions Benchmark: Success Rate should be 60% or greater. (Drop, Fail, Withdrawal – DFW - % should be less than 40%.)	Fall 2004/Spring 2005/Fall 2005/Spring 2006 (DFW%) % with grades of D, F, or W. 1101: 42/22/28/28 1111: 50/52/47/47 1113: 57/48/64/49 1232: 41/34/46/37	Establish prerequisite check in Banner before the beginning of class to remove unprepared students from courses. Currently, as much as 20% of courses are made of students not meeting prerequisites (working with Registrar’s Office, Spring 2006). Optional Mathematics Placement Test converted from WebCT to Vista; advertised by Admissions for students to take before attending SOAR. Increased number of MATH 1101 sections; work with advisors on campus to place students in MATH 1101 instead of 1111 where applicable (begin Fall 2006). Review of Minimal Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) in Core Math Classes; Revision of Course Syllabi based on SLO. Development of course manuals by course coordinators and faculty.
Academic distinction Student centeredness	Revise the Master of Science (M.S.) in Mathematics program of study.	Discussions with College of Graduate Studies Review of course enrollments of M.S. Core Courses Review number of M.S. graduates	College of Graduate Studies no longer accepted the research projects written by M.S. in Mathematics students. Graduate course enrollments needed to be strengthened.	Developed new courses – MATH 7895 (Research), MATH 7999 (Thesis); deleted MATH 7899 (Research Project in Applied Mathematics). Revised the program to require 3 hours of Research and 3 hours of Thesis. Revised the Core Curriculum as of Summer 2006: MATH 7231 MATH 5332 (new) MATH 5335 (new) STAT 5531 (This is a more standard core for students seeking degrees in mathematics or statistics.) All revisions approved at all levels of university review.

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Public-private partnerships	Continued and improved outreach to the community.	Review number of students majoring in mathematics. Consultation with P-12 educators in the community.	At Georgia Southern, number of math majors lower in recent years. Fewer than 40 in 2005-06.	Establishment of a Public Lecture Series. Lectures held in November 2005 and April 2006. High attendance by local high school and Georgia Southern students. Continued success of Georgia Southern University Invitational Mathematics Tournament. Five faculty involved on successful Partnership for Reform in Science and Mathematics (PRISM) grant projects with P-12 regional community.
Academic distinction	Improved scholarship in the department.	Comparison to other University System of Georgia institutions. Review of journal articles accepted by math/statistics faculty Leadership in professional conferences	In 2004, 26 tenured or tenure track faculty, published 36 peer-reviewed papers, 9 proceedings, and 6 books. Based on comparison of annual reports, the department ranks behind only Georgia Tech and University of Georgia in research productivity in the University System. Georgia State is approximately our equal.	The department will host the 2006 Summer Conference on Topology and Its Applications and the 2007 Southeastern Section Meeting of the Mathematical Association of America (MAA). The department will strengthen weekly colloquium series in which faculty or visiting scholars speak. The department will continue the Distinguished Lecture Series. There have been speakers in May 2005 and May 2006. Increase the amount of undergraduate research in the department.
Academic distinction Student centeredness	Provide learning opportunities for students beyond the classroom.	Student Participation Senior Surveys	Students continue to participate in activities outside of class when provided. Seniors indicate that they would like opportunities to work with faculty outside of class.	Student MAA Chapter meetings well supported by faculty. Topical presentations given or career choices/graduate school preparation; mathematical topics also presented. Math Jeopardy Coach appointed. Team made regional finals in 2005 and 2006. Faculty will continue to encourage students to take part in Mathematical Competition in Modeling and the Putnam Exam. Faculty will continue to give review sessions for students for Putnam Exam. Faculty will continue to work with students on undergraduate research projects. Student Study Room established in department in Spring 2006.

