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INTRODUCTION

Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, authorizes grants to developing institutions in the areas of faculty and curriculum development, administrative and fiscal improvement, development capability, and student services. The University of the Virgin Islands was awarded a five-year (2007-2012) grant in the Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities Program. This report reflects the mid-grant formative assessment of the second and third year (2008-2010) of the grant cycle. In keeping with its commitment to accountability the University decided to have its program evaluated by a team of external evaluators to determine program consonance with the stated objectives and with federal regulations and guidelines. Utilizing a bid process, the University selected Associates for Institutional Development, Inc., Red Oak, Georgia, to conduct a formative evaluation of the grant period. This report represents the findings of that visit. The evaluators were as follows: Dr. Haywood L. Strickland, President, Associates for Institutional Development, Inc., Red Oak, Georgia; Dr. Gloria James, Senior Program Associate, AID, Inc., Red Oak, Georgia; Dr. Laura Dawson, The Dawson Group, Midlothian, Virginia; and Dr. Leonard E. Dawson, The Dawson Group, Midlothian, Virginia. None of these consultants had other professional engagements or relationships with the University. The evaluation was conducted October 13-15, 2010. Dr. Laura Dawson also facilitated a workshop on writing measureable objectives.

Specific objectives of the evaluation are delineated below, and they reflect the guidelines established for the evaluation as follows:

1. Assess and evaluate the status of each of the University’s Title III activities in relation to its stated objectives, milestones and performance evaluation measures.
2. Assess the internal monitoring procedures used by the Title III Director and the University to plan, manage and evaluate the total Title III efforts.
3. Review activity budgets and expenditures and assess them in regards to grant compliance and activity projections.
4. Determine the impact to date of the activities on the University.

The evaluators met with Mr. Dayle Barry, Title III Coordinator, for the purpose of discussing the evaluation process, and for determining what documentation would be needed to carry out the evaluation efforts. The evaluators reviewed the documentation and other relevant
program materials provided by the Title III Office. Structured interviews and conferences were conducted with the Title III activity directors and other key personnel. Files and records were examined, and program site visits were made in order to gather the information which formed the basis of this evaluation. Extensive materials and documentation were provided by internet prior to the team visit. Other documentation was provided on-site.

**The Evaluation Model**

In assessing the Title III Program activities, the evaluators observed resources, procedures and outcomes of each activity. Where possible, the evaluation centered on whether the planned program goals were met in the form of observable outcomes achieved within the time frame and budget of the individual activity. In the very few cases where the observable outcomes fell short of the goals, the evaluators assessed both the procedures and the resources that were in the process of leading to the desired outcomes, as well as parts of the outcomes that had surfaced. In short, the evaluators attempted to determine the status of both the outcomes and the processes of each of the Title III activities at the University of the Virgin Islands.

Three basic questions guided the information gathering process and served as the evaluation model:

- What are the desired outcomes of the program and at what state of the development or accomplishment are they?
- What are the program procedures and activities and how are they expected to result in the desired observable outcomes?
- What resources (inputs) including the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of people, funding, equipment, supplies, training, initial plans and strategies are being used to form the procedures and activities that lead to the desired outcomes?

As a result of document review and interviews with appropriate faculty, staff and administrators, the following information was ascertained:

- Institutional goals over the Title III grant period.
- Institutional goals over the current academic year.
- Specific objectives over the Title III grant period.
- Specific objectives accomplished to date and corresponding performance evaluation measures with documentation.
♦ Specific objectives in progress for the year, if not completed, and projected time of completion.
♦ Specific objectives accomplished to date.
♦ Statistics (number of consultants used, number of students served, number of faculty served, workshops held or attended, etc.)
♦ Impact on the institution.
♦ Problems encountered.
♦ Staff or faculty recommendations.
♦ Balance to date.
♦ Percent of budget spent to date.
♦ Number of meetings held and purpose of meetings.
♦ Recommendations.

Needs Assessment

A variety of procedures and studies was used at the beginning of the University’s involvement in Title III to determine the needs of students, faculty and administration. These processes have provided an ongoing needs assessment capability for subsequent Title III requests. Examples of the methodologies used are listed below:

♦ Studies of student performance and persistence;
♦ Discussions about the curriculum and academic programming;
♦ Classroom observations and reports;
♦ Studies of the University’s administration and management;
♦ The use of comprehensive long-range planning studies;
♦ Annual Reports of the University and various fiscal reports.

Documentation was provided to verify the fact that the University’s constituencies (faculty, staff, administration, and alumni and local community representatives) impacted the needs assessment process.

The evaluators concluded that the Title III Program Activities at the University of the Virgin Islands are well administered and coordinated.
The schedule reflects the on-site visit of the evaluation team, as they conducted interviews, examined records and reports, and observed demonstrations and inspected various project sites in campus.

The evaluation ratings scale ranges from NR for objectives which have not been addressed to 5.0 for activities totally completed at the time of the evaluation.

The following scale is used to indicate the level of achievement:

1. No significant progress
2. Performance less than 50% of measure
3. Performance between 50% and 90% measure
4. Performance within 100% of measure
5. Performance exceeds measure by more than 10%
Title III Internal Evaluation Site Visit Schedule
Associates for Institutional Development
October 13-15, 2010

Tuesday, October 12, 2010
AID Arrives

Wednesday, October 13, 2010

*Project Interviews*

8:00-9:00—Project Administration Orientation
9:00-10:00—CATS Interviews w/ Dr. Edwin (ACC 2nd Floor Conference Rm)
10:00-11:00—Project Administration (ACC 3rd Floor Conf. Rm)- HLS
11:00-12:00—Sponsored Programs Administration (ACC Rm 224-OSP Office)-James
11:00-12:00-- Enrollment Management Records/ Financial Aid (ACC 2nd Floor Conf. Rm)- Dawson

12:00-1:15  **LUNCH**

1:30-2:30—Transitioning University Systems Forward (ACC 3rd Floor CIO Office) – Dawson
1:30-2:30—Chemistry Infrastructure Improvements (ACC 2nd Floor Conf. Rm)- James
2:30-3:30—CATS Interview w/ L. Wymer and Dr. Lord (ACC 2nd Floor Conf. Rm)- James
3:00-4:00—Interview with the President

Thursday, October 14, 2010

9:00-11:00—Objective Writing Workshop (Chase Auditorium Rm B110 and EVC 401 on St. Croix)

12:00-1:15  **LUNCH**

1:30-2:30—GIS Curriculum (ACC 3rd Floor Conf. Rm)- James
2:00-3:00—Title III Endowment and Online Giving (Institutional Advancement Conf. Rm)- Dawson
2:30-3:30—Institutional Research and Planning (ACC Rm 227)- Dawson

3:00-4:00—CATS Interview(St. Croix)- James

Friday, October 15, 2010

9:00-10:00—Wrap up / Report Preparation (ACC 2nd Floor Conf. Rm)
10:30-11:30—Exit Interview (President’s Office)
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Introduction

Program Administration provides staffing for the ongoing programmatic, fiscal monitoring and evaluation of the Title III funded activities at UVI. Daily oversight and management is entrusted to the Title III Coordinator, who also serves as Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs. This individual, Mr. Dayle Barry, commits 85% of his time to administration. He reports to the Director of Sponsored Programs who is supported 30% time by the Title III Program. Although Mr. Barry does not report directly to the President, he submits appropriate reports and documents to him and consults with him directly as needed. It is observed that a new President, Dr. David Hall, was appointed near the end of the 2008-2009 grant year. Staff also includes a Grants Administration Specialist (85% time) who assists in the day-to-day monitoring activities. General oversight is provided by the Director of Sponsored Programs. A Grants Accountant whose salary was supported 100% by the University provided fiscal monitoring and implementation. In 2009-2010, a web developer was employed on a part-time basis to maintain the Title III/CCRAA website.

Staff corresponded with the Department of Education and grants officers on matters related to successful program implementation. Specifically, Program Administration had the responsibility to (1) assure the projected activities are carried out as stipulated in the Comprehensive Development Plan and the Revised Plan of Operation; (2) facilitate the maximum impact of the activities on the University’s mission and goals; (3) serve as institutional spokesperson for the Title III Program; (4) Implement monitoring and evaluation activities; and (5) Ensure fiscal integrity.

The written Policies and Procedures manual was updated in order to ensure that grant terms and conditions were followed properly in keeping with EDGAR’s regulations and policies, institutional directives and with the policies of the government of the Virgin Islands.

The Coordinator and the Grants Specialist meet on a regular basis with activity directors, monitor and review fiscal expenditures, prepare required reports, and maintain administrative oversight to help ensure that program activities comply with grant conditions, rules and regulations.
The following objectives and performance indicators have been established for Program Administration.

**2008-2009**

**Objective 1:** Ensure that the rate of unspent funds at the end of the fiscal year (September 30, 2009) does not exceed 22% of the 2008-2009 project award.

**Performance Indicators:**

a. Reduced risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.
b. Completion of not less than 78% of the established project goals/ objectives for the 2008-2009 grant year and reduced risk of award reduction.

**Status:** This objective was exceeded.

**Rating:** 5.0

**Objective 2:** Upgrade staff skills by providing at least 20 hours of grants management / sponsored projects administration training to Title III Project Administration staff by September 30, 2009.

**Performance Indicators:**

a. Improve staff capability with regard to providing assistance to Project Activity Directors.
b. Reduce risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.

**Status:** Documentation demonstrated that this was met.

**Rating:** 4.0
**Objective 3:** Ensure that institutional and program policies are clearly communicated to Activity Directors and program staff through the preparation and distribution of a revised Policies and Procedures Manual by November 30, 2008.

**Performance Indicators:**

a. Activity Directors will have better understanding of institution’s expectations of them as they utilize those resources made available through the Title III HBCU grant Program.

b. Reduced risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.

**Status:** This objective was achieved.

**Rating:** 4.5

**Objective 4:** Comply with all submittal deadlines established by the US Department of Education within the 2008-2009 grant year.

**Performance Indicators:** Reduced risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.

**Status:** Program Administration submitted all required reports in a timely manner. Results for budget and programmatic changes were also submitted.

**Rating:** 5.0
Objective 1: Ensure that the rate of unspent funds at the end of the fiscal year (September 30, 2010) does not exceed 22% of the 2008-2009 project award.

Performance Indicators: a. Reduced risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.
   b. Completion of not less than 78% of the established project goals/ objectives for the 2008-2009 grant year and reduced risk of award reduction.

Status: Accomplished.
Program Administration continues to exceed the indicators established for this objective.

Rating: 5.0

Objective 2: Upgrade staff skills by providing at least 20 hours of grants management / sponsored projects administration training to Title III Project Administration staff by September 30, 2010.

Performance Indicators: a. Improve staff capability with regard to providing assistance to Project Activity Directors.
   b. Reduce risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.

Status: Achieved.
Staff training is an ongoing at UVI. The leadership provides ongoing technical assistance to the project directors.

Rating: 4.5
**Objective 3:** By September 30, 2010, ensure that the quarterly reporting form is capable of gathering 30% of the data needed for the Annual Performance Report, up from the current 8%.

**Performance Indicator:** Reduce need for additional data gathering for preparation of the 2010 Annual Performance Report for the Title III Part B program.

