# Academic Success: Communicating with Non-enrolled Students to Enhance Degree Completion

**Laura Denker, CAFNR Coordinator of Student Services • DenkerL@Missouri.edu**

## Background

CAFNR's current one-year retention rate is 83%, but we wanted to know where non-returning students were going. Did they choose another institution? What was the reason something we could change for future students? Were students intending to register, just not doing it during early registration? Did the students know how to register using myZou? How could we help our students better?

We began requesting a list from SIS each semester so we could contact students individually. We provided them with links and resources if needed. We also sent the faculty advisor chairs a list of non-enrolled students in their respective programs for additional follow up.

## Timeline (for Spring 2014)

- **March 21** — Early registration for currently enrolled students ended.
- **March 31** — Initial list was received; Individualized emails were sent to students based on their hold status in myZou (see sample emails below)
- **April 1** — Emails with lists were sent to advisors and advisor chairs in the major
  - Follow up from the advisors and majors were each different, but very impactful. Some advisors talked to students in class, others followed up thru e-mail and some advisors already knew the student’s situation.

## Results

- March 31 - 18 students had taken action* (7.4%)
- April 1 - 23 students had taken action (9.4%)
- April 2 - 62 students had taken action (25.4%)
- May 5 - 130 students had taken action (53.3%)
- June 24 - 176 students had taken action (72.1%)

Of the 176 students who responded, 150 students (85%) were enrolled at Mizzou for the Fall 2014 semester. Of the 244, 8 students officially indicated to our office that they were not returning to Mizzou. The reasons varied from financial concerns, large institution and transferring due to programs offered.

## Objectives

- Assist student in career and major exploration, if needed.
- Help students determine if they are on track to complete degree requirements.
- Assist students in meeting with faculty advisor, if needed.
- Determine why students chose not to return to CAFNR or Mizzou.

## Comments from Students

- I thought I had already registered, but the courses were still in my shopping cart.
- Wow! I feel like you really want to help me. And, you actually know my name.
- Will you help me get a hold of my advisor or find someone else who could answer questions?
- I was going to start a professional program, do I still have options to complete my undergrad?
- I don’t like the major I’m currently in. What else can I do?

### Enrolled, 150

- IE**, 19
- No Response, 49
- Trying to register, 18
- Non-Returning (self determined), 8

---

*In this case “take action” included students registering for courses, indicating they were not returning to Mizzou or a negative academic action was taken against them (i.e. ineligible to re-enroll).

**IE means the students were not allowed to return to Mizzou due to academic performance.
Advising Success: Assessing and Improving the Quality of Academic Advising

Raine Jasenowski, CAFNR Academic Advisor • JasenowskiC@Missouri.edu

Background

The development of the Missouri Advisor Quality Survey (MAQS) resulted in three validated factors:
- Knowledgeable
- Available
- Autonomy Support

The survey asks 15 questions - five questions per factor. The development validated that all three factors independently predicted global satisfaction, with Autonomy Support consistently being the strongest predictor. CAFNR uses an individualized, CAFNR-branded approach to increase the response rate. (Figure 2)

Objectives

- Utilize a tool that allows students to provide honest and anonymous feedback about their advising experience.
- Gain a better understanding of how knowledgeable, available, and autonomy supportive CAFNR faculty advisors are.
- Provide feedback to faculty and degree programs about their effectiveness in advising from the students perspective.
- Determine ways to better support and improve quality advising.

Timeline (Spring 2014)

- March 15th - Upload the following student information into a Qualtrics panel for individualized survey distribution:
  - Student name
  - Student email
  - Declared major(s)
  - Assigned advisor(s)
- March 31st - PowerPoint slides advertising the survey displayed on CAFNR TVs. (Figure 1)
- April 3rd - Initial email introducing and inviting students to take the survey is sent to all CAFNR undergraduates.
- April 8th - Reminder email #1
- April 10th - Requested instructors of large CAFNR classes to announce the survey in class, and provided PowerPoint slide to show.
- April 15th - Reminder email #2
- April 21st - Reminder email #3
- April 28th - Final reminder email
- May 24th - Final response is recorded.
- July-August - Reports are created and finalized. (Figures 3 & 4)
- August - Reports are distributed to faculty advisors and department chairs.

Results

- 53% CAFNR wide response rate.
- Reports are organized in the following categories:
  - College
  - Degree Program (15)
  - Individual Faculty Advisor (113)
- Individual Faculty Advisor reports include open-ended comments and feedback.
- Each Faculty Advisor receives his/her individual results along with his/her Degree Program and CAFNR results for comparison.
- A resource guide will be developed for use by faculty advisors based on the areas shown to need improvement in the survey results.
- Workshops by degree program will be developed based on results.

Figure 3

Figure 4
**Career Success: Assessing career outcomes of CAFNR undergraduates**

Whitney Kinne, Assistant Director of CAFNR Career Services  |  KinneW@Missouri.edu

**Background**
CAFNR initiated a college-wide assessment in fall 2013 in response to the discontinuation of the campus-wide “Destination Survey” (summer 2013). The CAFNR Career Services team worked with colleagues in the college to design and build the instrument tailored to CAFNR students. The first CAFNR-branded survey assessed fall 2013 graduates, followed by a second round with spring 2014 graduates. The results of both semesters’ assessment will be released publicly in December 2014.

**Objectives**
- Assess and report the following data for all CAFNR graduates:
  - Rate of “success” in landing a position (continuing education or job) within six months of graduation
  - Number of graduates who reported completing internships, research projects or work experience during college
  - Number of CAFNR graduates start their own business or return to the farm
  - List of employers for the class
  - Salary averages by major
- Determine how CAFNR graduates utilized career development resources during their college career, and evaluate the value that might have had on success rates.

