

Stewardship Goal Team Report

University of Texas-Pan American Goal One

Stewardship teams were charged with reviewing the six goals of the University from the perspective of the degree to which UTPA has fulfilled the goals. The Stewardship committee was subdivided into six teams and each team was assigned a university goal. Each team was provided various reports and information from all divisions and units and given guidelines regarding specific information to be gleaned from the reports. The following is a synopsis of all six goal team final reports.

COMMON THREADS:

- All goals were met to some degree but none were completely fulfilled.
- A consistent difficulty mentioned across all goals was an apparent lack of understanding of exactly what and how to incorporate appropriate information into the TracDat system. More training in this area was suggested as well as noting that with time all divisions and units would become more proficient at providing proper information.
- All reporting units mentioned the need for developing methodologies for collecting data.
- All units recognized the need and potential for UTPA to collaborate with community entities on events/programs that expose the University community to more global perspectives.
- All divisions and units made concerted efforts to evaluate how they could contribute to the fulfillment of each goal.

- There was a pattern between the academic and some non-academic divisions of the University concerning the level of seriousness each goal was given.
- The academic units focused on retention of faculty, course scheduling, and time to graduation while the non-academic side focused more on retention of students, training of staff, and upgraded software/equipment to help the end product be more effective and efficient.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Assessment methods need to be stated more concretely so that the criteria for success can be more appropriately answered.
- Need a campus-wide initiative for defining how to incorporate students into research activities.
- Strategies need to be developed at the institutional level to assess future infrastructure needs to support research.
- Consistent outcomes in TracDat would be helpful to evaluate success. Academic units had global outcome based on Provost AES; while non-academic units had differing outcomes.
- More detail in assessment reports would be more helpful in evaluating extent of success.
- Create an Assistant VP for PK-16 collaboration in the Undergraduate Studies office.

The following are individual recommendations for each of the six goals:

GOAL 1 – Provide students a quality educational experience that enables them to complete their education goals in a timely fashion:

- Need a clearer definition for “quality educational experience in a timely manner”.
- All divisional level reports must be completed.
- Need to improve data collection process.
- If no external measures such as certification or licensure are required, use national standards or model programs for comparisons.
- Student learning outcomes evidence should drive curriculum and instruction changes.
- More training on use of TracDat.

GOAL 2 – Become an outstanding research institution, emphasizing collaborative partnerships and entrepreneurship.

- All divisions need to more comprehensively align strategies for their support of research.
- Finally, strategies should be developed at the institutional level to assess future infrastructure needs to support research.
- Not all units aligning strategies with this goal rolled up into the summary report. As the university community becomes more familiar with the tool, the linkages should function better.

GOAL 3 – Enhance UTPA’s engagement with the community to meet challenges and maximize opportunities:

- Need a concise, clear definition of “community engagement.” As the University further develops a sense of its mission, the service it provides to the surrounding community has taken on even more importance. AES data reveals competing perspectives about the nature and meaning of this mission.
- Institutional units should collaborate to pool resources for community engagement. AES reports repeatedly indicate duplication of effort without articulated awareness that other units are similarly engaged in the same endeavor.
- Faculty and staff should be offered incentives for participating in community service initiatives. If incentives are not feasible, faculty and staff should be appropriately mentored so that they recognize the value of community service in meeting personal, professional, and research goals.
- Community engagement information should be reported in quantifiable terms. AES reports are inconsistent and incomplete; few units offered quantifiable data, thereby making it difficult to assess yearly progress toward community engagement goals.
- Significant institutional, unit, division, and/or individual accomplishments in the area of community engagement should be prominently reported and highlighted in appropriate institutional, regional, and national publications.

GOAL 4 – Collaborate with P-12 schools to enlarge the pool of applicants who are personally prepared and academically qualified for high education.

- Create an Assistant Vice President for PK-16 Collaboration in the Undergraduate Studies Office of the Division of Academic Affairs .

GOAL 5 – Infuse Inter-American and global perspectives throughout the University community:

- Consistent outcomes would be helpful. Most academic reporting units had one overarching, global outcome based on the Provost's AES plan and the non-academic administrative units had different outcomes. A common reporting format might be helpful, having either one global outcome or several more specific outcomes that are shared between divisions.
- Future assessment of these criteria may show which criteria are important to pursue and whether Academic Affairs needs to continue pursuing each of these criteria.
- Where collaborations exist between academic and non-academic units, assuring that all units report comparable outcomes may require coordinated strategic action planning.
- The reports would be more helpful if the assessment results contained more detail. Several reports show significant increase in production and effort; however, it might be well worth the effort to expand each report to include a narrative explanation of each department's results as they relate to fulfilling the University's goal as a whole.

- Consideration might also be given to the reporting deadlines. The faculty representatives from our committee noted that many departments gather the necessary information for their reports from faculty merit folders that do not become readily available to the administration at the department level until well into September of the academic year. In contrast, the TracDat reports are due at the end of each fiscal year which may be too early for a complete report by most academic units.

GOAL 6 – Optimize institutional effectiveness and efficiency consistent with high quality organizational standards:

- Although most colleges (COED, COSE, COBA, COAH, COHSHS, COSBS) are/have developed a two- year departmental master schedule, not all colleges have implemented such plans/schedules. Thus, there is inconclusive data (criterion not met).
- Most colleges have most courses at capacity. While for some colleges the criterion for assessment has been met, other colleges have indicated “Inconclusive” (i.e., Criterion not Met).
- For some colleges, the hiring ads were not approved on time. Thus, delays in the hiring process were experienced by those colleges.
- According to the reports reviewed, most colleges do have their respective Means of Assessment and the colleges are following their plans. But their Assessment of Results indicates that there some colleges which have “Inconclusive Results,” and/or “Criterion Not Met.” Thus, their Means of

Assessment Plan(s) needs to be revisited/evaluated in order to modify such Plan(s).

- The *Assessment Methods* need to be reviewed to reflect more concretely what is being assessed. Similarly, several of the *Criteria for Success* were stated ambiguously. That is, no clear statements were made as to how the evaluation/assessment would be done.