**Status:** Delayed.
Staff is waiting for USED to complete the revision to the form.

**Rating:** NR

**Objective 4:** Ensure that institutional and program policies are clearly communicated to Activity Directors and program staff through the preparation and distribution of a revised Policies and Procedures Manual by November 30, 2009.

**Performance Indicators:**

a. Activity Directors will have better understanding of institution’s expectations of them as they utilize those resources made available through the Title III HBCU grant Program.

b. Reduced risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.

**Status:** Achieved.
Staff completed this objective in March 2010.

**Rating:** 4.5
Objective 5: Comply with all submittal deadlines established by the US Department of Education within the 2008-2009 grant year.

Performance Indicators: Reduced risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.

Status: This objective continues to be implemented in a quality manner. The liaison activities with the USED is exemplary.

Rating: 4.5

Each of the objectives and performance indicators is in process of implementation. They will be ongoing to ensure effective monitoring of the grant.

The criteria functions for evaluation of Program Administration were as follows: (1) coordination function; (2) liaison function between the University and the U.S. Department of Education; (3) fiscal control of Title III funds; and (4) conducting internal and external evaluations.

A. Coordination

Program Administration was responsible for the coordination of all aspects of the Title III Program. Coordination activities include monitoring, responding to requests, insuring effective communication and general oversight. The Title III Policies and Procedures Manual facilitated the implementation of project activities and provided the parameters for the activities. Quarterly meetings were held with the President and activity directors concerning Title III activities and regulators and guidelines. Periodic meetings were also held to monitor the implementation of the activities. Minutes of the meetings were available for review. Oral and written reports are required from each of the Title III activities on program progress at the quarterly meetings. Reports were on file.

Function Rating: 5.0
B. **Liaison Function**

The Coordinator serves as the designated official liaison to represent UVI in matters with the U.S. Department of education regarding the Title III Program. The evaluator examined records to verify that this function is executed in a quality manner. The information reviewed clearly indicates that all program changes were officially requested and approved for the activities involved. The files and records containing documentation with respect to Title III regulations were examined and found to be appropriate. The Title III staff represented the University in all meetings and activities that required interpretation of the program to various publics. Title III related meetings were attended by the Coordinator on behalf of the University when such meetings were held.

**Function Rating: 5.0**

C. **Fiscal Function**

Program Administration provided overall supervision for this function and signed off on requisitions, etc. as amended as mandated. The day-to-day fiscal monitoring is the responsibility of the Grants Specialist and the Grants Accountant. They review all documents for accuracy in budgeting and expenditures and employ a pre-encumbrance system to be sure that categories are not overspent. Staff also works with the university fiscal office on reconciliations. Staff checks and approves all personnel action forms for Title III funded staff, conducts conferences with activity directors on budget and grant procedures, reviews and processes requisitions, travel requests, etc. and helps prepare fiscal reports.

**Functional Rating: 5.0**

**Evaluation Function**

Program Administration is responsible for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of Title III activities. Documentation verifies that the monitoring activities were executed as planned. Internal evaluation was ongoing. Following a prescribed
bidding process, UVI selected Associates for Institutional Development, Inc. Red Oak, Georgia to conduct the Title III External Evaluations. This report reflects the findings of the assessment at mid-point in the grant cycle.

**Rating: 5.0**

**October 8, 2010 Project Expenditure Monitoring Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Original ’10 Budget</th>
<th>Revised ’10 Budget</th>
<th>Expended**</th>
<th>% Expended</th>
<th>$Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Approach to Retention, Progression &amp; Graduation</td>
<td>$306,921.00</td>
<td>306,921.00</td>
<td>109,081.17</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$116,839.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Chemistry Program Infrastructure</td>
<td>$218,645.00</td>
<td>218,645.00</td>
<td>145,707.92</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$72,937.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitioning Forward University Systems</td>
<td>$757,324.00</td>
<td>757,324.00</td>
<td>827,034.73</td>
<td>109%</td>
<td>$(69,710.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Curriculum</td>
<td>$103,253.00</td>
<td>103,253.00</td>
<td>63,930.83</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>$39,322.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III Endowment</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>$185,606.00</td>
<td>185,606.00</td>
<td>160,515.62</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$25,090.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$1,591,749.00</td>
<td>$1,591,749.00</td>
<td>$1,392,270.27</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$199,478.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In FY 10, there have not yet been any adjustments to project budgets.

** Includes revised expenditures and encumbrances as of September 30, 2010, reflected on Banner on October 8, 2010.

**Includes $189,520.97 in encumbrances**

Lower than expected spending.

Very low spending

The following travel was undertaken by program administration staff in support of the objectives.

**FY 2008-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traveler</th>
<th>Workshop/Conference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date of Travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dayle Barry</td>
<td>National Association of HBCU Title III</td>
<td>Memphis, TN</td>
<td>June 22-27, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveler</td>
<td>Workshop/Conference</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date of Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayle Barry</td>
<td>2009 National HBCU Week Conference Management Concepts’ grant training course</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>August 29-September 3, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayle Barry</td>
<td>“Federal Grants Update”</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>July 9-11, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayle Barry</td>
<td>Evaluation 101-Intro to Evaluation Practice</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>November 9-11, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarelle A. Berkeley, Sr.</td>
<td>2010 Title III Directors’ Meeting</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>March 28-April 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Ephraim</td>
<td>2010 Title III Directors’ Meeting</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>March 28-April 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayle Barry</td>
<td>2010 Title III Directors’ Meeting</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>March 28-April 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarelle A. Berkeley, Sr.</td>
<td>National Association of HBCU Title III Administrators’ Technical Assistance Workshop</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>June 20-25, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayle Barry</td>
<td>National Association of HBCU Title III Administrators’ Technical Assistance Workshop</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>June 20-25, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2009-2010**

**Problems Encountered**

The University continues to have some challenges with the Banner System. Accurate up to date fiscal reports are not always available to Title III Administration. Activity Directors often don’t
submit required reports in a timely manner. There are continuing problems in the implementation of the CATS activity.

Adequacy of Resources
The funds provided were sufficient to allow full implementation of each activity. As is indicated in the chart below all but one of the activities had funds remaining at the end of September 30, 2010.

Summary
Title III funds are critical to the University if it is to successfully accomplish its strategic goals delineated in VISION2012. The Title III Activities are aligned with VISION2012 goals. It is clear that the Territory is unable to provide the necessary resources to strengthen the University sufficiently to ensure that its mission can be effectively addressed. The activities that are being supported by Title III strengthens the University in general and contributes greatly to its various administrative academic and student offerings.

Recommendations
That the University continues to work to eliminate the Banner challenges.

That the President consider writing a recommendation to the Activity Directors concerning the delinquent reports.

That more coherence be established for the various student success activities.

Persons Interviewed
Mr. Dayle Barry, Title III Coordinator and Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs
Mr. Jarelle Berkley, Grants Administration Specialist

Documents Reviewed
Plan of Operation
Budgets
Financial Statements
Policies and Procedures Manual
Time & Effort Reports
Travel Reports
Monitoring Reports
Quarterly Reports
Inventory
Annual Performance Reports
Site Visit Report
Correspondence
TRANSITIONING UNIVERSITY SYSTEMS FORWARD
Ms. Tina M. Koopmans, Activity Director
Dr. Laura R. Dawson, Evaluator

Introduction
The Information and Technology Services (ITS) Component of the University of the Virgin Islands provided leadership for the implementation of a third year (FY 2008-2009) and fourth year (FY 2009-2010) of grant funding from the Title III Part B Program. The activity, Transitioning University Systems Forward, supported two priorities of the University’s Vision 2012 Strategic Long-Range Plan: (1) The Plan for Curriculum and Technology Support, which created a technology support system for faculty and students to enhance teaching and learning outcomes; and (2) The Enterprise Applications Improvement Plan to implement new business processes supported by appropriate technology to streamline workflow and enable staff to provide improved support to internal customers and students. Areas of focus for the Banner Enterprise Improvement Plan include the following:

- Enrollment Management Services
- Administration and Finance Services
- Human Resources, and
- Library Services

Ms. Tina Koopmans, UVI’s Chief Information Officer, served as the Activity Director for this activity at no cost to the grant. This evaluation report addresses the progress made toward achieving the activity objectives, related benchmarks, and performance indicators funded for implementation by UVI during the two-year period FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010.

Findings
The FY 2008-2009 Plan of Operation for the Transitioning University Systems Forward activity lists five (5) objectives and five (5) anticipated results. The FY 2009-2010 Plan of Operation for this activity lists seven (7) objectives and seven (7) anticipated results. The
objectives, benchmarks, and anticipated results, as specified in the annual plans of operation for each fiscal year are shown below and followed by a discussion of the status of each objective and an assigned rating.

**Objective 1:** By 2012, increase to 90% the number of faculty consistently using the instructional technologies available at UVI.

*By FY 2008-2009 increase to 60%....
By FY 2009-2010 increase to 80%....*

**Anticipated Results: 1.1** A system for collaboration with faculty associates and external partners for peer mentoring will be documented and formalized through the Provost's office; a process for the discovery and implementation of new technology will be established to facilitate expanded use of technology for teaching and research.

**Status:** Very Good Progress toward Objective 1. Benchmark for FY 2008-2009 Exceeded; Benchmark for FY 2009-2010 Slightly Behind Projection. *It should be noted, that after the encouraging results achieved in year one (i.e., FY 2007-2008) of this activity, the initial five-year projected outcome of 80% was increased to 90%.*

The FY 2008-2009 benchmark, which projects a 60% increase in faculty “consistently using the instructional technologies available at UVI,” has been exceeded by 3%, with a 63% faculty participation. However, the FY 2009-2010 benchmark of 80% of faculty consistently using UVI instructional technologies has not been met. The actual outcome is 72% (i.e., 10 percent less than the projection). According to the activity director, Ms. Tina Koopmans, the benchmark was not fully reached, because during FY 2009-2010 the size of the faculty was reduced by approximately 30 members. Reportedly, many of the faculty who left the University during that year was among the most active faculty members participating in on-campus technology training. Consequently, the projected outcome was negatively impacted. The outcome for FY 2009-2010 is still viewed by the evaluator as a significant accomplishment. Appropriate documentation is available in ITS files and databases to substantiate the outcomes reported for both fiscal years.

*There are no recommendations for Objective 1.*

**Rating:** FY 2008-2009 - 5.0
FY 2009-2010 - 3.5
2 Yr. Average Rating: 4.25

**Objective 2:** By 2012, 60% of the full time faculty will participate in training to build capacity among faculty for using UVI’s technology (i.e. smart classroom equipment, e-learning applications).

*By FY 2008-2009 achieve 35%*
*By FY 2009-2010 achieve 50%*

**Anticipated Results:** By 2012 at least 6 faculty per year (30 in all) will participate in intensive training to develop a pool of associates available for increased training and support. Access to e-learning resources will be increased through membership in professional development organizations. At least 10 new teaching and learning applications will be implemented from Internet2 resources.

**Status:** Excellent Progress toward Objective 2/Anticipated Results. Benchmarks for FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010 Exceeded.