**Timeline (for spring 2014)**
- **April 8**—Request graduation list from Academic Programs colleagues
  - Upload to Qualtrics panel for survey distribution
- **April 17**—INITIAL email invitation to complete survey
  - Ongoing—Contact graduates indicating their interest to discuss career search strategies with the CAFNR Career Services team
- **April 22**—Email reminder #1
- **April 30**—Email reminder #2
- **May 5**—Email reminder #3
- **May 12**—FINAL email reminder pre-graduation
- **May 17**—Pull list of non-responders, work with Academic Programs colleagues to mark graduation cards of those still needing to complete survey
- **May 18**—Use graduation name cards to identify and distribute paper surveys from graduation registration line
- **May 19-23**—Key survey responses into Qualtrics from graduation paper copies
- **July 1**—Request list of conferred degrees, and remove any responses from non-graduates
- **July 7**—First follow-up message to “still seeking” responses & non-responders
- **Fall semester**—Faculty & online search for updates on “still seeking”
- **November 10**—Final email follow-up to “still seeking” responses
- **December 1**—Release report from fall 2013 & spring 2014 CAFNR graduates

**Reporting Outcomes**
- Exceeded response rate goal of 80%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total graduates</th>
<th>Graduates responding</th>
<th>Graduates not responding</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** Combined response rate with fall 2013 and spring 2014 graduates

- Data will be analyzed and reported to key stakeholders, including:
  - Faculty & staff
  - Current students & parents
  - Prospective students & parents
  - Employer partners
- Data will be organized in the following segments:
  - College-wide
  - Degree program specific
- Continue reporting salary data with consortium of 15 institutions offering agriculture, food, and natural resources degrees

**Resources**
- Qualtrics Survey Software (Missouri.Qualtrics.com)
- NACE First-Destination Standards and Protocols, January 2014
- MU Career Services Council

**Figure 2:** Assessment Instrument designed using Qualtrics Survey Software (Missouri.Qualtrics.com)

**Figure 3:** CAFNR Success Survey email invitation

**Figure 4:** Employers hiring spring 2014 graduates (as of May 15, 2014)
CH ENG Program Evaluation under ABET for Continuous Improvement

Mary Myers (myersmar@missouri.edu) and Baolin Deng (dengb@missouri.edu)

Background Information

• ABET is a nonprofit, non-governmental organization that accredits college and university programs in the disciplines of applied science, computing, engineering, and engineering technology.
• ABET accreditation provides assurance that a college or university program meets the quality standards established by the profession for which the program prepares its students.
• ABET is recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.
• MU Chemical Engineering Program (Ch Eng) conducts annual assessments aiming to continuously improve the program quality.

ABET Evaluation Process

The process for ABET accreditation of Ch Eng and other engineering programs involves a multifaceted assessment:
• Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)
• Student Outcomes (SOs)
• Continuous improvement
• Others (curriculum, student, faculty, facility, institutional support)

Previously review: AY11-12
Next review: AY 17-18

Program Educational Objectives (PEOs)

• Established themselves as practicing professionals through increased responsibilities beyond their original entry-level position, or if engaged in post-baccalaureate study are making timely progress toward an advanced degree;
• Continued education through special training, professional licensure, or additional certifications; and
• Participated in professional extension through mentoring, community activities, and/or served in local/regional professional societies.
PEOs are evaluated partially based on the alumni survey conducted every 3-yr that reflect student accomplishments 3-5 yrs after graduation.

Student Outcomes (SOs)

1. Possess a comprehensive background in mathematics, engineering, chemistry, and science, and an ability to apply this knowledge to solve problems.
2. Be capable of designing and conducting experiments to prove or disprove a hypothesis, and be able to analyze and interpret data.
3. Be able to design systems, components, or processes to meet industrial needs within realistic constraints such as economic, environmental, social, political, regulatory, ethical, health and safety, manufacturability, and sustainability.
4. Demonstrate an ability to function on teams.
5. Be capable of identifying, formulating, and solving engineering problems.
6. Understand professional and ethical responsibility.
7. Be able to communicate effectively.
8. Understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context.
9. Recognize the need for, and be able to engage in life-long learning.
10. Possess knowledge of contemporary issues.
11. Have an ability to use techniques, skills, and modern engineering tools in engineering practice.
12. Be knowledgeable in engineering economics and be able to apply this knowledge.

Assessment for Continuous Improvement

• Tab A - Alumni Survey. Every 3 yrs, used to receive alumni impressions of their training after 2-6 yrs of experience.
• Tab B - Course Evaluation and Assessment. Individual course evaluation prepared by instructor, faculty evaluation on courses and curriculum.
• Tab C - EBI Survey. The Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI) survey is conducted annually and directly linked to the student outcomes a-l.
• Tab D - Senior Exit Interviews. This is for each graduating senior and conducted by the chair, both oral and written interview.
• Tab E - The Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) Exams. The FE exam is a direct assessment of student outcomes and the results can be compared with other institutions.
• Tab F - Capstone Reports and Presentations. Prepared each semester by the Capstone instructor, including Industrial Advisory Board review.

Case Study

Identify issues (Capstone reports presentation assessment by IAB):
• 07 – 08: The problems with capital cost estimates were identified. The problem resides in the fact that the academic community does not have access to the “benchmark” costs for facilities.
• Identify and implement possible solutions:
• 08-09: Require students to report both purchase costs and bare module costs prior to calculation by software. Assign an independent study project on developing a heuristic approach for calculating and reporting cost estimates and profitability calculation.
• Results: 09 and after: more consistent cost estimate
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Figure 1. Continuous Improvement Processes

Figure 2. Mapping of Core Ch Eng curriculum to student outcomes
Developing a Mentoring Program for Faculty

Background Information

Department cultures influence whether faculty receive mentoring, how they experience the mentoring relationship and whether they perceive the possibility of academic success (Bloom, 1995).

Further, mentoring programs have the potential to increase productivity and satisfaction and foster collegial relationships. These benefits to individual faculty and to the institution are critical at all ranks and for tenure-stream and non-tenure track faculty alike (Peluchette & Jeanquart, 2000; Hermsen, Litt, Hart, & Tucker, 2011).

As of the Fall of 2012 there was no formal systematic mentoring plan in ELPA or ESCP despite requests from faculty for general help.

Baseline Data/Information/Issues Identified

Each faculty member has different mentoring needs and goals. For example:

- Some want to establish research collaborations and support
- Some are interested in possibly pursuing academic leadership roles in the future
- Some have a desire to improve teaching
- Some seek peers from the same gender and/or race/ethnicity
- Some are interested in strategies to establish work-life effectiveness.

Many faculty lack a broader network within the university that prohibit them from identifying possible mentoring relationships. Even those with such networks may not seek such relationships out.

Intervention(s)

At each faculty member's annual review, they were asked if they were interested in participating in a formal mentoring program. If so, they filled out a form that identified their goals and desires in a mentoring relationship. They also identified a possible mentor. Most faculty did not have a mentor in mind. In that case, the chair (ADD) worked with the faculty member to identify a possible match and invited the match to meet the faculty member. The department funded monthly lunches for the faculty member and their mentor at the UClub. If the faculty member did not benefit from the match, another potential mentor could be identified. These lunches are purposefully not structured so the dyad can naturally develop a relationship.

Goals

- To match faculty with like-minded peers who can support the faculty member’s mentoring goals
- To foster relationships between faculty throughout campus
- To mitigate academic isolation and silos
- To support faculty as they attend to their professional development goals and plans
- To increase faculty productivity and professional progression in their job duties
- To increase faculty satisfaction

Results/Outcomes

Although in its infancy (second year of the program), early and mid-career faculty have participated in the program. Anecdotally feedback from mentors and mentees reflect mutually beneficial new relationships. Several faculty are participating again, some with new mentors to address changing mentoring needs; others are continuing with the same mentors. In addition, the program was adopted by a section department (ESCP) in the Fall of 2013 with 10 current faculty participants in the first year.