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	Undergraduate students will demonstrate the ability to approach a problem, reason mathematically, and read and write proofs.	Student portfolios	Details of portfolio responsibilities under development in Fall 2006. Spring 2007, portfolios will be initiated for freshmen math majors and select upper classroom.	
Academic distinction	Undergraduate students will communicate mathematical ideas with clarity and coherence through writing and speaking.	Judged oral and written projects in Undergraduate Seminar Course (MATH 4910).	75% of students will have an average score of at least 2 in each of the three areas on standard grading rubric MATH 4910 will be taught for the first time in Spring 2007. Grading rubrics under review Fall 2006.	
Academic distinction	Undergraduate students will use mathematics to formulate and solve certain real-world problems.	Judged projects in Mathematical Models (MATH 5539).	Grading rubrics under development for implementation in Spring 2007.	
Academic distinction	M.S. students will demonstrate the ability to approach a problem, reason mathematically, and read and write proofs.	Student portfolios	Details of portfolio responsibilities under development in Fall 2006. Spring 2007, portfolios will be initiated for M.S. students.	
Academic distinction	M.S. students will communicate mathematical ideas with clarity and coherence through writing and speaking.	Judged oral and written projects in select graduate courses.	75% of students will have an average score of at least 2 in each of the three areas on a standard grading rubric. Courses will be identified for implementation in Spring 2007. Grading rubrics under development/review Fall 2006.	
Academic distinction	M.S. students will use mathematics to complete a research project and write a thesis.	Judged oral defense of thesis by committee and members of the faculty.	Grading rubrics under development/review Fall 2006 for implementation in Spring 2007.	
Academic distinction	Identify 2-3 strategic initiatives for each academic year to bring focus to the department’s strategic planning efforts.	Departmental strategic planning committee will review status initiatives from previous year to determine if goals were met or if initiative should remain for the current year.	For benchmarks, consider national initiatives set forth by professional societies such as the MAA or university-wide initiatives. Departmental strategic planning committee meets early in the fall semester and will make recommendations to the department.	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	Increase the number of students majoring in mathematics.	Monitor data collected by the Registrar’s Office.	Strive for 1% of University’s total undergraduate enrollment. Request reports from Registrar’s Office each semester. Review and/or modify recruitment methods each year.	

**Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B
Response to Recommendations 4 and 5**

Zach S. Henderson Library

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Performance: Library employees will instill confidence in patrons.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p align="center">Minimum Score</p> Undergrad 5.51 Graduate 6.43 Faculty 6.19 <p align="center">Desired Score</p> Undergrad 7.37 Graduate 7.89 Faculty 7.70 <p align="center">Performance Score</p> Undergrad 6.13 Graduate 6.64 Faculty 6.28	Scores highlighted in red indicate a failure to meet minimum expectations, as represented by the minimum score. The Library will focus on addressing these areas first. Steps for addressing failures are noted below. The Library will also look at other areas where they barely exceeded minimal expectations, but the failures will receive the highest priority as efforts to improve Library performance are addressed.
	Library Performance: Library employees will provide individual attention to patrons.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p align="center">Minimum Score</p> Undergrad 5.50 Graduate 6.78 Faculty 6.36 <p align="center">Desired Score</p> Undergrad 6.97 Graduate 7.83 Faculty 7.62 <p align="center">Performance Score</p> Undergrad 6.09 Graduate 6.80 Faculty 6.56	During Summer and Fall 2006, the Library will prepare questions for focus groups to obtain more specific feedback as to why they are not meeting patron expectations for services, collections, and facilities. They will conduct the focus groups in Fall 2006, and Spring 2007, if necessary. Patron service training will be developed immediately to respond to the concerns raised in the open-ended responses of the survey, and the Library will adapt the training as focus group feedback is received. Comments regarding facility shortcomings will be placed in abeyance, since the Library will be vacating the existing part of the building at the end of the summer. Some of the concerns noted are unavoidable such as noise made by the construction crews carrying out the renovations; however, those concerns which are still applicable (e.g., need to enforce the quiet study area policy) will be addressed immediately. Regarding the failure of collections and resources to meet expectations, the Library will continue to work with the academic departments during the summer and fall to identify the resources they require. The Library will also work with Academic Affairs and University Advancement to seek the funding necessary to obtain the required resources.