Given the higher than expected level of faculty participation in the University’s technology training during FY 2007-2008, the initial 50% five year projected outcome for 2012 was increased to 60% of full-time faculty participation in such training. The FY 2008-2009 benchmark is 35% faculty participation and the benchmark for FY 2009-2010 is 50%.

The FY 2008-2009 projection that 35% of full-time faculty will participate in UVI technology training has been exceeded by approximately 23%, with 45.25% of the faculty actually having participated in the technology training activities. The following were among the teaching and learning technology (TLT) sessions attended by faculty:

- **TLT Group** - A workshop on *Using Clickers* introduced faculty to the pedagogy of student response systems.

- **Turning Technologies** - A workshop on Turning Technologies introduced Turning Point student response cards. The session taught faculty the mechanics of using clickers for applying theories presented in the TLT session.

- **The Learning Times & Jossey-Bass Higher Education Publishers** - Sessions on teaching effectively online and introducing faculty to a variety of strategies for integrating technology into teaching for distance learning courses.
• Heidi Alvarez of Florida International University (AMPATH) – Shared information on Internet2 resources and training opportunities.

• Blackboard training and related tools provided one-on-one and group support for users, peer instruction, and formal instruction on topics identified by users.

• The grand opening of CETL on St. Thomas was held on March 18, 2009. This facility provides faculty a single point of technology support for to enhance teaching and learning.

The FY 2009-2010 projection that 50% of full-time faculty will participate in UVI technology training has also been exceeded. The actual faculty participation level for FY 2009-2010 is 53.44% (approximately a 6.4% increase above the projected participation level). The following were among the teaching and learning technology training sessions attended by faculty during FY 2009-2010:

• Two-day Fall Faculty Training: Blackboard, Internet 2, and Classroom Response Systems (clickers)

• TLT Group: Classroom Assessment Techniques and The Power of Rubrics

• Two-day Spring 2010 Faculty Training: Blackboard Basics, Teaching and Learning with Technology, Using Clickers, and Podcasting

• Adobe Connect Pro Introduction

Strong ITS staff capabilities are essential to providing in-house training and technical assistance to support faculty and staff development of technology skills and competencies that enhance teaching and learning. To ensure that the University’s ITS personnel maintains up-to-date knowledge and skills, ITS staff participated in the following professional development activities:

• The Blackboard system administrator completed Blackboard certification training.

• SkillSetsOnline – Subscription was instituted to provide online training for ITS staff to increase capacity for supporting technology.

• The CETL Director and Manager for Learning Resources and Faculty Technology Services completed Blackboard Release 9 orientation training.

• The CETL Director completed a three-part program in Blackboard course design.

• The Annual SunGard Summit Conference (for Banner users) – Attended by four (4) of the six (6) members of the Enterprise Data User Services staff
Blackboard and Banner training proved beneficial in preparing the draft plan for implementing the upgrade to Blackboard 9 and preparing the University for upgrades to UVI’s Banner Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) database.

Appropriate documentation is available in ITS files and databases to substantiate outcomes for both fiscal years. Objective 2 appears on schedule for timely implementation by the projected 2012 completion date.

**There are no recommendations for Objective 2.**

**Rating:**

FY 2008-2009 - 5.0  
FY 2009-2010 - 4.5  
(2 Yr. Average Rating: **4.75**)  

**Objective 3:** Improve educational and administrative process in enrollment management services…

…by reducing processing time by 25% above the current benchmark. (FY 2008-2009)  
…by reducing processing time by 25% from four hours to three hours (FY 2009-2009)

**Anticipated Results:** 3.1 After implementation, the following processes will significantly improve current processes: the financial aid self service module, availability of external test scores in Banner, data integrity and automated reporting. Additional processes will be implemented as well.

**Status:** Excellent Progress toward Objective 3; benchmarks completed or exceeded for FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010.

During FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010, UVI used Title III funds to procure products and services to implement the Banner Enterprise Improvement Plan. The Improvement Plan is designed to increase and improve operational processes. Upgrades to UVI’s Banner Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) database resulted in a minimum 25% reduction in the time necessary to process applications carried out in the Student Satisfaction Academic Progress Module; the Student Employment Module; the Return of Funds for Title IV Module; Implementation of
Financial Aid Self Service Module; the Processing of Direct Loans Module; and the TouchNet Bill + Payment Client. As a result of these technology upgrades, multiple improvements have occurred in the Enrollment Management area:

- The satisfactory academic progress (SAP) module in Banner automates the process by which a student’s academic progress is monitored and calculated.

- The ethnicity data for all students and employees has been updated in the Banner system. All UVI persons are presented with an ethnicity survey upon accessing self service Banner, giving them the opportunity to select their ethnicity based on new federal regulations. New IPEDS and other reporting will be required to use the new ethnicity categories.

- External test scores can now be batch loaded in Banner electronically, thus, saving time and reducing manual data entry errors.

- Direct loan processing is now completely accomplished in Banner. The financial aid staff can now create and maintain direct loan data in the manner outlined by the Department of Education’s Direct Loan Technical Reference.

- The financial Aid Self Service module is now available, providing student access to their data. This module reduces the time needed to alert students of financial aid awards. Instead of sending paper letters, students are emailed and informed of the availability of their award in the self service module.

- The TouchNet Bill + Payment Client has been installed to support Federal regulation changes in how online payments are to be received by institutions of higher education. These requirements are designed to ensure security of the data passed about individual students. The University has added several payment points for students to pay for registration, courses, transcripts, and graduation application fees online through self service Banner.

Requisitions, purchase orders, electronically accessible Banner generated reports, and other appropriate records are available in ITS files and databases to document outcomes for both fiscal years of Objective 3.

**There are no recommendations for Objective 3.**

**Rating:** FY 2008-2009 - 5.0  
FY 2009-2010 - 5.0  
(2 Yr. Average Rating: 5.0)
**Objective 4:** Improve educational and administrative processes in Human Resources by reducing processing time…

...by 25% above the benchmark (FY 2008-2009)
...by 25% above the benchmark (FY 2009-2010)

**Anticipated Results:** 4.1 After implementation, the following processes will significantly improve current processes: data integrity and automated benefit enrollments. Additional processes will be implemented as well.

**Status:** Delayed Progress toward Objective 4/Benchmarks Incomplete for FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010. The Banner Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Database used for Human Resources functions was upgraded to the latest supported vendor release during FY 2008-2009. New hires information was automatically loaded into the upgraded Banner database from PeopleAdmin. The automatic load reduced the duplication of effort that normally would have been required if such information had to be rekeyed into a different database.

Web Time Entry was automated during FY 2008-2009 in order to reduce paper and processing time for the UVI payroll. In addition to potentially eliminating the need for UVI personnel to complete time sheets, this upgrade is designed to reduce paper and processing time for payroll. The FY 2008-2009 Information and Technology Services Annual Report states that the Human Resources Department mechanism, PeopleAdmin software interface with Banner, “is being tested” and that Implementation of Web Time Entry “…is awaiting departmental testing.” Hence, the intended full capabilities of PeopleAdmin and Web Time Entry do not appear to have been operative by the end of FY 2008-2009.

During FY 2009-2010 efforts were continued to finalize the set up for time and effort reporting directly through Banner. A new version of the Oracle Application Server was installed for use with time and effort reporting via Banner. When fully implemented, these upgrades will enable several forms to be automated through PeopleAdmin, including Separation Clearance, Change in Status, Exit Interview, and the Interview Questionnaire.

The Information & Technology Services staff has provided significant training and technical assistance to the Human Resources Department to resolve issues related to
implementing the upgraded technologies necessary to implement this objective. Some progress has been made. However, full implementation of those technologies, by the end of FY 2009-2010, has not been documented. More importantly, the projected reduction in processing time by “25% above the benchmark” in FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010 cannot be documented until the newly installed technologies/databases are fully operational and appropriate UVI Human Resources personnel are trained to interface with them.

According to the activity director, the projected Human Resources Title III outcomes for Objective 4 were not fully achieved for either fiscal year due to a lack of leadership in the Human Resources area. Reportedly, a new Human Resources Director is in the process of being recruited and hired and Objective 4 has been rescheduled for implementation during FY 2010-2011.

As confirmed by the activity director, the major problem that seems to have impacted the implementation of this objective is the need for stable and knowledgeable leadership to take charge of this project in the Human Resources Department. This need is in the process of being addressed. There are no other recommendations at this time.

Rating:  
FY 2008-2009 - 2.0  
FY 2009-2010 - 2.0  
(2 Yr. Average Rating: 2.0)

Objective 5: Improve educational and administrative processes in Administration and Finance by reducing processing time…

...by 25% above the benchmark. (FY 2008-2009)  
...by 75% from two hours to thirty minutes. (FY 2009-2010)

Anticipated Results: 5.1 After implementation, the following processes will significantly improve current processes: time and effort reporting, grants module, data integrity and automated reporting. Additional processes will be implemented as well.

Status: Fair Progress toward Objective 5/ Benchmarks for FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010 Not Documented. Objective 5 addresses administration and finance technology upgrades to improve processing time and accuracy of accounting and administrative transactions. The key
tasks identified for Objective 5 during FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010 involve time and effort reporting, upgraded grants module, data integrity, and automated reporting.

In support of this objective, during FY 2008-2009, the Banner Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Database used by the University for administrative and finance functions was upgraded to the latest supported vendor release. The upgraded Banner database supports data integrity and automated reporting. During FY 2009-2010 the Raisers Edge database was upgraded and a mechanism for the acceptance of online giving was implemented. During FY 2009-2010, the Cognos software license was procured, a server installed, and the software downloaded. Documentation of the full installation of Cognos was not provided to the evaluator. The last written mention of the Cognos installation was in the 3rd Activity Quarterly Progress Report (i.e., 5/1/2010 – 6/30/2010) which stated in reference to Cognos, “The installation is to be scheduled.” A 4th Activity Quarterly Progress Report was not made available to the evaluator. The draft Information & Technology Services Annual Report for FY 2009-2010 also provided no update on the status of Cognos. As such, the evaluator can only conclude that Cognos had not been installed, tested, and made fully operational by the end of FY 2009-2010. (See Note below)

Limited documentation was made available to document the progress made in this objective.

**NOTE:** Because the activity director had to cut short the evaluation interview for this activity in order to be part of a very important conference call, the status of this objective, as well as the status of objectives 6 and 7 (that follows) could not be discussed with her. The evaluator made two follow-up calls to the activity director, but was unable to speak to her. However, before the end of the day, the activity director emailed to the evaluator a draft copy of the “FY 2009-2010 Information and Technology Services Report.” That report was helpful, but, it gave no updated information on the status of Cognos nor on any of the projected outcomes and performance indicators for Objective 5. Consequently, the evaluator has had to rely on information presented in the “FY 2008-2009 Information and Technology Services Report” and the information presented in the FY 2009-2010 Activity Quarterly Reports (for the first three quarters) to discuss the status of this objective and the two objectives that follow (i.e., Objectives 6 and 7). Quarterly Activity Progress Reports were not made available to the evaluator for the fourth quarter of FY 2009-2010 nor for any quarter in the FY 2008-2009 grant year.