Lessons Learned

Executing this program can be difficult if the chair does not have a broad campus network and knowledge of mentors’ experiences and expertise. It is also possible that matches will not work and such relationships cannot be forced. Not all faculty are interested in a mentor or in a formal mentoring program. Requiring participation rarely results in a positive mentoring experience. However, most faculty who participated said that it was worthwhile and helped them advance their professional goals.

References


Refinement of a Faculty Productivity System

Matthew P. Martens (Division Director); Jeni L. Hart (ELPA); Joi L. Moore (SISLT); Chris Riley-Tillman (ESCP)
Contact information: Matthew Martens, martensmp@missouri.edu; 882-3382

Background Information
- The College of Education is organized into two divisions, one of which includes three departments: ELPA, ESCP, and SISLT
- The three departments had very different procedures for assessing faculty productivity for evaluation and merit decisions
- There is similarity across all three departments in terms of expected faculty outcomes (e.g., quality teaching, scholarly publications, external funding)

Goals
- Develop an objective productivity system that accurately assesses outcomes relevant to faculty performance and is consistent with the strategic goals of the departments, college, and university
- Have some degree of standardization across the three departments
- Establish transparency with faculty regarding criteria for evaluation/merit decisions

Baseline Data/Information/Issues Identified
- In some cases, department criteria were overly subjective and not clearly defined
- Department chairs in some units had little guidance in making evaluations and merit decisions
- Faculty had limited input into the criteria in some departments
- One department had a system that provided points or “shares” for various faculty-related outcomes

Results/Outcomes
- Each department developed their own productivity system, based on the same principles, but modified to meet department-specific needs
- Faculty data are used to inform faculty evaluations and, in part, determine merit raise amounts (each point or share can be assigned a dollar amount)
- The systems do a good job of identifying differences in faculty performance
- Department heads consider factors when making evaluations/merit recommendations

Intervention(s)
- The former division director implemented the “shares” system in all three departments
- Faculty members in each department provided recommendations for categories, point values for specific outcomes, etc.
- Modifications to the system have been made on an annual basis, with faculty input

Lessons Learned
- It is important for faculty to provide input into the criteria for a points/share-based system
- Alternatively, faculty can become bogged down in minutia, and department heads at times need to make decisions when faculty are divided and/or indecisive
- Establishing criteria for some areas (e.g., research outcomes) is easier than others (e.g., service)
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Figure 1: Example of Points/Shares for Scholarly Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Your Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book Written/Authorized/Co-Authored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Edited/Co-Edited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Reviewed Journal Article - First/Solo Author</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Reviewed Journal Article - 2nd, 3rd, etc Author</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Peer-Reviewed Journal Article</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Report (e.g., commissioned report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Example of Points/Shares for Teaching Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Your Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Psychometrics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spg 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spg 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spg 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committees - Finished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Your Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Psychometrics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spg 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spg 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spg 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Committees - Finished</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1:1 iPad Initiative: Preparing Teachers to Teach with Technology

Contacts: James E. Tarr, tarrj@missouri.edu, 882-4034; John K. Lannin, lanninj@missouri.edu, 882-6774, Kathryn B. Chval, chvalkb@missouri.edu, 882-7832

Background Information

Based on a three-year review of our undergraduate programs, we identified technology as an area that needed considerable improvement. Local school districts reported that we were not adequately preparing our graduates to teach with technology and digital textbooks. School districts in Missouri were equipping their classrooms with infrastructure that MU did not have.

Recently, school districts began to implement 1:1 iPad initiatives including the Columbia Public Schools, Boonville, and Ashland. Other school districts in mid-Missouri, across the state and nation, are incorporating iPads in teaching and learning. Each semester, the Teacher Education Program in MU’s College of Education places more than 1000 teacher candidates in local schools, to work side-by-side with teachers and students. However, teacher candidates report inadequate preparedness to teach with educational technologies including iPads.

Baseline Data/Information/Issues Identified

Based on an analysis of student teaching evaluations and capstone projects from 2009-2012, teacher candidates did not articulate how technology use was connected to clear instructional objectives, learning activities, and assessment strategies. They referenced SMART Boards and PowerPoint presentations, but not other tools and resources.

Spring 2014 Undergraduate Exit Surveys corroborated student concerns about their preparedness to teach with technology:

• 47% indicated Technology was given Far Too Little or Too Little emphasis in coursework (Question 39)

Similarly, many faculty expressed limitations in their capacity to effectively utilize educational technologies in courses they teach in our teacher education programs.

Apple administered a survey based on the SAMR (Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, Redefinition) model. 100% of respondents reported at the lowest levels of technology use in their courses.

Goals

• To equip all instructors with an iPad, including TT/NTT faculty, faculty adjuncts, and GTAs.
• To train instructors in effective use of the iPad, including accessibility features, design capabilities, and applications for teaching, learning, and research. (addressing Goal #1 of the CoED Strategic plans)
• To provide ongoing support to faculty as they incorporate iPads in instruction and classrooms.
• To increase student and faculty productivity.
• To increase student and faculty satisfaction (Goal #3 of the CoED Strategic Plan)

Results/Outcomes

• Faculty who attended found the professional development to be worthwhile in providing ideas for preparing teachers to teach with technology

Lessons Learned

• In enacting new initiatives, communication is critical, including information about the purpose, goals, and expected outcomes. One knowledgeable person needs to assume the responsibility of handling all the inquiries from faculty, staff, students, and parents.
• Establish a plan for students who do not have the financial resources for the purchase.
• Establish a system for students to serve in leadership roles
• Establish a professional development system for faculty.

Use of iPads in Education

https://www.apple.com/education/ipad/

The SAMR* Model (*substitution, augmentation, modification, redefinition)

http://hippasus.com/resources/tte/part1.html
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Becoming a member of iSchools

Joi L. Moore (SISLT); The iSchool at University of Missouri
Contact information: moorejol@missouri.edu; 884-2797

What is iSchools?
- The iSchools organization was founded in 2005
- A collection of Information Schools dedicated to advancing the information field.
- While each individual iSchool has its own strengths and specializations, together they share a fundamental interest in the relationships between information, people, and technology.
- Currently, 55 institutions

Goals
- Lead and promote the information field
- Enhance academic initiatives and to leverage funding for important research challenges in the information field.
- Provide support for, and solutions to shared challenges among member iSchools
- Provide informed perspectives on matters of public policy as they affect the collection, organization, dissemination, use, and preservation of information.

