

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW 2002-2003
 UNIVERSITY PROGRAM REVIEW COUNCIL'S EVALUATION
 for the

 University Learning Center _____
 SERVICE/RESEARCH CENTER

I. COUNCIL'S GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE CENTER

Essentially serves as the primary provider of the University's staff but does little faculty development and is not viewed by faculty as a provider of faculty development. There appears to be potential for some duplication of effort with Continuing Education and CETL efforts. The Center is currently housed organizationally under Center for Leadership, Ethics and Character, however there appears to be no obvious relationship to the mission of CLEC.

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

PRODUCTIVITY INDICATORS

II. Summary of Center's Overall Productivity	Very strong	Strong
Council's Observations:		

Have developed partnerships with campus units to provide a good variety of staff development courses; unclear extent of services provided for faculty or extent of faculty participation. CETL is not listed as one of the Learning Center's partners which leads to a conclusion that duplication of efforts may be occurring.

II A. Fulfillment of the Center's Purpose & Attainment of Goals	Very strong	Strong
Council's Observations:		

Provides good variety of staff development courses; unclear how it serves the faculty in a substantial way.

II B. Services Rendered by the Center to the Campus Community	Very Strong	Very strong
Council's Observations:		

Offers a wide variety of staff development topics and partners with a variety of campus units to provide training for staff.

II C. Services Rendered by the Center to External Communities	No Rating	No Rating
Council's Observations:		

This has not been their mission in past, but indicate that this is changing. Report documents that plans are being made to partner with other institutions to provide collaborative professional development opportunities but no details are provided. Will this be revenue generating or a service?

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
<p>II D. Grants & Contracts Acquired by the Center Council's Observations: No activity reported although there might be possibilities if model staff development is being provided.</p>	No rating	Very weak
<p>II E. Center Publications, Reports, & Professional Presentations Council's Observations: No evidence of any publications or presentations given. Catalog and newsletters were cited but these are marketing materials.</p>	Very strong	Weak
<p>II F. Sponsorships, Endowments & Gifts Acquired for the Center Council's Observations: Resources for Center are provided by annual University budget. No evidence of soliciting additional support.</p>	No rating	Weak
<p>II G. Sales, Service Fees, & Income Generating Activity Council's Observations: CEUs are reported through Continuing Education as part of total CEUS generated by KSU that produces formula funding from the GA Legislature to the Board of Regents. Report makes reference to the “Centralization of employee development opportunities” which is accurate for staff but not for faculty development.</p>	No rating	Satisfactory
<p>II H. Return on Investment Council's Observations: Number of staff served and number of courses offered appear strong. Report indicates that no research has been done to show the effects of professional development on employee retention at KSU. Need to provide data that show that outcomes produce positive results at KSU. Financial data show that outsourcing the training programs would have cost essentially the same as it cost for the Center to do the work—would outsourcing be better? No data is provided to answer that question. When travel time and costs are added, it appears that there is value to do the programs in-house rather than having them out-sourced but this does not address quality of instruction or benefit to KSU.</p>	Not rated	Satisfactory

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
II I. Contribution to Achieving KSU's Mission Council's Observations: Center is clearly consistent with University mission.	Very strong	Strong

QUALITY INDICATORS

III. Summary Conclusions About the Strength of the Center's Overall Quality Council's Observations: Offerings appear to be of strong quality and appropriate for staff development needs; whether this is appropriate place for faculty development needs to be examined.	Strong	Strong
III A. Public Recognition, Honors & Awards Received by the Center Council's Observations: Received 2 awards for staff development programs.	No rating	Satisfactory
III B. Stakeholder Satisfaction with the Center's Work & Accomplishments Council's Observations: No data provided to substantiate strong rating.	Strong	No rating
III C. Other Assessments of the Quality of the Center's Work Council's Observations: Repeats information given in IIA as evidence to answer this category.	No rating	Satisfactory

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
<p>III D. Center's Responsiveness to State Needs & Changing Conditions Council's Observations: Provides evidence of providing programs to prepare employees to be aware and knowledgeable of changing State and local demographics and technology demands. No evidence to show that provide effective faculty development.</p>	Strong	Strong
<p>III E. Quality of the Faculty & Staff Supporting the Center Council's Observations Director and secretary well qualified. Concern is that 32% of instructors teaching in the program have a bachelor's degree or less (15% have "on the job training" and no degree). No data provided to substantiate credentials or level of expertise of instructors without academic credentials. If truly doing faculty development, they need to consider having more than 15% of instructors doctoral prepared.</p>	Very strong	Strong
<p>III F. Quality of KSU Facilities & Equipment Supporting the Center Council's Observations: Very nice facilities and equipment</p>	Strong	Strong
<p>III G. Quality of the Overall Annual Financial Investment in the Operation of the Center Council's Observations: Institutional investment is strong.</p>	Strong	Strong
<p>III H. Quality of Advanced Technology Available to the Center Council's Observations: Technology support is strong for office and presentations. No data is provided to show what technology is available for technology courses.</p>	Strong	Satisfactory
<p>III I. Leadership Position of the Center Council's Observations: Center provides data to show they have offered more course opportunities than comparable State institutions over a three-month period. No other leadership measure is given or supported.</p>	Strong	Satisfactory

<u>Focus of Evaluation</u>	<u>Self-Study Eval</u>	<u>Council's Eval</u>
----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

IV. CENTER'S VIABILITY AT KSU

Viabile

Viabile

Council's Observations:

Staff development efforts of this Center are appropriate for a University. Why it is housed under CLEC is not clear and the Council questioned if the Center should be consolidated with other University units such as Human Resources or Continuing Education. Faculty development activities appear to be negligible and seemed not to be a true function of the Center.

V. MODEL CENTER POTENTIAL

Council's Observations:

Self-study indicates they are poised to become a model program. More data is needed to substantiate this claim especially in light of scant data positioning them in a leadership position.

VI. COUNCIL'S OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE PLANS FOR IMPROVING QUALITY & PRODUCTIVITY

The plans for improvement included several items for expanding offerings and instructor base and modifying marketing techniques. A needs assessment on staff development needs should be conducted.

VII. EXPAND, MAINTAIN CONSOLIDATE, OR DISCONTINUE

Maintain/consolidate

Council's Observations:

Recommend maintain the Center for providing staff development, but assessment should be made about where these functions are most appropriately housed to avoid duplication of effort in tight budget times. Faculty development activities should be centered under CETL and the VP for Academic Affairs to maximize appropriate distribution of resources.

COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDED FOLLOW-UP

The issues of duplication of efforts with other campus units and appropriate location for a comprehensive staff development center needs to be addressed.