__________

It is recommended that Cognos be made fully operational with well-trained users. Cognos extracts data from Banner to provide efficient reports arranged in logical business area reporting views. Such reports could be invaluable planning and decision-making tools to strengthen administration and finance processes that support improvement of educational and administrative outcomes.
It is recommended that appropriate documentation of activity progress and budget activity be maintained by the activity director and made readily available to the evaluator during an evaluation site visit.

Rating: FY 2008-2009 - 2.5
FY 2009-2010 - 2.5
(2 Yr. Average Rating: 2.5)

Objective 6: By 2012, improve access to library resources by reducing the various interfaces available to users…

…from four to one. (FY 2009-2010)

...(Objective 6 is not listed in the FY 2008-2009 plan of operation)

Anticipated Result: 6.1 After implementation, faculty, staff and students will have improved access to library resources and databases through one interface. It is also the first step towards development of a portal.

Status: Excellent Progress toward Objective 5/Benchmark and Anticipated Results completed. The libraries have been installed with SirsiDynix’s Symphony. The new ILS allows persons to request books and technology equipment online. Patrons can directly reserve media equipment, such as laptops and projectors, through the web interface. Library staff working in the various library department can more easily carryout their reporting responsibilities. The online databases and the library catalog can be searched from the one interface. Library users are automatically given an account in the library database, based on their role in Banner. This eliminates the need for persons to separately provide proof of status to the library in order to access the system.

There are no recommendations for Objective 6.

Rating: FY 2009-2010 - 5.0

Objective 7: This initiative is in accordance with Vision 2012 Strategic Goal #1 which seeks to "create an engaging, student centered environment that promotes
school spirit and educational pride." By providing one single means of access to systems and services, the university is enhancing service delivery to its students.

**Anticipated Results:** 7.1 After implementation, the UVI ID card will also be used as a door access, meal and laundry card for appropriate persons. The my Campus portal will allow students access to an online community for their student activity needs. *(FY 2009-2010)*

*(Objective 7 is not listed in the FY 2008-2009 plan of operation)*

**Status:** **Objective and Anticipated Results Completed.** The CampusEAI portal has been implemented as a single sign-on application for most UVI technology resources. Through one location, the UVI community can access email, Blackboard, and self service Banner. The CampusEAI portal allows users access to data on the portal based on their individual role in the Institution (i.e., faculty, staff, and students). The portal also allows users participation in other groups (SGA, programs of study, etc.).

UVI students have been issued an ID card that gives them access to multiple facilities and services, including access to the 24 hour computer lab, library services, and meals. Faculty members have also received new ID cards that give them various accesses, including access to labs and buildings.

__________

*There are no recommendations for Objective 7.*

**Rating:** FY 2009-2010 - **5.0**

**Adequacy of Resources**

A. **FY 2008-2009**

Resources for this activity appear adequate to implement the FY 2008-2009 UVI Plan of Operation for the Transitioning University Systems Forward activity. The FY 2008-2009 activity budget, totaling $ 796,985.00, provided funding in the amount of $248,228 for six full-time positions (i.e., 1 faculty and 5 professional staff); Positions funded by the grant include the following:
Full-time positions and percentage of salaries funded by the Grant:

- Learning Environment Supervisor @ 80% time
- Media Computer Specialist @80% time
- Systems Administrator @100% time
- Program Analyst III @100% time
- Media Computer Specialist @80% time
- Faculty Training Supervisor @75% time

In addition to personnel salaries, the FY 2008-2009 activity budget provided for fringe benefits for full-time personnel ($79,540); contractual services ($344,382); professional travel ($31,500); communication and information ($335); supplies ($71,000), minor equipment ($2,000); and major equipment ($20,000). The UVI Transitioning Forward Spending to Date Report,” ending September 30, 2009, shows that 89% of the FY 2008-2009 activity budget has been expended.

**B. FY 2009-2010**

Resources for this activity appear adequate to implement the FY 2009-2010 UVI Plan of Operation for the Transitioning University Systems Forward activity. The FY 2009-2010 activity budget, totaling $757,324.00, provided funding in the amount of $222,244 for six full-time positions (i.e., 1 faculty and 5 professional staff).

Full-time positions and percentage of salaries funded by the Title III Part B Grant include the following:

- Learning Environment Supervisor @ 80% time
- Media Computer Specialist @80% time
- Systems Administrator @100% time
- Program Analyst III @100% time
- Media Computer Specialist @80% time
- Faculty Training Supervisor @75% time
In addition to personnel salaries, the FY 2009-2010 activity budget provided for fringes for full-time personnel @32% ($71,118); fringes for Part-time student personnel @ 8.65% ($1,557); contractual services ($286,585); professional travel ($14,500); communication and information ($335); supplies ($5,320); and other (138,000). The UVI Transitioning Forward Spending to Date Report,” ending September 30, 2010 would show the percentage of the FY 2009-2010 activity budget expended to date. However, that report was not available at the time of the evaluation site visit.

Problems Encountered

The activity director did not report encountering any problems for FY 2008-2009 or FY 2009-2010, other than the lack of leadership during FY 2009-2010 to implement Objective 4, Improve Administrative Processes in human Resources. The University is in the process of recruiting and hiring a new Director of Human Resources who can provide the quality of leadership and knowledge base necessary to successfully address (with ITS support) the projected outcomes, anticipated results, and benchmarks.

Summary, Impact, and Recommendations

The Transitioning University Systems Forward Activity has achieved some impressive outcomes for FY 2008-2009 and FY 2009-2010. Resistance by faulty and staff in higher education to the introduction of technology (and related training) is well known. The response of UVI faculty and staff to this challenge and opportunity suggests a growth in positive attitudes toward the expansion of technology at The University of the Virgin Islands. ITS data indicate increased faculty and staff participation in technology training and the consistent use of instructional and administrative technologies in carrying out their day-to-day responsibilities (Objectives 1 and 2). Improvements in administrative processes are especially evident in the Enrollment Management Services unit (Objective 3); the Library (Objective 6); and in service delivery to students and faculty (Objective 7). Those objectives were highly rated between 4.0 and 5.0.

While some progress has been made, there were delays in implementing two technology enhancement objectives. Human Resources (Objective 4) is awaiting appointment of a new director to provide leadership and Administrative and Finance Processes (Objective 5), is
awaiting software installation to support implementation of the projected outcomes. These needs are already being addressed.

The activity director, Ms. Tina M. Koopmans and her very capable staff are to be commended for the achievements in the Transitioning University Systems Forward activity.

Three (3) recommendations are offered at this time:

1. It is recommended that appropriate documentation of activity progress and budget activity be maintained by the activity director and made readily available to the evaluator during an evaluation site visit.

2. It is recommended that Cognos be made fully operational with well-trained users. Cognos extracts data from Banner to provide efficient reports arranged in logical business area reporting views. Such reports could be invaluable planning and decision-making tools to strengthen administration and finance processes that support improvement of educational and administrative outcomes.

3. It is recommended that an impact study be developed and implemented for this activity in collaboration with the University’s Office of Institutional Research and Planning or the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

OVERALL ACTIVITY RATING: 4.07

Documentation

FY 2008/2009 Activity Plan of Operation
FY 2009/2010 Activity Plan of Operation
FY 2008/2009 Activity Budget
FY 2009/2010 Activity Budget
FY 2009/2010 Activity Director’s Quarterly Reports (First 3 quarters)
FY 2008/2009 Information and Technology Services Annual Report
Draft of FY 2009/2010 Enterprise Network Services Section of ITS Annual Report
FY 2008-2009 and 2009/2010 Time and Effort Reports
FY 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 Requisitions and Invoices (Database)
UVI Title III Transitioning Forward Spending to Date Report - FY 08-09
Travel Expenditure Reports
Trip Reports
Approved Consultant Contracts
Approved Services Contracts
ITS Website (Observation)
Workshop/Training Sign-In Rosters
Workshop/Training Participant Evaluation Forms
**Person(s) Interviewed**

Ms. Tina M Koopmans, Chief Information Officer/Activity Director
Ms. Judith Rogers, Manager, Learning Resources and Faculty Technology Services
Ms. Charlene Harris, Enterprise Data and User Services
ACADEMIC APPROACH TO RETENTION, PROGRESSION AND GRADUATION

Dr. Judith Edwin, Activity Director
Dr. Gloria Pryor James, Evaluator

Introduction

University student retention, sometimes referred to as persistence, is of increasing importance to college and university administrators as they try to improve graduate rates and decrease loss of tuition revenue from students that either drop out or transfer to another school. Transfer rates are very high in the United States with 60% of all bachelor's degrees being awarded to students that began their college at another institution. A number of efforts are underway in universities to provide resources to keep students engaged in their studies and in their involvement with the institutions. On-campus or online advisors provide students techniques for success and can direct them to university resources for academic or psychological support at many colleges and universities. While the University of The Virgin Islands is experiencing an increase in its student population, the retention rate shows a decline over the past years. The progression rate, 3rd and 4th year levels, has remained consistent, however, the graduation rate has fluctuated.

To maintain the existing enrollment and to continue to work toward the goal of a 3,000 student body population by 2012, the University has established the Academic Approach to Retention, Progression and Graduation Activity to provide a rigorous approach to retention, progression and graduation and to achieve the ultimate goal of student success. Further this activity was established to enhance the development of students both inside and outside of the classroom environment. Under this activity, the Office of Access and Enrollment oversees the Campus Advising and Tutorial Services (CATS) Center, which randomly selects a cohort of approximately 20% of the freshman class and provides intentional intervention to encourage academic success and increase persistence among those students. Each year, a new cohort is identified. A tracking system is implemented with a control group; and other students who make use of the Center will be compared with the control group cohort that receives intervention, they will not be participants in the Title III tracking system. Additionally, the CATS program
provides programs and activities to assist a random selection of approximately 20% of those students who are placed on “academic probation. The program includes intrusive advisement and tutorial assistance with the expectation of improving students’ success at the University.

The Office of Access and Enrollment oversees the Campus Advising and Tutorial Services (CATS) Center, a central source for faculty/student interaction and student engagement under this activity. Additionally, psycho-educational and diagnostic services to support student learning is provided as an ancillary service for those students presenting a need. An activity director (University paid), a sub-activity director (CATS Director), and two (2) Writing Center Coordinators at 25% each (Title III) guide the activity. The Retention Support staff and the Academic Advisor Specialist were hired in summer 2008.