SISLT Profile
- The School of Information Science and Learning Technologies (SISLT) shares with other member organizations in the iSchool Consortium a focus on scholarship at the intersection of information, technology, and education.
- SISLT comprises two academic units, Library and Information Science (LIS) and Learning Technologies (LT). The integration of the two units expanded the compass to a wider conception of information as a multifaceted area of interdisciplinary research in the academy.

Membership Criteria
- Substantial sponsored research activity
- Engagement in the training of future researchers (usually through an active, research-oriented doctoral program)
- Commitment to progress in the information field

iSchool became a member in Fall 2013

iConference Participation
- The iSchools sponsor the iConference as a forum for faculty, students, and researchers to share their work and to develop their extended network of colleagues.
- The conference runs 3-4 days and the program typically includes a doctoral colloquium, poster and paper sessions, panels, roundtables, and social events.

Unique Contributions of SISLT
- Usability testing and design via the Information Experience Lab (http://iclab.missouri.edu)
- Distance Learning innovations through research and practice, i.e. Zone (http://zone.missouri.edu)
- Design and development of digital archives. For over a decade, MU has worked with the Truman Presidential Library and Museum, building a robust, interactive portal to the Truman holdings, i.e., the Truman website (http://www.trumanlibrary.org)

iSchool Member Institutions in United States

Carnegie Mellon University
Drexel University
Florida State University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Michigan State University
Pennsylvania State University
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Syracuse University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Illinois
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of Michigan
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of North Carolina
University of North Texas
University of Pittsburgh
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
University of Texas, Austin
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
Faculty and Professional Staff Development Plans: Focusing on Continuous Improvement

John K. Lannin (Division Executive Director); James E. Tarr (Associate Division Director, LTC) Contact Information: John Lannin, LanninJ@missouri.edu; 884-8862

Background Information

- The College of Education is organized into two divisions, one of which includes two departments: Learning, Teaching, and Curriculum (LTC) and Special Education (SPED)
- LTC is composed of faculty with various content area foci (e.g., music, arts, literacy/English/TESOL, mathematics, science, social studies)
- LTC has 33 faculty members and the division has 11 professional staff members

Baseline Data/Information/Issues Identified

We needed a structure to support faculty and professional staff in their goals and promote connections to the College of Education Strategic Plan:
- **Goal 1.** Deliver highly competitive, rigorous, research-intensive academic programs.
- **Goal 2.** Improve research quality, productivity, and impact.
- **Goal 3.** Ensure a positive, productive, and efficient work and learning environment.
- **Goal 4.** Increase cultural and global competence of College personnel and students.

Intervention(s)

- Faculty members and staff have developed professional development plans that support the department and their professional goals
- The process of developing Professional Development Plans has helped everyone focus on specific goals that are connected to the College of Education's Strategic Plan
- Faculty and staff suggestions are used to develop support systems for their work

Goals

- To develop a system of Professional Development Plans that is consistent with the strategic goals of the departments, college, and university
- To promote and support faculty and staff plans to reaching Strategic Plan Goals

Process

- Faculty and staff draft their Professional Development Plans
- In annual reviews, administrators meet with faculty and staff to discuss their goals and share ways to support them in achieving their professional goals
- Updates are made to the Professional Development Plans on an annual basis

Lessons Learned

- Faculty and staff develop challenging short-term and long-term goals that are aligned with the College of Education Strategic Plan
- Leaders are needed to develop plans in order to support faculty and staff in reaching their goals
- Professional Development Plans need to be reviewed and revisited periodically during the year

Components of Professional Development Plan

3-5 Year Goals
- Are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound, connected to the College of Education Strategic Plan

Annual Goals
- Connected to teaching, research and service components and linked to the College of Education Strategic Plan

Strategies
- Are clearly linked to specific goals and include deadlines for completion

Department Support
- Includes suggestions for department-wide support for attaining goals
Assessing Instructional Quality

Department Chair: Dr. David Mandy
Contact information: mandyd@missouri.edu

Goals:
- To provide a quality education for MU economics majors.
- To provide a consistent and fair structure of accountability for faculty and graduate instructors.
- To provide faculty with feedback regarding their own classroom performance and provide assistance if necessary.
- To provide departmental leaders and committees adequate, tangible evidence to make personnel decisions.
- To provide departmental leaders evidence of undergraduate accomplishment compared to other campuses.

Inputs:
- Coupled with course average GPA, two items from standard student evaluation forms are tabulated for every course:
  a. "Overall Teaching Effectiveness"
  b. "Language Proficiency"
- Annually updated teaching files containing materials from every course & any other relevant information.
- A peer review team is assigned annually to every Assistant, Associate & NTT faculty member. The team reviews the teaching file & conducts a classroom visit; then prepares a summary report (not to include recommendations).
- The Educational Testing Service’s Major Field Test (MFT) in economics, an externally normed instrument, is administered for credit to every graduating senior during the capstone, after a review of the undergraduate curriculum.

Assessment:
- The Salary Advisory Committee utilizes Input 1 as major contributing evidence into its recommendations to the chair.
- The Personnel Committee relies on Inputs 1 & 3 when conducting annual reviews and evaluating promotion and tenure cases (for both regular and NTT faculty).
- The Director of Graduate Studies analyzes Input 1 for TA’s and graduate instructors to inform subsequent TA assignments.
- The department chair reviews Input 2 of tenured faculty as part of the annual post tenure review process.
- Results from input 4 are reviewed by the department chair and capstone instructor to identify strengths & weaknesses in the curriculum.

Outputs:
- The department chair determines appropriate pay increases based on Salary Committee recommendations and an independent review of inputs 1, 2, & 3.
- Promotion & tenure recommendations of the Personnel Committee and department chair.
- The Director of Graduate Studies determines appropriate TA assignments and recommends language classes as needed.
- Annual review letters for all faculty are written by the chair.
- Targeted mentoring may be utilized when recommended by the peer review process.

Data:
- Figure 1 shows consistently high quality teaching. Instructors regularly earn scores in the mid-3 range while teaching thousands of students outside of their major in section sizes between 250 and 500, while also maintaining demanding standards (most section GPA’s are between 2.0 and 2.5).
- Figure 2 shows MU economics majors outstripping the national average on the MFT.

Figures

**Figure 1**
Average Overall Teaching Effectiveness Scores for Courses Below 3000 Level (Scale of 1 to 5)

**Figure 2**
MU Economics MFT Scores
(National Average in Red)
Background

Objectives:
- Describe strategies for a team-based approach to error disclosure
- Describe the impact of team-based error disclosure training for professional students.
- Define benefits of team-based error disclosure training for faculty and staff facilitators.