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Performance: Library employees will demonstrate courteous behavior when interacting with patrons.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.54 Graduate 7.57 Faculty 7.20</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.89 Graduate 8.54 Faculty 8.21</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.85 Graduate 7.45 Faculty 7.38</p>	Given the \$2,500 LibQUAL+ price tag and the amount of time it requires for patrons to complete, the Library only conducts it once every three years. The next survey administration will be in the Spring of 2009. Consequently, over the next two years, the Library will measure its improvement efforts by employing shorter, less comprehensive questionnaires based on the LibQUAL+ questions and targeting areas where the Library was found wanting. In order to control costs and to focus on the constituencies that expressed the most concerns, these questionnaires will be given to selected graduate students and faculty members only.
	Library Performance: Library employees will readily respond to patrons' questions.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.38 Graduate 7.42 Faculty 7.18</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.75 Graduate 8.41 Faculty 7.95</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.81 Graduate 7.35 Faculty 7.15</p>	
	Library Performance: Library employees will accurately answer patrons' questions.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.47 Graduate 7.47 Faculty 7.09</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.82 Graduate 8.36 Faculty 8.14</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.89 Graduate 7.29 Faculty 6.86</p>	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Performance: Library employees will demonstrate caring behavior when interacting with patrons.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.35 Graduate 7.54 Faculty 6.62</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.81 Graduate 8.34 Faculty 7.67</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.84 Graduate 7.22 Faculty 6.96</p>	
	Library Performance: Library employees will demonstrate an understanding of patron needs.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.45 Graduate 7.45 Faculty 7.04</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.80 Graduate 8.37 Faculty 8.22</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.00 Graduate 7.42 Faculty 6.96</p>	
	Library Performance: Library employees will demonstrate willingness to assist patrons.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.40 Graduate 7.36 Faculty 7.11</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.79 Graduate 8.38 Faculty 8.07</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.96 Graduate 7.46 Faculty 7.13</p>	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Performance: Library employees will demonstrate dependability in handling patron service problems.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.51 Graduate 7.62 Faculty 7.17</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.86 Graduate 8.53 Faculty 8.06</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.95 Graduate 7.55 Faculty 7.11</p>	
	Library Performance: Electronic resources will be accessible from patron homes and offices.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.25 Graduate 7.31 Faculty 7.39</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.93 Graduate 8.49 Faculty 8.57</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.65 Graduate 7.13 Faculty 6.84</p>	
	Library Performance: The library web site will be user-friendly, enabling patrons to locate information on their own.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.28 Graduate 7.29 Faculty 7.32</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.78 Graduate 8.38 Faculty 8.59</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.70 Graduate 7.14 Faculty 6.63</p>	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Performance: Printed library materials will be available for instruction and research.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.44 Graduate 7.33 Faculty 6.34</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.81 Graduate 8.37 Faculty 7.66</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.95 Graduate 7.30 Faculty 5.62</p>	
	Library Performance: Electronic information resources will be available for instruction and research.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.44 Graduate 7.16 Faculty 7.60</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.83 Graduate 8.36 Faculty 8.82</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.04 Graduate 7.19 Faculty 6.73</p>	
	Library Performance: Equipment which facilitates easy access to information will be available for patron use.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.77 Graduate 7.51 Faculty 7.24</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 8.06 Graduate 8.44 Faculty 8.52</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.35 Graduate 7.76 Faculty 7.02</p>	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Performance: Access tools that enable patrons to find information on their own will be available.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.53 Graduate 7.27 Faculty 7.32</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.98 Graduate 8.26 Faculty 8.50</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.94 Graduate 7.35 Faculty 7.00</p>	
	Library Performance: Information for independent use will be accessible.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.49 Graduate 7.28 Faculty 7.26</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.88 Graduate 8.34 Faculty 8.26</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.11 Graduate 7.49 Faculty 6.98</p>	
	Library Performance: Print and electronic journal collections will be available for instruction and research.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.57 Graduate 7.49 Faculty 7.30</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.91 Graduate 8.48 Faculty 8.52</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.18 Graduate 7.34 Faculty 5.83</p>	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Performance: Library space that inspires study and learning will be available to patrons.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.35 Graduate 6.36 Faculty 5.88</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.94 Graduate 7.71 Faculty 7.25</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.71 Graduate 6.76 Faculty 5.31</p>	
	Library Performance: Quiet space for individual activities will be available to patrons.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.55 Graduate 6.74 Faculty 5.62</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.98 Graduate 7.99 Faculty 6.71</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.85 Graduate 7.20 Faculty 5.82</p>	
	Library Performance: Comfortable and inviting study space will be available to patrons.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.44 Graduate 6.90 Faculty 6.08</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.94 Graduate 8.24 Faculty 7.32</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.89 Graduate 7.13 Faculty 5.57</p>	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Performance: The Library will create a haven for study, learning, or research.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.50 Graduate 6.77 Faculty 6.06</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.95 Graduate 7.85 Faculty 7.43</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.14 Graduate 7.16 Faculty 6.23</p>	
	Library Performance: Community space for group learning and group study will be available.	All faculty and students were invited to complete the LibQUAL+ survey, a normed and validated questionnaire that asks respondents to rate library facilities, collections, and services. The results were compared to the responses from the 2003 LibQUAL+ survey, and to the responses collected by peer institutions. Respondents were asked to use a scale of 1 to 9 (9 being the highest score) and indicate a minimum, desired, and observed score for each question. One measure of success is when observed performance exceeds minimum expectations, and another is when observed performance exceeds desired performance.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.25 Graduate 6.22 Faculty 4.39</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.69 Graduate 7.33 Faculty 5.82</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.10 Graduate 7.20 Faculty 5.66</p>	
	Library Resources and Collections: Electronic resources will be available from patron homes and offices.	The LibQUAL+ survey was conducted in February and March of 2006. The Dean and University Librarian coordinated the survey in cooperation with the LibQUAL+ developers, the Association of Research Libraries and Texas A&M University.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.25 Graduate 7.31 Faculty 7.39</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.93 Graduate 8.49 Faculty 8.57</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.65 Graduate 7.13 Faculty 6.84</p>	Scores highlighted in red indicate a failure to meet minimum expectations, as represented by the minimum score. The Library will focus on addressing these areas first. Steps for addressing failures are noted below. The Library will also look at other areas where they barely exceeded minimal expectations, but the failures will receive the highest priority as efforts to improve Library performance are addressed.