II. Specific Objectives, Implementation Strategies, and Accomplishments

The following objectives and anticipated results guided the activity for the 2008-2010 grant years:

**Objective 1:** To increase the persistence rate of a group of first-time freshmen by 5% by September 30, 2012.

**Anticipated Results:**

1.1 The results will show that more students returned to UVI after their freshmen year.

1.2 The retention rate will be measured and compared to that of the previous year.

1.3 Specific attention will be focused on the freshman students who participated in the program.

1.4 A review of GPA and completion of questionnaire surveys and evaluation will be used.

**Status:** In Process.

The activity staff are working diligently to attain this objective by September 30, 2012. The baseline data against which the 5% increase will be measured is the retention rate of a target group of students in the 2008-2009 freshman cohort. By spring 2009, the target group of 121 students who received programmatic interventions had a baseline retention rate of 93% as
compared to a control group’s (43 students) retention rate of 86% (Office of Institutional Research and Planning, October 7, 2010). This 93% baseline retention rate for spring 2009 was used to track the 2008-2009 cohort of target group students until spring 2010 where the cohort had decreased in number from 121 students their first semester in fall 2008 to 72 students in spring 2010 with a 60% retention rate for the target group, a 33% drop in retention over three (3) semesters. Similarly, the control group had a documented reduction in its number of students from forty-three (43) in fall 2008 to twenty-three (23) in spring 2010 with a 33% (from 86% to 53%) reduction of the retention rate over the three semesters covered by the tracking initiative. Since there was a 5% increase forecasted by 2012, the data would have to document a 5% increase over the 93% baseline for the 2008-2009 cohort yielding a 98% retention rate by spring 2012. The evaluator’s experience suggests that this is a large feat given the historical data provided for review. Therefore, it is recommended that since data show a marked decrease in retention for students in the target group from the 2008-2009 cohort, the objective be rewritten to state, “To ensure that a mean retention rate of 65% for the 2008-2009 cohort target group for the eight (8) semesters covered by this activity (spring 2009-fall 2012) will be attained”, (based on historical data and the fact that the activity was in an organizational mode during the first two years of this cohort’s matriculation at the University).

A similar analysis was conducted by the evaluator to identify a feasible retention rate for the other two cohorts for whom data were available. The evaluator concluded that tracking the target and control groups for each semester’s cohort is a laudatory undertaking, but may not be useful in the University’s quest to improve retention. On the other hand, if staff concentrated on refining the services of the Center while ensuring that students who avail themselves of its services pass their core courses with a grade of “C” or better would bring more focus to a measurable outcome. Therefore, the evaluator recommends that the focus be placed on strengthening student success and that an objective be written that states, “To assure that ___% of the students enrolled in the English and mathematics core courses who avail themselves of the Center’s individualized intervention plan, will successfully complete these courses with a grade of “C” or better, each semester”.

The data analysis presented at the summative evaluation in the form of the quarterly reports was exceptional and indicates that the Director of the Center and other staff have a grasp
on how the data should be reported. However, the evaluator’s review of the components of Objective 1.0 determined that too much is being addressed under this one objective. Also, the comparison of the treatment group to the control group does not add value to the overall analysis. The evaluator surmised that “treatment” is an acceptable concept, but all students who avail themselves of the Center’s services become a part of the Center’s treatment group and their progress should also be tracked. Consequently, it is recommended that when determining how to strengthen this objective, both the St. Croix and St. Thomas campuses be involved and that the same processes be used by both campuses to offer interventions and to keep records of the outcomes of these interventions.

Rating: 3.0

Objective 2: To increase the persistence rate of a group of students on academic probation by 5% by September 30, 2012.

Anticipated Results: 2.1 It is anticipated that students who are on academic probation will be removed after one semester of interaction in this project.

2.2 The retention rate of the students who are on academic probation will be measured to determine if the intervention status changed to good standing.

Status: In Process.

This objective was addressed until the spring 2010 quarter at which point it was changed. The quarterly reports outlined the process for providing assistance to students on probation. The last assessment of reported students on Probation I was published at the end of spring 2009. Based on the University’s definition of Probation, a student will only be placed on probation after attempting twelve (12) degree credits. CATS’ interventions, done with sub-groups of each entering Cohort beginning with the fall 2008 Cohort, identified as the Treatment Condition, are operationally defined as students with basic skills placements who receive early academic interventions. These students typically attempt sixteen (16) credits during their first semester, ten (10) of which are non-degree credits. According to the report, it is therefore, unlikely that
any of these students from the spring 2009 cohort would be on probation at this point.

**New Objective 2.0 (Effective 3rd Quarter; 2009-2010 Grant Year)**

**Objective 2.0:** To reduce the failure rate in skills courses for a subgroup of the spring 2010 Cohort.

**Status:** Accomplished.

The data and data analysis for this objective were detailed and included all of the elements of a thorough report to document measurable outcomes. CATS provides early intervention initiated during the second week of classes. Students in the Treatment Condition whose course performance was unsuccessful in ENG 100, 101 and MAT 023 receive this intervention. For the 2009-2010 grant year, CATS design methodology included two equivalent subgroups of the fall 2009, first-time freshman Cohort, in block schedules, i.e., Treatment and Control Conditions. Course performance using class attendance, submission of assignments, pass/fail assignments, quizzes, tests, and other course requirements were used as variables to determine needed intervention measures.

This evaluation covers the 2008-2010 grant periods. During the past 4 semesters, or 2 years, the number of first-time students testing into skills courses ranged from 71% in fall 2008 to 81% in spring 2010, a 10% increase. The percentage was highest in fall 2009 at 84%, with spring 2009 mirroring spring 2010 at 81%. Therefore, first-time freshmen in large numbers are placed into these courses; therefore, these courses become prerequisites for most 100 level courses. Skills courses typically make up ten (10) of the sixteen (16) credits of first-time, full-time students in their first semester and student performance in these courses is used as reasonable indicators of needed academic intervention.

Overall, aggregate figures for both campuses, during this two-year time period, showed the academic performance of students in these courses to be a concern. In **ENG 100**, although performance, pass rates, increased between fall 2008 (76%) and spring 2009 (81%), the pass rates were lower for fall 2009 (74%) and even lower (9% decrease) in spring 2010 (65%). Performances over the two-year period were a concern when “D” grades are factored into performance with a mean of 41% of the students earning grades of “D” or below. For fall 2008,
38% of students enrolled in ENG 100 earned grades of “D” or below, 34% in spring 2009, 40% in fall 2009 and 51% in spring 2010.

In ENG 101, pass rates decreased between fall 2008 (87%) and spring 2009 (75%), increasing in fall 2009 (81%), and decreasing again in spring 2010 (67%). Although the mean percentage of students earning a “D” or below was lower for ENG 101 (31%) when compared to the mean percentage of students who earned a grade of “D” or below in ENG 100 (41%), staff and faculty were concerned.

Similar data were provided for the other basic for credit courses and 100 level courses. These data must be used to identify the discrete academic skills areas that require more focus if students are to be assisted in successfully matriculating through the University to graduation. However, there was no discussion as to how these data inform the programs offered to provide students intrusive intervention. Therefore, it is recommended that although data are crucial and help to define the strategies that must be employed to assist students, these data not be the focal point of outcomes assessment, but be used to design appropriate individualized programs for students who need CATS’ services in order to maintain satisfactory academic progress. Again, since Title III grants are designed to strengthen the University by providing funds to address a critical need, it is recommended that the evaluator’s concern about the small number of students included in the treatment group be addressed by reviewing the rationale for not being more inclusive and for not designing the data collection and analysis processes to document a more global impact on the student body.

Rating: 4.0

Objective 3: To enhance the delivery of Freshman Year Experience Program courses through professional training and development for faculty by September 30, 2012.

Anticipated Results: 3.1 Faculty who participate in training and attendance at conferences will be able to provide a new approach to the Freshman Year Experience Program.

3.2 The measure of success will be based on the
evaluations from students as to the success of their class interactions.

**Status:** Accomplished.

The implementation of this activity seems to be complex in that the determinants of program strategy appear not to be dictated by student need, but by individuals who have the responsibility for implementing the activity. Therefore, **it is recommended that training and workshops be provided all individuals who assist students to ensure that these staff and faculty are operating under the same pedagogical orientation.** Some training has taken place, however, it is clear that the activity is not being implemented in an all-inclusive manner. Also, **it is recommended that intensive discussion be engaged in to assure that the services students receive are offered in a comprehensive manner by staff who have common goals and who work together to assist students in attaining the required learning outcomes.**

Most recently in June 2010, one (1) staff member from St. Croix and two (2) from St. Thomas travelled to NACADA’s Assessment and Retention Conference. As a result of the travel, staff decided to use the Keeling et.al model for developing student learning outcomes. Although this decision was a positive one, it appears that generally there is a disconnect between ideas and cooperative implementation. **It is recommended that all staff, no exception, be trained on the guidelines, strategies, and processes that will be employed to guarantee the effective operation of the Center and the Freshman Program in order to attain positive outcomes for the Academic Approach to Retention, Progression, and Graduation Activity and the University as a whole.**

**Rating:** 3.0

**Objective 4:**

To enhance the Freshman Year Experience Program to include a more comprehensive component for first-year and new freshmen who are “undecided” on their major course of study by September 30, 2012.

**Anticipated Results: 4.1** Communication to students will be enhanced, thus, creating a more informed student body on issues related to academic success.

**4.2** Students will be measured through surveys to
determine their knowledge of information and their level of participation in sessions.

**Status:** In Process.

The curriculum for the section of the FDS course for undecided students was enhanced with additional exploration exercises, such as assigning career exploration research papers, assigning students to interview individuals in their field of interest, encouraging students to seek counseling from faculty advisors before changing majors, etc. A speakers’ bureau representing various career areas was established to bring guest speakers to the campuses to encourage students to select majors based on their interests. In the fall 2008, a Career Counselor was added to the Learning Community/block of courses developed for undecided students.

During the 2009-2010 grant year, Career Exploration on St. Thomas continued to be addressed through block scheduling, where one (1) of the six (6) block schedules was a grouping of students who were undeclared majors as of the completion of their application for admission to UVI. Career exploration interventions were part of the FDS curriculum for this block. Activities unique to this section of FDS were shadowing, a speaker’s bureau and interviews. A career exploration inventory was administered to this group pre-post-test fashion in collaboration with UVI’s Counseling and Placement Center.

The curriculum for Objective 4.0 for the St Croix campus was augmented to mirror that of St. Thomas, although operating on a different timetable. The interventions were initiated during the spring 2010 semester. Interventions regarding career exploration were also delivered in the FDS section of the Block Schedule for undeclared majors. These interventions included shadowing, interviewing individuals already established in fields of interest, and a Speakers Bureau.

Efforts on both campuses operated on different time schedules. Adjustments were made to formalize uniform curriculum and assessment measures between campuses to address students examining a number of possible career interests with the goal of them selecting a discipline of study. With this change, aggregate assessments will be available beginning with the fall 2010 semester.
Rating: 3.0

Overall Rating: 3.2

III. Resources (Fiscal and Personnel)

Resources for this activity were adequate to accomplish its objectives. The FY 2008-2009 Title III activity budget, totaling $306,921 provided funding for the implementation of the activity. Title III funded the following personnel:

1. Julie Cruz, Retention Support Staff, 100%
2. Marsha Henry, Academic Advisor Specialist, 100% (resigned spring 2010)
3. Jacquan Patterson, Data Analyst, 100%
4. Dr. Valerie Combie, Writing Center, 25%
5. Linda Wymer, Writing Center, 25% (no longer serves as the CATS Writing Center Coordinator)
6. Peer Tutors (20)

The 2008-2009 budget also provided funds for travel ($6,550), equipment ($20,000), and supplies ($3,993). For the 2009-2010 grant year, funding for personnel was the same with the exception of the Academic Advisor Specialist who vacated the position after an extensive leave of absence.