Error disclosure training at the University of Missouri School of Medicine has traditionally occurred in a lecture format, without a formal opportunity to practice these skills. School of Pharmacy and School of Nursing did not have formal training in this area. Most faculty in all disciplines lacked formal training in this area. Improvements to the current approach were sought by all disciplines.

An interprofessional error disclosure program was initially developed by the team at a collaborating institution in 2006 as part of an educational grant by the Josiah Macy Foundation. An Error Disclosure Team Training Toolkit is available from the Center for Health Science Interprofessional Education, Research, and Practice at the University of Washington. Available at: www.collaborateuw.edu

As part of a Faculty Development in Team Based Care grant from the Josiah Macy Foundation, this team training in error disclosure activity was adapted by the University of Missouri to incorporate standardized family members.

Methods

Components: 3 hour Error Disclosure Session

- Introductory Lecture
- Small Group Simulations
- Debrief

Participants:
183 health professional students
Second-year medical
Seventh semester baccalaureate nursing
Third-year pharmD

Facilitators:
36 Interprofessional faculty (79%) and health system staff (21%).

Program:
- Following a one hour introductory lecture on error disclosure (by an institutional leader), students broke into groups of 10. Each group had 2 facilitators.
- Two hours small group session began with a discussion of an adverse event and a step-by-step process to error disclosure.
- Case study involving a frail elderly patient: A 92-year-old home resident presents to the emergency department with symptoms of healthcare-associated pneumonia. He receives a medication to which he has a previously known allergy, resulting in an anaphylactic reaction and ultimately an ICU admission.

After breaking into smaller groups of 3-4, students planned a team approach to disclosing the error to a standardized family member. Each of the groups encountered a different response from the actor (i.e., worry, frustration, disbelief).

Team-based disclosure process
- Acknowledge error
- Conduct blame-free discussion
- Involve all team members
- Discuss relevant events
- Determine who should speak?
- What should be said?
- Where will disclosure occur?
- How should we address emotions?
- Carry out plan
- Acknowledge and apologize
- Allow all members to participate
- Answer questions

Debrief
- Reflection on strengths/improvements

Results

Post survey completion rate was 96-100%.

Mean confidence in disclosing errors increased for students in all disciplines: 3.71 to 4.48 (pharmacy), 3.29 to 4.22 (medicine) and 3.57 to 4.21 (nursing) following the event.

Mean responses of knowledge regarding error disclosure techniques increased after the event from 2.90 to 4.43 (pharmacy), 2.36 to 3.95 (medical) and 3.12 to 4.19 (nursing).

Discussion/Conclusion

Utilizing “hands on” training with simulated patients was an effective mechanism for teaching health professional students and faculty about discussing, planning, and performing error disclosure as a team. Results demonstrate significant improvement in self-reported knowledge of disclosure and comfort with the skill by all professional groups. Students also reported improved understanding of interprofessional roles and teamwork.

Added benefits included the faculty development that occurred as a result of the training and small group session.

Take away “pearls”

- “Do better job of getting multidisciplinary team members together and, for my future medical error discussions.” (Faculty)

- “Avoid making excuses and placing or shifting blame on team members.” (Student)

- “You can’t stress the importance of working together as a team with each discipline enough… crucial to excellent patient care.” (Faculty)

- “Take time to prepare and plan the disclosure—don’t just wing it!” (Student)

Discussion

Interprofessional education added value to error disclosure education
Case study involving an elderly patient and his family provided a realistic example for learners that was also generalizable to broader populations
Challenging area created learning opportunity for students and faculty alike
Engaging institutional experts (Ethics and Risk Management) in faculty debrief provided additional opportunities for faculty/staff learning
# 4-H: Pipeline and Access to Higher Ed.

**MU Extension 4-H Center for Youth Development Campus and Field faculty and staff (N = 107)**  
Contact information: Ina Metzger Linville, linvillei@missouri.edu, 573-882-7430

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Information</th>
<th>Baseline data/Information/Issues identified</th>
<th>Results/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Today’s young people must be prepared to live and work in a world that no one can completely envision --- for jobs that do not exist, using technologies that have not yet been invented, solving problems that have not yet been identified. | Annually, 4-H Youth Development connects over 8,500 youth ages 8 to 18 from 107 Missouri counties and the City of St. Louis with University of Missouri campuses and faculty. MU = 8,200 CAFNR, A &S, Bus. Ed., Eng., HES, Life Sci. & Vet. Med  
UMKC = 150 Ed. Inst.  
Hum. Dev.  
UMSL = 120 Pub. Admin.  
S & T = 120 Aerospace | As a result 4-H Members are:*  
2 X’s more likely to go onto Higher Education  
3 X’s more interested in science careers  
3 X’s more likely to be engaged in service to their communities.  
When compared to peers of similar age, gender, race/ethnicity, SES, family structure and maternal education.  
Youth Futures: 76% (n= 259 ) enrolled in college, 65% (n=222 ) persist to graduation |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Intervention(s)</th>
<th>Lessons learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4-H Youth will enter the workforce with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and health for the 21st century workplace. | **4-H Pipeline programs for young people:**  
Events: FilmFest, State 4-H Congress, State 4-H Teen Conference  
Camps: Aerospace, Summers@Mizzou; Food & Fitness; Livestock; Dairy Judging  
Contests: FIRST LEGO League, Horse, Livestock and Poultry Judging; Horse Bowl, Hippology and Horse Public Speaking and Demonstrations, Fashion Revue, Public Speaking, Shooting Sports, Sports Fishing, Wildlife Habitat  
**4-H Access:** Youth Futures: College Within Reach and MU Extension Program Integration Theme – Educational Attainment | Effective youth development programs:  
• provide a series of progressive, sustained opportunities to build life skills, engage in meaningful leadership opportunities and connect with caring adults.  
• address the developmental needs of youth emphasizing and building upon strengths rather than deficits or problems.  
 Effective first generation college access programs connect youth to a caring mentor, provide youth to practice meaningful leadership and engage young people over time (early adolescence to early adulthood) to build relationships with volunteers, faculty and staff. |

[http://4h.missouri.edu](http://4h.missouri.edu)
MISSOURI MANUFACTURERS’ SUPPLY CHAIN NETWORK

Targeted manufacturers, ranging from component part suppliers to modular integration companies, will be engaged in new opportunities to increase their revenues and skilled-workforce through connections to the nuclear industry.

The agencies cooperate with industry stakeholders Ameren Utility Company, operator of Callaway Nuclear Power facility in central Missouri, and Westinghouse Electric, developers of Small Modular Reactor technology, which will result in new supply chain needs. New and higher-skilled jobs will result in economic improvement in both rural and urban areas of Missouri.