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Resources and Collections: Printed library materials will be available for instruction and research.	The LibQUAL+ survey was conducted in February and March of 2006. The Dean and University Librarian coordinated the survey in cooperation with the LibQUAL+ developers, the Association of Research Libraries and Texas A&M University.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.44 Graduate 7.33 Faculty 6.34</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.81 Graduate 8.37 Faculty 7.66</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.95 Graduate 7.30 Faculty 5.62</p>	The LibQUAL+ results clearly document that library patrons, especially graduate students and faculty members, are dissatisfied with the Library’s collections. The benchmark comparison (see full report on web) illustrates major funding differences between Henderson Library and the libraries at selected peer institutions. James Madison University (JMU) is the only one of the three aspirational peers that also participated in LibQUAL+ during Spring 2006. In marked contrast with Georgia Southern’s results, all three patron categories (undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty members) at JMU reported that the library’s collections exceeded minimal expectations.
	Library Resources and Collections: Electronic information resources will be available for instruction and research.	The LibQUAL+ survey was conducted in February and March of 2006. The Dean and University Librarian coordinated the survey in cooperation with the LibQUAL+ developers, the Association of Research Libraries and Texas A&M University.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.44 Graduate 7.16 Faculty 7.60</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.83 Graduate 8.36 Faculty 8.82</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.04 Graduate 7.19 Faculty 6.73</p>	The Henderson Library will continue to work with Academic Affairs and University Advancement to seek the necessary funding to obtain needed resources.
	Library Resources and Collections: Access tools that easily enable patrons to find information on their own will be available.	The LibQUAL+ survey was conducted in February and March of 2006. The Dean and University Librarian coordinated the survey in cooperation with the LibQUAL+ developers, the Association of Research Libraries and Texas A&M University.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.53 Graduate 7.27 Faculty 7.32</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.98 Graduate 8.26 Faculty 8.50</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.94 Graduate 7.35 Faculty 7.00</p>	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Resources and Collections: Information will be accessible for independent use.	The LibQUAL+ survey was conducted in February and March of 2006. The Dean and University Librarian coordinated the survey in cooperation with the LibQUAL+ developers, the Association of Research Libraries and Texas A&M University.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.49 Graduate 7.28 Faculty 7.26</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.88 Graduate 8.34 Faculty 8.26</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.11 Graduate 7.49 Faculty 6.98</p>	
	Library Resources and Collections: Print and electronic journal collections will be available for instruction and research.	The LibQUAL+ survey was conducted in February and March of 2006. The Dean and University Librarian coordinated the survey in cooperation with the LibQUAL+ developers, the Association of Research Libraries and Texas A&M University.	<p>Minimum Score</p> <p>Undergrad 6.57 Graduate 7.49 Faculty 7.30</p> <p>Desired Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.91 Graduate 8.48 Faculty 8.52</p> <p>Performance Score</p> <p>Undergrad 7.18 Graduate 7.34 Faculty 5.83</p>	