IV. Challenges to Programmatic Accomplishments

There were several challenges to the implementation of this activity. There was a plethora of data collected and analyzed to document the accomplishment of the objectives; or the fact that strategies were being implemented to address the intended outcomes. However, the evaluator concluded as a result of reviewing the quarterly reports and through interviews that the activity is difficult to manage as written due to the structure and process used to document outcomes. As an evaluator who emphasizes the use of data collection and analysis processes to document outcomes, this activity has too much data and is presented in a manner that is difficult to determine the focus. Therefore, it is recommended that Objectives 1.0 and 2.0 be re-focused.
along with the attendant anticipated results and implementation strategies, in order to determine the factors that need to be assessed and how the assessment results should be presented and used to strengthen the University’s persistence initiatives.

A review of the documentation disclosed that there is a connection between FDS 100 and the Center. Issues were discussed during the evaluation interview that this relationship of the two entities has caused concern and until resolved, will continue to have a negative impact on the implementation of this activity. In order to garner an objective appraisal of FDS 100, the required course that first-time students must complete, the University engaged an external consultant to offer his findings. As a part of his review, the following challenges and barriers were identified:

1) Changes have been made to the curriculum and requirements of FDS 100, such as the removal of papers, exams, and textbook, without being vetted or approved by a faculty body or relevant stakeholders (such as colleagues on the St. Croix campus and current instructors).

2) There are differing standards and practices for FDS 100 between the two campuses on St. Thomas and St. Croix.

3) The course is not being regularly evaluated on the St. Thomas campus.

4) Courses are not being offered at convenient times for students, but rather to fit instructor schedules.

5) There is a lack of clarity about who is responsible for the program.

6) Student perceptions of the course are mixed. The consultant was not able to meet with students but was provided two pieces of evidence regarding student perceptions of the course; (a) course evaluations from the St. Croix campus (evaluations from St. Thomas were unavailable), and (b) an analysis of FDS 100 written by nine (9) students as part of class project for BUS 241.

The concerns noted in that report included:

(a.) Students do not understand purpose of the course (greater effort needs to be made to help students understand relevance of material)

(b.) The quality of instruction varied greatly

(c.) Class size should be kept small
(d.) Class times should be convenient for students

7) There seems to be two competing sides about what should happen with FDS 100, and there is a general mistrust among these sides. On a related note, early alert information for Title III reporting was harder to gather over the past few months, perhaps because of the fall-out over where the course should be housed.

V. Program Impact

This activity has impacted the institution as a result of providing services to students who need intrusive intervention in order to successfully matriculate through their academic program to graduation. Once this activity’s organization, structure, processes, and goals/objectives are clearly defined, the University will realize more comprehensive outcomes and global impact.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1:

Since data show a marked decrease in retention for students in the target group from the 2008-2009 cohort, the objective be rewritten to state, “To ensure that a mean retention rate of 65% for the 2008-2009 cohort target group for the eight (8) semesters covered by this activity (spring 2009-fall 2012) will be attained”, (based on historical data and the fact that the activity was in an organizational mode during the first two years of this cohort’s matriculation at the University).

Recommendation 2:

The focus be placed on strengthening student success and that an objective be written that states, “To assure that a certain % of the students enrolled in the English and mathematics core courses who avail themselves of the Center’s individualized intervention plan, will successfully complete these courses with a grade of “C” or better, each semester”.

Recommendation 3:

When determining how to strengthen this objective, both the St. Croix and St. Thomas campuses be involved and that the same processes be used by both campuses to offer interventions and to keep records of the outcomes of these interventions.
Recommendation 4:

Although data are crucial and help to define the strategies that must be employed to assist students, these data not be the focal point of outcomes assessment, but be used to design appropriate individualized programs for students who need CATS’ services in order to maintain satisfactory academic progress.

Recommendation 5:

The evaluator’s concern about the small number of students included in the treatment group be addressed by reviewing the rationale for not being more inclusive and for not designing the data collection and analysis processes to document a more global impact on the student body.

Recommendation 6:

Training and workshops be provided all individuals who assist students to ensure that these staff and faculty are operating under the same pedagogical orientation.

Recommendation 7:

Intensive discussion be engaged in to assure that the services students receive are offered in a comprehensive manner by staff who have common goals and who work together to assist students in attaining the required learning outcomes.

Recommendation 8:

All staff, no exception, be trained on the guidelines, strategies, and processes that will be employed to guarantee the effective operation of the Center and the Freshman Program in order to attain positive outcomes for the Academic Approach to Retention, Progression, and Graduation Activity, and the University as a whole.

Recommendation 9:

Objectives 1.0 and 2.0 be re-focused, along with the attendant anticipated results and implementation strategies, in order to determine the factors that need to be assessed and how the
assessment results should be presented and used to strengthen the University’s persistence initiatives.

**Recommendation 10:**

Objectives be written in measurable terms by stating in this order, the: (1) desired outcome in numbers and/or percentages (preferably both); (2) methods you are going to implement to attain the number and/or percentage; and, (3) timeframe for accomplishing the outcome.

**Recommendation 11:**

If the objective is going to take more than one year to accomplish, the final desired outcome, number or percentage, be divided by the number of years projected to complete the final outcome, and this number or percentage will be doubled each year to calculate the desired outcome for the objective. For example: An activity’s overall desired outcome is 100.00% completion in four years (divide 100.00% by four (4) to get the number or percentage of completion for each year).

- First Year- a desired outcome of 25.00% completion;
- Second Year- a desired outcome of 50.00% completion;
- Third Year- a desired outcome of 75.00% completion: and,
- Fourth Year- a desired outcome of 100.00% completion during the final year.

**Recommendation 12:**

Since completing quarterly reports is the only formal reporting mechanism for activity directors to document that they are making satisfactory progress toward the attainment of their activities stated outcomes, these reports be detailed and all documentation of completed deliverables be attached to each quarterly report as an addendum.

**Recommendation 13:**

If the objective called for an increase in a result, each quarterly report document the number and
percentage of the increase attained during that quarter.

**Recommendation 14:**

Each quarterly report state what equipment or software were purchased and the changes in instruction and student learning outcomes that were realized as a result of the new equipment be documented.

**Recommendation 15:**

Each activity director delineates a systematic assessment process that includes strategies and methods that will be used to collect and analyze data, by objective and performance indicator, to document the extent to which the objective and performance indicator have been met each quarter.

**Recommendation 16:**

The activity director ensures that the objectives and anticipated results are measurable (quantifiable) and not tasks (examples of tasks are: to purchase equipment, to network the campuses, to set up a laboratory) and that appropriate assessment methods to collect data and information to support outcomes are identified at the onset of the grant period.

**Documents Reviewed**

FY 2008-2010 Plans of Operation  
FY 2008-2010 Budget and Budget Summary  
Quarterly Progress Reports  
Data from Institutional Research Office

**Persons Interviewed**

Dr. Judith Edwin, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, Activity Director  
Ms. Angela McGhee, Director, Campus Advising and Tutorial Center (CATS)  
Mr. David Capriola, Coordinator, Freshman Development (Via Teleconference)  
Ms. Trudy Golphin, Program Coordinator (Via Teleconference)
CHEMISTRY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT

Dr. S. Latesky, Activity Director
Dr. Gloria Pryor James, Evaluator

Introduction

This activity was designed to support the desire on the part of the science faculty to upgrade the chemistry program at the University. The ultimate goal of the University is to seek accreditation by the American Chemical Society (ACS) for this program. The ACS is the major professional society in the United States for practicing chemists. The idea is that the students matriculating in and receiving degrees from the University with ACS accreditation will be more likely to gain acceptance to prestigious graduate programs, be more employable, and more competitive. At the present time, the chemistry program at UVI does not meet ACS standards even though the required course work that is necessary for accreditation by ACS is available to students.

For the past three years, another specific goal of the funding was to upgrade the existing instrumental capabilities of the UVI chemistry program, to replace obsolete major analytical instruments, and to provide teaching support for the chemical laboratory courses. Prior to receiving Title III funding, the chemistry program at the University of the Virgin Islands did not meet ACS standards. Although the required course work was available to students, the laboratories and required analytical equipment were inadequate. To help address these shortfalls in the chemistry program, the University undertook an initiative to renovate the science building in order to improve laboratory facilities, increase safety and address environmental compliance. Additionally, prior to Title III funding, the chemistry department was facing a difficult situation without analytical equipment and no means to address the need of the department to improve its operational equipment required for an effective teaching program.

Specific Objectives, Implementation Strategies, and Accomplishments

The following objectives and anticipated results guided the activity for the 2008-2010
grant years:

Objective 1: To attain ACS accreditation will be achieved by December 30, 2012.

Anticipated Result: 1.1 The American Chemical Society will inform the President of UVI that the chemistry department program is accredited.

Status: In Process.

The timeline for accomplishment for this objective had to be extended due to the University’s inability to meet ACS standards. A review of the documentation revealed that the initial time period for accomplishment was not realistic given the complex strategies that had to be implemented to attain this objective. The greatest challenge to attaining accreditation continues to be the inability to hire a professor with a doctorate in Physical Chemistry. The search failed for two years and the activity director is working on implementing additional strategies to meet this objective. However, it is recommended that the activity director continues to contact universities in the US and its territories, as well as abroad, to identify graduates and those individuals in the final stages of completing the doctorate in Physical Chemistry to attain a commitment to teach and conduct research in the Virgin Islands.

The curriculum must also meet ACS standards. At the time of the 2008-2010 formative evaluation in October 2010, the activity director discussed the requirement of adding additional courses to the chemistry curriculum in order to be in compliance with ACS. Therefore, the faculty will strengthen the curriculum by adding an elective in Physical Chemistry and a required course in Organic Chemistry.

Rating: 4.0

Objective 2: To ensure that all upper level chemistry majors will be capable of using the equipment that is considered standard for chemistry majors by December 31, 2011.

Anticipated Results: 2.1 A combination of grades achieved in analytical and physical chemistry courses
combined with a standardized test bank to monitor student success.

### 2.2 Grade Point average increases from B to A and test averages in excess of 80% will be considered a successful measure.

**Status:** In Process.

The activity director provided samples of syllabi documenting that the use of the equipment has been incorporated into appropriate courses and class syllabi. The examples included syllabi for CHEM 151, 152, 251, and 252. In addition to this documentation to verify that the equipment has been infused into the curriculum, following is an example of other accomplishments:

- ICP-MS has been installed and training completed for the faculty who use the instrument. Students used the instrumentation in the Instrumental Analysis course, spring 2010.

- FT-IR purchased during last quarter was installed and is operational. Training was held after two additional optional devices were installed (the devices are an external fiber-optics probe and a diamond Attenuated Total Reflectance cell), and an Electrochemical Analyzer was installed and used for instrumental analysis.

The anticipated result spoke to students’ grades increasing as a result of incorporating state of the art equipment into the curriculum. At the time of the formative evaluation, although the equipment was installed, data were not provided to document that there had indeed been an increase in majors’ grade point average. Therefore, **it is recommended that the activity director develops a strategy to determine if students’ grade point averages increased as a result of the infusion of the equipment into the curriculum by comparing the mean grade point average of students who completed the Instrumentation Analysis course the two semesters prior to installing the equipment with students’ mean grade point average in this same course two semesters after the installation of the equipment.**

**Rating:** 2.5
**Objective 3:** By December 31, 2012 the chemistry program will increase the number of graduates attending graduate school in chemistry after leaving UVI.