OVERARCHING GOALS
- To educate & train a highly skilled, high quality, and ready to employ workforce;
- To provide technical assistance to potential and current supply chain manufacturers that permits them to increase revenues and employ more workers; and
- To analyze transportation and logistics in Missouri to enable parts and modules to be moved from plants to facilities.

EDA: STRENGTHENING REGIONAL ASSETS

EDA will fund technical assistance to help companies participate in the SMR supply chain and deliver an infrastructure & logistics study.

BRIDG/MU Business Development: Manufacturers who are/or may be capable of participating in the supply chain are contacted to determine their readiness to participate. Manufacturers desiring to participate in the SMR supply chain will receive information such as:
- Lead-time for necessary certifications;
- Parts they may contribute;
- Certifications needed for the job titles and parts they make;
- Who they will sell to;
- Time-line of the needed parts.

CELD:
The MU/College of Engineering based Center for Excellence in Logistics & Distribution is analyzing the transportation network data, including rail, road and water networks, their current condition and upgrades necessary to handle SMR.

EDA: REPORTING & ASSISTING SMES

EDA will fund technical assistance to help companies participate in the SMR supply chain and deliver an infrastructure & logistics study.

BRIDG/MU Business Development: Manufacturers who are/or may be capable of participating in the supply chain are contacted to determine their readiness to participate. Manufacturers desiring to participate in the SMR supply chain will receive information such as:
- Lead-time for necessary certifications;
- Parts they may contribute;
- Certifications needed for the job titles and parts they make;
- Who they will sell to;
- Time-line of the needed parts.

CELD:
The MU/College of Engineering based Center for Excellence in Logistics & Distribution is analyzing the transportation network data, including rail, road and water networks, their current condition and upgrades necessary to handle SMR.

RI: CONNECTING REGIONAL SUPPLY CHAINS & ASSISTING SMES

NIST will fund outreach efforts to manufacturers and assist with supply chain connections.

Mo Workforce/MURR/LSTC
Mo Workforce coordinates the work of MU Research Reactor and Linn State Technical College. These two schools initiated programs in Winter semester 2014, introducing students to experiences in nuclear and other power generation industries. Two-year and four-year college students will be trained for careers in energy production and manufacturing, and will earn an Assoc. of Applied Science or a Bachelor of Science in Engineering degree.
Building Successful Collaborations Using the Arts

Dr. Lee Ann Woolery, Mark Porth, Dr. Mary Leuci - The University of Missouri Extension

Introduction
The MU Extension Community Arts Project (CAP) - a 3-year pilot project - engages campus faculty and students with Extension in rural communities in Missouri. Working collaboratively, utilizing the arts, together we build community and create economic opportunity.

How it started:
The effort was launched with the Community Arts Café in November 2010. With a commitment of funds from the Vice Provost for Extension, a Community Arts Specialist was hired in January 2012. A 16-member advisory council was formed, represented by art faculty, students, and leaders from Extension, the community, and art organizations. The council developed a four-step platform of strategies to engage community interest and participation in the CAP as well as a criterion for choosing a pilot project community. For the first year, CAP broadened the engagement of campus faculty and students by working collaboratively with six central Missouri communities. The project infuses the full breadth of art disciplines - performing arts, theatre, visual, music, arts education, and arts history and architectural studies, film, design, and new media in addition to others.

The arts...
- Are a way to unite/connect people and resources.
- Are multi-generational and involve youth in community growth.
- Stimulate community development and economic revitalization.
- Improve quality of life.
- Help students to be more attractive to future employers.

Key Findings
Commitment to future engagement:
The effort was launched with the Community Arts Café in November 2010, bringing together art faculty, leaders from campus, Extension, the community and art organizations. The work developed during the café provided a framework and best practices for a community arts program to be housed within Extension. The arts café created commitment to future engagement in the council and the project itself by various participants.

Criteria for choosing pilot project site:
- Demonstrated evidence of ability to galvanize community around the proposed project.
- The community values the arts, strong sense of community, pride of place, evidence of community leadership.
- Commitment and ability to galvanize an intergenerational community including youth around the project.
- Willingness to provide some funding (e.g., travel for student interns, travel for community participants to select project events at MU, hosting community events, in-kind support, etc.).
- Willingness to partner with MU Extension in fundraising for the project and its ongoing outgrowth.
- Sufficient local extension leadership/interest and capacity to be an active partner.
- Evidence of capacity for long-term project sustainability.

Results
Creativity workshops:
Over the first year, six Missouri communities actively engaged in fee-based creativity workshops held on campus led by extension and art faculty. Eight community engagement workshops followed, led by Extension and Community Development faculty. Communities engaged in exercises to envision and plan a community arts project through community asset mapping and imagination development and strategic and action planning.

Proposals:
Five strong proposals were submitted fulfilling criteria for projects that build vibrant communities, spark innovation, and create new economic opportunity through projects such as: a community arts center offering art career education for youth and arts-business development and entrepreneurship opportunities for adults; a stage play of a local hero parlayed into a cultural arts destination to include a festival.

Community Arts Pilot Project:
The first MU Extension Community Arts Pilot Project was awarded to The City of Lexington, a community of 4,500 rich in Civil War history. Lexington's community arts project is an audio-visual architecture and history tour of "Legendary Lexington." Seven subcommittees with over 30 volunteers have formed to support the project including marketing, development, education and a local artists group.

Collaborations
The community arts pilot project is creating collaborative learning opportunities through arts and professional development.
A youth summer art camp held on campus led by art faculty and graduate students served 11 high school students from Missouri and adjoining states.

Professional development workshops held on campus for:
- Individual artists providing learning in entrepreneurial and management practices.
- Leaders in communities teaching practical skills for effectively involving and empowering local citizens in community-based arts efforts - all benefiting cultural vibrancy and creating economic opportunity.

Expanding on the concept of the term "community," work with student veterans and active-duty military on campus has been an internally funded "Arts engagement with student veterans and military" interdisciplinary network. This network recruited StoryCorps' Military Voices Initiative (an oral history project for post-9/11 veterans and their families) to visit the MU campus to conduct interviews with 36 members of this community on September 11-13, 2013.

In this collaborative engagement between communities, Extension and the University - meaningful dialogues continue to be created, regional linkages fostered, new relationships emerged, and perceptions changed.

A new partnership between the University of Missouri School of Music, Mizzou New Music Initiative and MU Extension Community Arts Project is resulting in the first Mizzou New Music Initiative Residency in Lexington, starting Fall 2013. The residency includes two students and one professor who will provide original music and audio production for Lexington's Architectural/History Audio Tour.

Next Steps
A model for replication - The collaborative partnership and engagement with Extension, faculty, students, communities and arts organizations are creating an institutional model for the replication of a state-wide community arts program. The statewide program will continue to broaden engagement of campus faculty and students to work collaboratively on projects, arts organizations and communities utilizing the arts as a community and economic development strategy.