Strategic Theme	Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction Student-Centeredness Technological Advancement Physical Environment	Library Web Site: The library web site will enable patrons to locate information on their own.	Information Services librarians conducted web usability tests during November 2005. Eleven students participated.		During Summer 2006, the following recommendations will be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Change name of Quick Menu box to Quick Links. . Change the section for book/video searching so that it reads “Search our catalog for books, videos, e-reserves, and other things we own” and move the search box below the description. . Add Library Workshop Schedule next to “Schedule” and “Calendar” on “About Us” page. . Since the GALILEO link in the blue bar on the bottom of the web page is redundant, replace it with “Borrowing from Other Libraries” which should be a link to a page describing ILL and GIL Express, with links to the appropriate pages. . Change “How to Use the Library” to “Guides to Finding Information.”

Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B Response to Recommendations 4 and 5

Alumni Relations—Division of University Advancement

Strategic Theme	Programmatic Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Academic distinction	Maintain an alumni giving rate competitive with peer and aspirational peer institutions.	% of alumni who donate to Georgia Southern University	11% (Based on comparable alumni giving rates from peer institutions; % is compiled using formula from <i>US News & World Report</i> .)	<p>Not Achieved: 9.3% for FY 2006</p> <p>Rate not achieved due to several factors: (1) loss of staff and tech problems in phone-a-thon positions; (2) calls to alumni delayed for a few weeks; (3) alumni directory updated this year which resulted in a number of “lost” alumni being added to the database, thereby lowering overall percentage rate.</p> <p>Plans for improvement include developing and cultivating a stronger relationship (and increased visibility) between the University and the Atlanta region alumni, targeting an increased annual giving rate through NEW Eagle Clubs/Affinity Groups and Executive Business Luncheons and Business After Hours.</p> <p>Additionally, contacts with prospective donors and alumni will be initiated and suggestions incorporated regarding monetary support for the University.</p> <p>Furthermore, Alumni Relations will target “non-giving” alumni with specific communications and events (e.g., phone calls, visits, direct-mail, and Eagle Club sponsored events) in smaller regional areas of metro-Atlanta.</p> <p>Alumni Relations will also conduct “one-on-one” visits with alumni to foster support and increase alumni giving in the metro-Atlanta area.</p> <p>The 11% benchmark will be maintained for FY 2007.</p>