**Anticipated Result:** 3.1 The number of chemistry majors each year will increase by 6-8 students.

**Status:** In Process.

At the time of the summative evaluation, data were not available to document the progress being made in addressing this objective. This objective is very ambitious and must be revised and a new date set for measuring its achievement must be determined. It is recommended that during the 2010-2011 grant period, this objective be modified to state, “To ensure that the Chemistry Department remains viable by increasing its enrollment by a minimum of 2% annually by September 30, 2012.” Additionally, it is recommended that an Anticipated Result be developed that states, “By September 30, 2011, there will be a 2% increase over the 2009-2010 enrollment of majors and by September 20, 2012, there will be a 2% increase over 2010-2011 enrollment of majors.”

**Rating:** 0.0

**Objective 4:** To ensure that a new cadre of science teachers are hired in the Territorial Schools by December 31, 2009.

**Anticipated Result:** 4.1 The goal is to graduate one chemistry major each year to work in the Territorial Schools.

**Status:** In Process.

Data were not available to address this objective. Therefore, it is recommended that the activity director addresses all of the objectives delineated in the plan of operation, including Objective 3.0 and 4.0.

**Rating:** 0.0

**Overall Rating:** 1.6
Resources (Fiscal and Personnel)

Resources for this activity were adequate. The FY 2008-2009 Title III activity budget, totaling $205,178 provided funding for the implementation of this activity. There were no positions funded through this activity but the budget included equipment ($139,729), and supplies ($65,449). The 2009-2010 budget of $218,645 provided funding for the implementation of the activity, including equipment ($126,645), supplies ($75,000), travel ($12,000), and other ($5,000).

Challenges to Programmatic Accomplishments

The primary challenge to Objective 1.0 was not being able to hire a professor with a doctorate in Physical Chemistry, a requirement for ACS accreditation. A second concern is that the activity director did not provide evidence that two of the objectives, Objective 3.0 and 4.0 were addressed. If these objectives were continued in the plan of operation for this activity for three years (2007-2010), it is a requirement of the Department of Education that progress toward the accomplishment of these objectives be reported for each grant year.

Program Impact

This activity’s impact has not been clearly documented. Since the equipment was purchased and installed and is being used by faculty and students, it is imperative that programmatic outcomes be documented to verify that the equipment has made a difference in student learning and faculty performance. Also, it critical to document that the major’s enrollment has increased and that the program has graduated qualified students who can acquire employment in the schools or enter graduate school. None of these critical outcomes were documented; therefore, the evaluator cannot verify that the equipment and other funding categories have made a difference to the University, program, or students.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are being offered to enhance the implementation of the Activity. It is recommended that:
**Recommendation 1:**

The activity director continues to contact universities in the US and its territories, as well as abroad, to identify graduates and those individuals in the final stages of completing the doctorate in Physical Chemistry to attain a commitment to teach and conduct research in the Virgin Islands.

**Recommendation 2:**

The activity director develops a strategy to determine if students’ grade point averages increased as a result of the infusion of the equipment into the curriculum by comparing the mean grade point average of students who completed the Instrumentation Analysis course the two semesters prior to installing the equipment with students’ mean grade point average in this same course two semesters after the installation of the equipment.

**Recommendation 3:**

During the 2010-2011 grant period, this objective be modified to state, “To ensure that the Chemistry Department remains viable by increasing its enrollment by a minimum of 2% annually by September 30, 2012.”

**Recommendation 4:**

An Anticipated Result be developed that states, “By September 30, 2011, there will be a 2% increase over the 2009-2010 enrollment of majors and by September 20, 2012, there will be a 2% increase over 2010-2011 enrollment of majors.”

**Recommendation 5:**

The activity director addresses all of the objectives delineated in the plan of operation, including Objective 3.0 and 4.0.

**Recommendation 6:**

The activity director establishes a process for measuring the improvement in program outcomes each year by keeping records (data) documenting the: (1) actual outcomes of the previous year (that will become the baseline for the following year); (2) number or percentage of improvement
that should be attained by the end of the current grant period as a result of funding; and, (3) actual outcome for the current year being evaluated.

**Recommendation 7:**

Objectives be written in measurable terms by stating in this order, the: (1) desired outcome in numbers and/or percentages (preferably both); (2) methods you are going to implement to attain the number and/or percentage; and, (3) timeframe for accomplishing the outcome.

**Recommendation 8:**

If the objective is going to take more than one year to accomplish, the final desired outcome, number or percentage, be divided by the number of years projected to complete the final outcome, and this number or percentage will be doubled each year to calculate the desired outcome for the objective. For example: An activity’s overall desired outcome is 100.00% completion in four years (divide 100.00% by four (4) to get the number or percentage of completion for each year).

- First Year- a desired outcome of 25.00% completion;
- Second Year- a desired outcome of 50.00% completion;
- Third Year- a desired outcome of 75.00% completion; and,
- Fourth Year- a desired outcome of 100.00% completion during the final year.

**Recommendation 9:**

Since completing quarterly reports is the only formal reporting mechanism for activity directors to document that they are making satisfactory progress toward the attainment of their activities stated outcomes, these reports be detailed and all documentation of completed deliverables be attached to each quarterly report as an addendum.

**Recommendation 10:**

Progress made in the previous quarter that involves data be repeated in the subsequent quarters along with new data reported separately in order to have a total picture of quantifiable evidence at the end of the grant period.
**Recommendation 11:**
If the objective called for an increase in a result, each quarterly report document the number and percentage of the increase attained during that quarter.

**Recommendation 12:**
Each quarterly report state what was purchased and the changes in instruction and student learning outcomes that were realized as a result of the new equipment be documented.

**Recommendation 13:**
Each activity director delineates a systematic assessment process that includes strategies and methods that will be used to collect and analyze data, by objective and performance indicator, to document the extent to which the objective and performance indicator have been met each quarter.

**Recommendation 14:**
Each progress report includes quantifiable data and other outcomes listed by objective to document the extent to which faculty and student performance or unit efficiency has improved as a result of the completion of implementation strategies that require the purchase of equipment and other resources, attendance at conferences, development of centers, to name a few.

**Recommendation 15:**
A narrative description be written for each activity, by objective and anticipated results, including quantitative and qualitative evidence to document the extent to which the objectives were completed during the grant period.

**Recommendation 16:**
The activity director ensures that the objectives and anticipated results are measurable (quantifiable) and not tasks (examples of tasks are: to purchase equipment, to network the campuses, to set up a laboratory) and that appropriate assessment methods to collect data and information to support outcomes are identified at the onset of the grant period.
**Documents Reviewed**

Activity Narrative  
Activity Objectives and Anticipated Results  
List of Needed Equipment and Instrumentation  
Title III Budget  
Quarterly Progress Report  
APRs

**Person Interviewed**

Dr. S. Latesky, Activity Director
Introduction

The Sponsored Programs Administration Improvement and Expansion Activity sought to improve and extend the services provided by the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). The activity was developed to establish a satellite office on the St. Croix campus of the University of the Virgin Islands, expand training offerings for faculty and staff on both the St. Thomas and the St. Croix campuses, improve the internal processing of proposals and awards, and improve statistical and reporting capabilities for internal management purposes. The goals of this activity were strategically aligned with VISION 2012, plans for the growth of mission-centered grant awards at a rate of at least ten percent (10%) annually. In order to effectively increase the number of proposals and awards, both campuses needed to increase their efforts and success of achieving awards. The Office of Sponsored Programs provided assistance to St. Croix-based faculty and staff, but was unable to deliver services that approximate the services provided to St. Thomas faculty and staff.

Management and reporting of proposal and award data is largely done manually. As UVI seeks to improve and expand the administration of Sponsored Programs, efforts were made to enhance the current processes for both pre- and post-awards by developing or acquiring a database system for tracking and reporting on proposal and award activities. The activity was guided by the Director of Sponsored Programs who is responsible for administration and proposal writing and a Sponsored Programs Coordinator (partially funded at 20% for the first two years of the grant cycle).

Specific Objectives, Implementation Strategies, and Accomplishments

The following objectives and anticipated results guided the activity for the 2008-2010 grant years:
Objective 1: To improve client satisfaction with OSP services on the STX campus by September 2009 through providing more services in-person.

Anticipated Result: 1.1 Positive change in the level of client satisfaction, as determined by pre- and post-year surveys.

Objective 2: To increase by at least 10% annually in STX proposals for competitive grants.

Anticipated Results: 2.1 Dollar volume of competitive proposals submitted by STX personnel.
2.2 Numerical count of competitive proposals submitted by STX personnel.

Objective 3: To increase by at least 10% annually in STX competitive grants received.

Anticipated Results: 3.1 Dollar volume of competitive proposals by STX submitters.
3.2 Numerical count of competitive grants received by STX submitters.

Status: In Process.

Since this activity was delayed in meeting its objectives and will not be funded for the 2010-2011 grant year, the three objectives delineated for attainment will be discussed under one Status Report. The activity experienced a number of challenges in implementing the plan of operation. Staff could not acquire space at the St. Croix campus initially due to the fact that no space allocation policy was in place and there was not adequate space to accommodate a physical office. In February 2008, Sponsored Programs was able to acquire the use of a room on the campus on Fridays and, rather than furnish the room as planned in the budget, decided to provide technology equipment that would be locked in a cabinet due to a lack in security in the room identified for use. This plan was later abandoned.

The staff met with faculty at the St. Croix campus to create a greater presence on the campus; however, there was no documentation of these contacts and outcomes. Because of the delays that occurred, the anticipated client satisfaction survey was not administered. Although
the activity did not meet the level of accomplishment anticipated when the activity was
developed, staff assisted those faculty and staff who had grants or who were seeking grants.

During the 2007-2008 grant year, the activity director reported that the volume of
proposals at the St. Croix campus remained the same in competitive grants, but the dollar amount
increased by 62%, from $1,049,497.00 in FY 2007 to $1,692,274.00 in FY 2008. However, at
the time of the external evaluation, there was no documentation that this increase was actually a
result of the impact of the activity.

For 2008-2009, a total of fifteen (15) proposals were submitted on the St. Croix campus
with a dollar value of over $2.5 million. During the previous fiscal year only ten (10) proposals
were submitted, with a dollar amount of $1.1 million, a 50% increase in the number of
competitive grants submitted. By the end of the grant period, a total of 10 awards with a dollar
value of over $1 million had been received by faculty on the St. Croix campus. This was a 150%
increase in the number of grant awards received by faculty on the St. Croix campus since the
previous year.