The Community Arts Engagement Tool Kit - Work continues on a multi-use, multi-platform product for engaging communities with MU in community and economic development through the MU Extension Community Arts program.

Social media - With the development of the Community Arts website, opportunities for communities to engage in communication and learning from one another are available through new platforms such as a community arts Facebook page and emerging art blogs.

Further Information
Inquiries should be directed to:
Dr. Lee Ann Woolery
phone: (573) 884-9025
e-mail: mwoolley@missouri.edu
http://extension.missouri.edu/communityarts
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Department of Geological Sciences

A Distributed Approach to MU’s Upper Division Writing Intensive Requirement

The Four-Course WI Requirement in the Department of Geological Sciences

Participating Faculty

Robert Bauer, Alan Whittington, Miriam Barquero-Molina, Mian Liu, Eric Sandvol, Peter Nabelek
Information Contact: Robert Bauer (bauerr@missouri.edu)

Background

Since 1987, MU’s Campus Writing Program (CWP) has promoted improved undergraduate “writing across the curriculum” by requiring two writing intensive (WI) courses following completion of MU’s first-year composition course – English 1000. WI courses are not designed as writing courses, but they include writing assignments that are integrated into the instruction and learning of course material in the discipline of the course. As such, writing assignments provide opportunities for students to learn through writing, to improve their writing through revision, and to learn approaches to writing that may be specific to the discipline of the course. One of the two WI courses may be taken in any discipline, however, the other course must be an upper division course (3000 or 4000 level) in the student’s major.

Criteria for WI Course Designation

All WI courses must meet criteria that are established by the Campus Writing Board. Courses are reviewed for approval by a discipline-specific subcommittee of the board.

Criteria for WI course approval include:
1. Courses should be designed and taught by faculty at ≤ 20:1 student-to-faculty ratio
2. Courses should include multiple assignments that involve substantive revision
3. Course writing, including revisions, should total at least 6600 words (20 pages)
4. Each course should include at least one assignment involving multiple interpretations
5. Writing assignments for the course should be distributed throughout the semester
6. Written assignments should typically constitute at least 30% of the course grade
7. Faculty may use teaching assistants to maintain ≤ 20:1 student-to-faculty ratio, but
8. Professors should remain in control of assignments, grading, and marking of papers

Rationale for Changing our Upper Division WI Course Requirement

Potentially Available Upper Division WI Core Courses

All Bachelor of Science majors in the Geological Sciences are required to complete four upper division, WI course candidates:

- Sedimentology (3800) – 4 credits, including a weekly 2-hour lab
- Structural Geology (4150) – 4 credits, including a weekly 2-hour lab
- Igneous & Metamorphic Petrology (4900) – 4 credits, with a 2-hour lab
- Plate Tectonics (4950) – 3 credit hours

Structural Geology served as our upper division WI course

Typical enrollment of 10-15 students. Course assignments included numerous problem sets in addition to the weekly 2-hour lab sessions and associated reports

- Writing components included:
  - Three writing assignments with graduated complexity/depth throughout the semester that were revised by the students
  - Professor, Lab TA, and student peer reviews – leading to assignment revisions
  - Laboratory synthesis report – not revised

All WI course criteria were accommodated

Our Concerns and Problems that had to be Addressed

- Making writing components at least 30% of the course grade significantly reduced grade% associated with the lab, problem sets, and lecture exams
- Student workload far exceeded that in other upper division courses
- The extra faculty workload made it hard to find faculty teaching other core courses who were willing to participate in the WI program

Our Solution

In 2004, we proposed to the Campus Writing Board that we be allowed to distribute our upper division B.S. writing intensive instruction among our four upper division core courses

Our Basic Premises

- Students would benefit from broader exposure to writing in multiple courses with multiple professors
- More faculty involvement in the WI program would promote the importance of student writing

Changes We Made

- Spread our upper division WI requirement for the B.S. over four core courses (10-20 students/course)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Winter Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>Sedimentary Env (Lab)</td>
<td>Structure (Lab)/Petrology (Lab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>Plate Tectonics (Bed Env)</td>
<td>Petrology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The four courses are taught by six different professors who all complete the CWP faculty workshop
- There are fewer writing assignments/course, but more total writing assignments (and pages written)
- Department-funded teaching assistants help faculty during the review process
- One responsible faculty member coordinates the program

Things that Remaining the Same

- There is a progression in assignment complexity from the early, Jr. year, courses to the Sr. year courses
- All CWP writing intensive criteria are met or exceeded over the four-course sequence

Advantages of This Approach

- Students receive greater breadth of writing experiences from more faculty members
- More faculty members are involved in improving student’s writing skills, & committed to WI program
- Distributes the workload of faculty members involved in teaching writing skills within our curriculum
- Allows for 10-15% grading from writing in each course, not detracting from other course material
Assessing Academic Program Assessment

Julie Brandt, PhD; Pat Okker, PhD; Mardy Eimers, PhD; John Spencer, PhD; and Gera Burton, PhD
Contact information: Julie Brandt; brandtju@missouri.edu; 884-7372

Background
• In 2010, MU invited by the Higher Learning Commission to pilot new model of accreditation
• Shift from satisfaction with basic requirements to a culture of “aspiration and continual improvement”
• Must undertake a major improvement initiative
• MU’s Project: Academic Program Assessment
• Created Academic Program Assessment (APA) team
• Provost’s Office, Institutional Research, Quality Improvement (QI), Assessment
• Began incremental implementation in 2011

Assessment of Program Assessment
• APA team felt it was necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the new process and outcomes
• Survey sent via Qualtrics to first two cohorts (AY 2011-12; AY 2012-13)
  • Included all who helped write assessment (chairs, faculty, and staff)
  • Open and closed ended questions
• APA team reflections on team process
• Continuous tracking conducted by Assessment and Quality Improvement

Opportunities for Improvement
• Only 24% of programs have worked with QI; 41% worked with Assessment
• More structured guidance on learning objectives and plans for improvement
• Length of process (> than a year in most cases)
• Why conduct program assessment and discipline specific accreditation?
• Annual updates were not happening
• Sporadic communication between APA team about communication with programs

Current Process Timeline
• Programs are chosen - @17 annually (August)
• APA team meets with programs (October)
• Template and comparative data provided
• Draft of assessment prepared by programs (October-May)
• Draft submitted to APA team; feedback provided (May-July)
• Program submits final copy (June-September)
• Meeting with Provost et al (July-December)
• Provide annual update (not fully established)

Strengths of Current Process
• Template helpful in terms of knowing what to include (95% approval both years)
• Comparative data interesting/helpful for making plans
• One-on-one assistance (when requested) from the APA Team was useful
• Feedback provided by APA team on assessment drafts is specific and improves assessment
• Meeting with Provost gives program visibility and helps programs understand campus perspective