Strategic Theme	Programmatic Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Public-private partnerships	Maintain a healthy and vibrant University Alumni Association.	<p># of dues paying members</p> <p>Participation rate</p>	<p>Target 631 dues paying members for FY 2006 (represents a 5% increase over average of past 5 years)</p> <p>Target 6,022 event attendees for FY 2006</p>	<p>Achieved: 758 dues paying members for FY 2006</p> <p>Achieved: 6,370 event attendees for FY 2006</p> <p>Based on trends, increase alumni membership and event attendance by 10% for FY 2007.</p> <p>Reach additional potential alumni association members through increased number of alumni events.</p>
Public-private partnerships	Generate consistent stream of revenue through Affinity Programs.	\$ raised from membership and affinity programs	<p>\$30,000 Alumni Association Dues (from membership campaign) (represents a 5% increase over average for past 5 years)</p> <p>\$80,000 MBNA (royalties from credit card program) (represents a 10% increase for FY 2005)</p> <p>\$10,000 Class Ring (royalties from selling class rings)</p> <p>\$10,000 Nelnet (royalties from student loan applications)</p>	<p>Achieved: \$32,810 raised in membership dues</p> <p>Not Achieved: \$73,955 raised in MBNA royalties</p> <p>Achieved: \$11,380 raised in Class Ring royalties</p> <p>Achieved: \$13,000 raised in Nelnet royalties</p> <p>Continue to market alumni revenue programs at Eagle Clubs and events throughout the year.</p> <p>Publicize and promote programs/items with updated web site.</p> <p>New contract negotiated with MBNA for increased royalties in FY 2007.</p> <p>Increase dues and royalties by 6% for FY 2007.</p>

Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B Response to Recommendations 4 and 5

Public Safety—Division of Business and Finance

Strategic Theme	Programmatic Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Physical environment	Maintain a campus environment that minimizes the crime rate.	Uniform Crime Reports and annual report comparisons with regard to specific crimes Analysis of unsecured doors Clery Statistics	Previous year’s statistics. Indicators of success: reduced number of crimes, specifically thefts	Partially Achieved: Will always be partially achieved. This outcome and the action and strategies are standard operating procedure and will be ongoing. Assessment of Outcome: Significant reduction in unsecured buildings. With regard to unsecured doors, continue to submit reports to President’s Cabinet. Physical Plant will be continuing to retrofit buildings with electronic locks. Four additional officer positions added in FY 2007 to Public Safety. To address the increase in larceny over the previous year, Crime Prevention will work with University Housing to educate incoming freshmen on crime awareness.
Student-centeredness Physical environment	Educate students, faculty, and staff in terms of crime prevention and safety.	Statistics on number of classes taught and presentations made Attendance	Previous year’s statistics	Partially Achieved: Will always be partially achieved. This outcome and the action and strategies are standard operating procedure and will be ongoing. Assessment of Outcome: Change in personnel impacted outcome. Did not keep attendance records. Continue to present classes focused on students. Provide additional educational information through Alcohol Awareness, the Governor’s Office of Highway Safety Click It or Ticket Program, and Hundred Days of Summer Heat traffic enforcement to combat DUIs and aggressive driving and seat belt violations. Sexual assault educational programs also planned. Will begin to track attendance at presentations.

Strategic Theme	Programmatic Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Public private partnerships	Provide high quality service to the university community, local community, and region.	<p>Statistics on calls for service</p> <p>Notation of particular accomplishments</p> <p>Statistics on number of fire extinguishers checked</p> <p>Statistics on number of safety inspections accomplished; Certificates of Occupancy received</p> <p>Statistics on amount of hazardous waste disposed of by Environmental Safety</p> <p>Statistics on number of law enforcement classes taught</p> <p>Notations on incidences of working with other departments and outside agencies</p>	Previous year’s statistics	<p>Partially Achieved: Will always be partially achieved. This outcome and the action and strategies are standard operating procedure and will be ongoing.</p> <p>During FY 2006, Georgia Southern Police assisted the Statesboro Police Department and the Bulloch County Sheriff’s Office by offering GCIC Security and Integrity certification training to their employees. This required training must be updated every two years. A total of 5 classes were offered with an approximate total attendance of 80 people. Throughout the year, the Police Department serves the community by providing law enforcement for events for the community held on campus. Approximately 10,000 people attended these events for FY 2006.</p> <p>Environmental Safety assumed responsibility this year for the safe disposal of fluorescent light bulbs and used oil. Disposal of light bulbs rose from 1,794 last year to 5,269 this year. Environmental Safety also assumed responsibility for inspection of kitchen safety hoods—rose from 5 last year to 26 this year.</p> <p>Improvements: The Police Department has identified a local law enforcement need in the community for training in Criminal History Records Information. This training will be developed.</p>