Adjustments and Next Steps
• Direct communication from APA team during writing of program assessment (see Figure 1)
• Create additional QI and Assessment templates (e.g., strategic planning)
• More clarity around the audience for program assessment
• Create and implement a process for managing annual updates (see Figure 2)
• Create a tracking and communication system for the APA team

Figures

Figure 1: Revised Academic Program Assessment

Figure 2: Number of Programs Currently Engaged in Program Assessment

The dear number of programs now involved in this continuous process (n=46) makes it difficult to manage annual updates. This was an unforeseen consequence. The APA team will create a process that will ensure that each program is communicating with annually and receive help in achieving their plans for improvement.
ALLEN ANGEL CAPITAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

HOW DO WE DO IT?
The Allen Fund leverages the following significant resources to teach students about angel investing:

- A grant from the Evan P. Kaufman Foundation, Shriver Foundation, and contributions from Trulaske.
- A partnership with a professional angel network located in mid-Missouri. The Allen Fund is a full member of this group, assisting in providing due diligence and other services, and has the ability to invest in startup companies alongside other angels in the network.
- Strong relationships with numerous entrepreneurial organizations at the University of Missouri that serve as potential deal flow.
- An alumni organization that retain former members for educational and deal oversight as well as continuity of Program Information.

INVESTMENTS TO DATE

Robert J. Trulaske, Sr.
College of Business
University of Missouri

W. D. Allen
Web: alienacefund.org
Email: MUBUSAACE@Missouri.edu

The Elemental Enzymes technology allows enzymes to operate under higher temperatures and last longer in harsh environments or industrial processes.
Improving Clinical and Business Outcomes through an Innovative Leadership Academy in Long Term Care

Team Members: Shirley J. Farrah, Alexis Roam
Contact information: Shirley.J.Farrah@missouri.edu; 882-0215

Background Information & Goals

Practicing RNs in leadership roles in nursing homes:
- Have limited formal leadership preparation
- Feel overwhelmed due to regulations and inadequate leadership preparation
- Not ready to lead - few other RNs with whom to form peer networks or consult
- Limited mentors and role models

Nursing homes are Complex Adaptive Systems:
- Highly regulated environment
- Quality of care issues persist
- High turnover of nursing staff
- Top-down leadership no longer works
- New models of leadership are needed

Goals
1) Develop an innovative, evidence-based curriculum, based on complexity science, that could be used as a model to improve nursing home leadership.
2) Prepare RNs who can create and sustain improvement in their nursing home.

RN Leadership Link

Intervention(s)
Implement a formal leadership course, Enhanced leadership Development Academy for RNs in Long Term Care, with following features:
- Official MJ Certificate Program
- 8 days of classes & 2 weekends over 7 months
- ~50 hours CE (continuing education) Credit
- Innovative, evidence-based curriculum
- Complexity science as conceptual framework
- Triangular partnership:
  1) Academic Nursing & Extension
  2) MO Health Care Association
  3) MO Dept. of Health and Senior Services

Strong focus on adult learning strategies:
- Build on participants' prior experiences
- Use past experiences as learning exemplars
- Peer consultation
- Application of content to the practice setting
- Foster scaling collaborative references
- Faculty mentoring/teaching/supervision

Complexity Science as a Framework

Complexity Science

Results/Outcomes

Quantitative
ELDA Enrollment & Completion Rates
7th grade level reading
113 enrolled, 84 completed

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) - Koontz & Pooser® (pre/post-testing)
LPI RATING: SELF - Statistically significant difference between the mean scores on each of the five domains and the entire tool for all cohorts. T-test:

LPI RATING: OTHERS - Statistically significant difference between the mean scores on at least one and sometimes all five domains, except for one cohort. Statistically significant difference on the entire tool for half of the classes.

NOTE: The mean scores for each and every subscale and the total LPI for all cohorts were higher than those reported by the participants themselves. This suggests the Others' perceptions of the participants' leadership skills were higher than those perceived by the participants themselves. This may be due to the fact that the means were calculated by averaging the individual mean scores.

Competency Self-Assessment (CSA) - pre/post-testing
Statistically significant difference for all groups in confidence in performing the leadership competencies. T-test:

REFERENCES

CONCLUSIONS
Participation in innovative and evidence-based CE leadership program over an extended period promotes the development of:
- Transformational leadership behaviors
- Confidence in ability to perform the leadership skills
- Positive change in self-concept
- Job retention of graduates after completion

This model curriculum may be replicated for use by others.
Fostering an environment of success for emerging academics

Introduction
We nurture emerging academics in their coursework, their assistantships, and beyond. Our goal is to provide our doctoral students with the highest levels of marketability on the job front. There's merit to regular evaluation and integration of a holistic approach with doctoral students, especially when it comes to crafting an environment for scholarly success. Here's what we offer to our doctoral students:

Curriculum
- Core curriculum was overhauled in 2006, and we revised our core again in 2012.
- J9000 and J9006 Theory & Research 1 and 2 focus on ensuring knowledge of current theoretical and methodological perspectives in a diverse field. Both qualitative and quantitative theory and research are presented.
- J9010 Research Design is our qualifying examination, and requires students to complete their own original research and submit the paper to our preferred annual meeting to satisfy the requirement.
- J9087 Professional Seminar covers a wide array of topics pertinent to emerging academics (how to write a CV, navigating a job interview, how promotion and tenure work, etc.), as well as teaching pedagogy and best practices. Students take this class every semester.

Assistantships
- **Focus on research**: All incoming PhD students are assigned to research assistantships in the first year, which allows them to jump-start their research agendas.
- **The teaching program**: Students are individually assessed for their teaching experience and language ability, and placed in teaching program at the best starting point:
  - **Shadow**: students observe doctoral faculty teach undergraduate courses
  - **Teaching Assistant**: students grade and begin to lead class discussion and gives presentations
  - **Discussion Leader**: students lead discussion and writing labs for our large lecture courses (2000 News Writing, 2010 Multimedia, etc.)
  - **Graduate Instructor of Record**: students design and teach, under supervision, an undergraduate course of their own.

Outcomes
- Students have been placed at many top-tier research institutions, including: Kansas, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Texas Tech and Michigan State.

Beyond
- **Outside opportunities**: We heavily promote Preparing Future Faculty, the Minor in College Teaching, the Certificate in Online Teaching, and colloquium series in other departments.
- **Mizzou Mafia**: We guide students to develop relationships with our alumni base, as this networking often leads to job interviews and additional research opportunities.
- **Assessment**: We encourage our students and alumni to assess our program regularly, asking for feedback on an annual basis and making exit interviews a requirement.