**Table 3.3.1B and Table 3.4.1B
Response to Recommendations 4 and 5**

Health Services—Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management

Strategic Theme	Programmatic Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Student-centeredness	Demonstrate that high-quality programs and services are being effectively provided, aimed at enhancing student retention and graduation through internal and external measures.	<p>Internal measures include student/patient satisfaction surveys and a formal risk management and quality of care/peer review process. External measures include implementation of national ambulatory healthcare standards and completion of a national accreditation review process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Conduct internal Patient Satisfaction Survey throughout the year. b) Produce review and respond to monthly management information productivity reports produced from the MediCat practice management information system. c) Quality of Care, Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI), and Risk Management Committees formed to conduct meetings, appropriately act upon and document CQI and Peer Review studies in keeping with AAAHC Quality of Care standards; evaluate and revise existing Health Services Policies & Procedures to ensure that they meet or exceed AAAHC standards. <p>The Health Services Management Team and the committees form the backbone of the AAAHC accreditation process, responsible for maintaining a current, complete set of departmental policies and procedures; and documented, evidence-based assessment of the quality of the services that includes a number of Risk Management and CQI studies. The most important of these studies being a patient flow study to identify potential bottlenecks in the system aimed at increasing staff efficiency and reducing waiting times; and a number of Peer Review studies focusing on selected high volume clinical care areas.</p>		<p>a) <u>Patient Satisfaction Surveys</u> Timeline: Patient satisfaction surveys given to all new patients and every 10th returning patient at sign-in at beginning of academic year and throughout the year; completed surveys turned in prior to leaving facility or returned via campus mail.</p> <p>In addition to providing valuable feedback on care provided patients, one outcome of the survey evaluations has been a decision to work with the Student Affairs and Enrollment Management (SAEM) Office of Strategic Planning to implement a web-based survey tool to expand the evaluation process to include students who may not be using Health Services to help us determine the reason(s) why they are non-users.</p> <p>b) <u>MediCat Practice Management System Report Analysis</u> Timeline: Patient utilization (including ICD-9/CPC treatment code) reports comparing current fiscal year activity with previous year’s activity produced and analyzed on a weekly basis; monthly basis; and final end-of-year report.</p> <p>Monthly management information productivity reports: Reports used to evaluate overall patient use, including utilization per service area and service provider, and presenting medical conditions.</p> <p>c) <u>Quality of Care/CQI/Accreditation Process</u> Timeline: bi-monthly basis submitting reports to Health Services Management Team. Committees are part of AAAHC accreditation process—a 3-year accreditation process that is beginning the third accreditation survey year.</p>

Strategic Theme	Programmatic Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Student-centeredness	Demonstrate that high-quality programs and services are being effectively provided, aimed at enhancing student retention and graduation through internal and external measures.			Quality of Care, CQI, and Risk Management Committees formed. The outcome of these studies was the implementation of new program initiatives to better handle patient flow utilizing existing staff resources, including the <i>MedBuddy-U</i> web-based program, creation of treatment room triage system, creation of a dedicated Patient Services Support office. In addition, all Health Services Policies & Procedures were evaluated and are being revised/reformatted to mirror the AAAHC standards.
Student-centeredness	Demonstrate that financial resources are being efficiently managed aimed at meeting increased student/patient demand while minimizing student health fees and out-of-pocket costs, through sound budgeting and financial management that is measurable and meets or exceeds expense and revenue goals.	<p>Methods Used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Prepare budget utilizing university and Health Services budget and financial information reports. b) Monitor financial reports closely and regularly, identifying positive and negative operating expense and revenue areas. c) Develop and implement short- and long-term expense revenue plans, including cost changes in service delivery and alternative revenue streams. 		<p>a) <u>Prepare Budget</u> Timeline: August – September begin development of next fiscal year budget; October develop preliminary budget with emphasis on, and justification for, student health fee increase; November present budget document including health fee justification for approval by Director, VP, SGA representatives, President’s Cabinet, and Board of Regents.</p> <p>Evaluation: Budget evaluated based on current and future staffing, facility, equipment, and supply expense needs, anticipated enrollment based health fee income, and anticipated fee-for-service revenue aiming for 10% end-of-year net operating income.</p> <p>Other Program Contacts: Health Services Administrative Coordinator, Pharmacy, X-Ray and Medical/Pharmaceutical Supply Vendors.</p> <p>Intended User: Data collected from university and Health Services budget and financial reports is used by Director of Health Services and Health Services Management Team in developing budget, including any health fee increase request and justification.</p> <p>b) <u>Monitor Finances</u> Timeline: On-going, July 1st through June 30th</p> <p>Evaluation: Finances monitored using monthly departmental expense and revenue reports that are evaluated using an Auxiliary Services generated P&L spreadsheet; Director monitors and evaluates detailed departmental expense and revenue activity on a daily basis through web accessing university financial accounting system via crystal reports. Changes in expense and revenue related activity are made as needed based on this evaluation process.</p>

Strategic Theme	Programmatic Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Student-centeredness	Demonstrate that financial resources are being efficiently managed aimed at meeting increased student/patient demand while minimizing student health fees and out-of-pocket costs, through sound budgeting and financial management that is measurable and meets or exceeds expense and revenue goals.			<p>c) <u>Respond to Needed Changes in Service Delivery & Revenue Generation</u> Using financial account reports and P&L statements, Health Services Management Team evaluates changes required immediately, short-or long-term to correct expense or revenue issues aimed at supporting cost effective, high quality programs and services.</p>
Technological advancement	Evaluate and implement state-of-the-art, innovative information technology programs with a special emphasis on web-based technology that improves patient-provider communication and practice efficiency.	<p>Methods Used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Define current and future web-based information technology needs aimed at enhancing patient-provider communications through HIPAA compliant applications. b) Research field to assess cost effective web-based data management, patient-provider communications, and health education/wellness promotion technology with a particular focus on applications specific to university health services and college age students and determine best fit. c) Develop funding plan, seek approval, complete bid process, implement technology. 		<p>a) <u>Determine present and future Health Services web technology needs.</u> Timeline: August – September 2004 to present</p> <p>Director surveyed Health Services staff, selected student leaders, and key Auxiliary Services and SAEM IT personnel to obtain their input and recommendations regarding web technology needs; utilized Health Services Management Team to review staff and student input and develop a set of functional technology specifications.</p> <p>b) <u>Research and assess available HIPAA compliant web technology and determine best fit.</u> Timeline: October 2004 – November 2004</p> <p>Director of Health Services worked with previous colleague, VP for Consulting Services at iLIANT Corporation, to obtain a comprehensive review of web-based medical technology applications in both the public and private sectors; review identified a number of solid web-based technology vendor applications for the private sector with one Atlanta-based ASP vendor application designed for both private and university health settings; determined that IMS <i>MedBuddy-U</i> application met all of the functional technology specifications developed previously. In addition, Director of Health Services researched health education and wellness information web/internet applications and identified a program designed exclusively for university students call <i>My Student Health Zone</i>. The program is a certified health education/patient education content site provided by Student Resources, a national student health insurance company, but owned and operated by the Nemours Foundation.</p>

Strategic Theme	Programmatic Outcomes	Assessment	Standard Against Which Evidence Compared	Improvement(s) (e.g., affect on “design of curricula, design and practice of pedagogy, and in improvement of evaluation.”)
Technological advancement	Evaluate and implement state-of-the-art, innovative information technology programs with a special emphasis on web-based technology that improves patient-provider communication and practice efficiency.			<p>c) <u>Develop funding plan, seek approval, complete bid process, implement technology.</u> Timeline: November 2004 to present</p> <p><i>My Student Health Zone</i> health education and wellness information web site was implemented September 12, 2005, and is available to students and the greater university community via the Health Services web home page and the University Library web site.</p>