The Office of Sponsored Programs offered a number of training opportunities for faculty
and staff of both campuses. The first of these workshops was Proposal Budgeting, that
illustrated how to develop line-item budgets in compliance with federal and University standards
and insight into estimating the costs per line item in a budget. Lastly, the Office of Sponsored
Programs in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Advancement organized a proposal
writing seminar; this provided instruction on writing grant proposals to foundations and
corporations. A total of fifty (50) persons attended this workshop; compared to previous training
sessions, where only five persons attended. Also, during the fiscal year, the Sponsored Programs
staff attended a number of professional development workshops. In the first quarter of the fiscal
year, the director attended the National Council of University Research Administrators annual
meeting in Washington DC, that focused on the protection of human rights in research, grant
administration and project design. The Sponsored Programs Coordinator attended the IRB
Administrators workshop and the Essentials of IACUC Administrators Workshop, both of which
were sponsored by Public Responsibility in Medicine and Research. The Director of Sponsored
Programs also attended the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s CSREES Administrative Officers
Conference.
In the 2009-2010, sixteen (16) grant proposals were submitted on the St. Croix campus with a dollar amount of over $5.3 million. For the previous fiscal year, seventeen (17) grant proposals were submitted, with a dollar amount of $3.4 million, a 56% increase in the dollar amount of competitive grants submitted. Although there was a decrease in the number of grant proposals submitted, the dollar value of the grant proposals increased by 56%. The staff attended a number of professional development workshops including the IACUC Administrator's conference, the National Sponsored Programs Administrators Alliance of HBCU Conference and Management Concepts' Procurement workshop under federal grants.

**Overall Rating: 3.0**

**Resources (Fiscal and Personnel)**

Resources for this activity were adequate. The FY 2008-2009 Title III activity budget, totaling $35,990 provided funding for the implementation of the activity. The Sponsored Program Coordinator (20% time and effort) was funded for $8,872. The budget included supplies ($1,279), contractual ($1500), and other ($3,500). For the 2009-2010 grant year, since the activity operated from 2008-2009 unspent funds.

**Challenges to Programmatic Accomplishments**

The primary challenge to the implementation of this activity was the space issue and the lack of ongoing coordination with the St. Croix campus for the 2009-2010 grant year. There were legitimate reasons for a reduction in the time the Director of Sponsored Programs spent on this campus, but not having the presence on the campus as planned negated the accomplishment of Objective 1.0.

**Program Impact**

The primary impact of this activity appears to be the increase in grantsmanship on the St. Croix campus. However, although proposals worth millions of dollars were submitted, the evaluator could not discern the number and amount of proposals that were actually funded. Therefore, **it is recommended that a concise statement as to the amount and number of funded proposals be documented.** Also, without this information, there is no way of verifying that the
implementation of this activity contributed to this increase since the Office’s consistent presence on the campus was not attained. Since this activity will not be funded for 2010-2011, recommendations are not being offered for programmatic improvement.

**Documents Reviewed**

Quarterly Progress Reports

**Person Interviewed**  
Mr. Steven Goode, Activity Director
Introduction

According to a 2009 National Geospatial Advisory Committee report, the information technology sector has experienced a $30 billion per year growth due to the demand for a host of location-based technologies that are deployed via desktop computers, PDAs, and cell phones (NGAC, 2009). The Department of Labor projects an average 15% annual growth in the geospatial technology field until 2024 (Falconer, 2009). It is incumbent upon institutions of higher learning to prepare its students who will become the nation's future policy leaders to understand the landscape of geospatial technology and the requirements for future improvements and advancements.

Through the implementation of Geographic Information Technology education, the undergraduate students at the University of the Virgin Islands (UVI) would be afforded the following benefits:

1. Applying spatial analysis tools in their class-work, for example, in Biology, Health Care, Social Science, Psychology, Business, Marine Science, etc.;
2. Continuing their education beyond an undergraduate degree with the necessary geospatial analysis tools; and
3. Obtaining a competitive edge for many jobs in the public or private sector.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) is recognized by the USVI government, UVI faculty and students as an important decision making tool to manage resources for Caribbean islands, heavily dependent on small marine and terrestrial systems. During the 4th Virgin Islands GIS Conference in 2008, a focus group discussion with Virgin Islands community professionals representing the private and government sectors identified mapping services and skills needed by their organizations. The identified mapping services and skills matched the Developing a Curriculum (DACUM) duties and tasks required for a GIS Technician, which is considered an entry position. Project staff conducted a DACUM chart gap analysis of the differences between
what UVI teaches and what a GIS Technician needs to know. The analysis revealed that there is a significant gap between the requirements of the position and the skills being taught at the University.

Using GIS to teach has been proven beneficial to developing computer literacy and training in research process: gathering, preparing, storing and analyzing data and presenting the results using a variety of media (ESRI ArcUser, 2007). Geographic inquiry is an approach to conducting research. Unlike the scientific method, this research approach is space oriented. Its focus is on locations and how they influence the characteristics of a subject and on how a given location influences the relationship with other phenomena. Spatial analysis as provided through GIS will support mapping and analyzing of:

- potential business sites based on census data and other business locations,
- health related hotspots, such as diabetes
- marine research objects, such as coral reef ecology and management
- other environmental issues

In 2003, the GIS pilot study demonstrated the necessity of implementing a GIS curriculum: “UVI (should) institutionalize the teaching of GIS” (Mayes et al. 2003). An evaluation of the GIS pilot study researched several Universities and how they set up their GIS curricula. This activity permits the University to continue where the pilot study stopped by implementing those suggestions, as well as other ideas and models from different universities.

Most Universities with GIS capabilities provide some type of GIS curriculum, community outreach, and GIS technical support (Mannel et al. 2008). Currently, there are no institutionalized GIS training opportunities in the Territory. However, institutionalized GIS training for students, faculty, and staff is vital in order to provide undergraduate students with vital interdisciplinary analysis tools and to meet the Territory’s demand for trained persons to provide information which could be used to make informed management decisions. The UVI Eastern Caribbean Center/Conservation Data Center (ECC-CDC) over the past decade has provided GIS services and limited training.
The Geographic Information System is an obvious addition to UVI’s educational efforts, because of the perfect fit with UVI’s mission statement: “The University of the Virgin Islands is a learner-centered institution dedicated to the success of its students and committed to enhancing the lives of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands and the wider Caribbean through excellent teaching, innovative research, and responsive community service.” GIS is an important tool for teaching spatial context, innovative research, and community outreach.

Specific Objectives, Implementation Strategies, and Accomplishments

There were three programmatic thrusts and attendant anticipated results identified to guide the activity for the 2008-2010 grant years. However, these thrusts, identified as objectives were not objectives but tasks. Therefore, the evaluator recommends that one objective be written for this activity that states, “To ensure that the University’s curriculum includes a minimum of one interdisciplinary course offering in Geographical Information System technology by engaging faculty from appropriate departments to design and implement the course and provide training and supporting activities by September 30, 2012”. Further, it is recommended that the objectives as stated in this activity be reworded and designated anticipated results and tasks that will be implemented to attain the proposed modified objective.

Given the above-stated recommendations, the findings for this activity will be discussed as a single Status Report:

**Objective 1:** To set-up steering committee with representatives from different divisions to gather input on UVI educational needs and USVI local needs by April 2009.

**Anticipated Result:**

1.1 Faculty from other departments and partners will enhance the GIS curriculum based on UVI educational needs and USVI local needs.

1.2 Success will be measured by recommendation and accompanying report for UVI’s GIS curriculum.
Objective 2: To determine feasibility of different GIS curriculum scenarios by steering committee under leadership of CDC by September 30, 2009.

Anticipated Results: 2.1 The Steering committee under leadership of CDC will recommend a scenario (or mix of scenarios) for a GIS curriculum, based on UVI educational needs as seen by faculty, USVI local needs as seen by local partners, and best practices in GIS based on models of GIS education.

2.2 A recommendation along with justification will be issued.

Objective 3: To enhance the delivery of GIS education through professional training and development for faculty until September 2012.

Anticipated Results: 3.1 Faculty who participate in training and attendance at conferences/workshops will be able to provide an approach proven and recommended by the GIS community.

3.2 The measure of success will be based on the evaluations forms students as to the success of their class interactions.

Objective 4: To place GIS course within best fitting division(s) by September 2010.

Anticipated Results: 4.1 Discussions with potential divisions have already begun.

4.2 In one scenario the GIS curriculum might be co-hosted by two divisions. We anticipate the GIS curriculum to become part of one or even two divisions.

Objective 5: To teach first class by September 30, 2010.

Anticipated Results: 5.1 We anticipate a GIS class to be taught by the beginning of the second year.

5.2 Success will be measured by comparing student surveys at the beginning and at the end of the class.
**Status:** In Process.

A Steering Committee was established to study the feasibility of incorporating GIS initiatives into the curriculum. Three meetings were held by members of the Steering Committee to analyze the University and territorial geographic information systems gaps. The Mesa College DACUM research chart was used as an instrument to assist with the evaluation of the university's GIS learning gaps. Also, a GIS/GPS Learning Needs survey was developed by the committee and submitted to students. Lastly, Dr. Allen Falconer from the College of Science at the George Mason University conducted a GIS Curriculum forum to assist with determination of the University GIS needs and provided recommendations for the development of a curriculum.

As part of its continued effort to build GIS awareness among students and faculty, the GIS Steering Committee conducted a series of workshops on both campuses. In a collaborative effort among the Steering Committee, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association, and the National Geodetic Service, a workshop entitled "Building an Accurate GIS" was held. In addition, members of the Steering Committee also attended the 2009 ESRI Annual User Conference to learn of the latest changes and technologies in GIS.

Two mentors were identified to guide two University students through internship/independent work opportunities. One of the initiatives involved producing maps to identify the geographical locations in which homicides were committed. The idea was to determine homicide prone areas to study the characteristics of these areas. As forecasted, it appeared that the areas in which a great number of homicides were committed were high density areas in which individuals live below the poverty level. The other student was placed in a small company owned by one of the female entrepreneurs in this field.

Through the Steering Committee’s activities and research, it was determined that a GIS course would be a logical addition to the University’s curriculum and that this course would provide opportunities for students interested in the practice of this field. The interdisciplinary course was developed during the 2009-2010 grant year and is cross-listed in the Social Sciences and in Mathematics. The course will be offered in spring 2011 and this basic course will be an elective. However, faculty and staff are investigating permitting students to take additional elective GIS courses on-line through Penn State.
Rating: 4.0

Overall Rating: 4.0

Resources (Fiscal and Personnel)

Resources for this activity were adequate. The FY 2008-2009 Title III activity budget totaling $136,464 provided funding for the following personnel:

1. Mr. Stevie Henry, Activity Director, 50%
2. Mr. Pedro Nieves, Technical Assistant, 25%
3. Ms. Grisha Fleming, Administrative Assistant 15%
4. Vacant, Coordinator, 15%
5. Steering Committee Members

The 2008-2009 budget also provided for travel ($14,924), supplies ($15,520), and other ($6,000).

For the 2009-2010 grant year, the budget supported the following personnel:

1. Mr. Stevie Henry, Activity Director, 50%
2. Mr. Pedro Nieves, Technical Assistant, 25% (left position before 10/01/09)
3. Ms. Grisha Fleming, Administrative Assistant 15%
4. Vacant, Coordinator, 15%
5. Steering Committee Members

Challenges to Programmatic Accomplishments

There were no challenges during the 2008-2010 grant years that precluded the accomplishment of this activity.

Program Impact

There has been on-going impact of this activity due to faculty and staff involvement in activities designed to move this initiative into full implementation. Once the course is taught in the spring 2011 semester, information garnered from students who complete the course and
faculty who teach the course will be used to further develop this initiative and other related activities and opportunities.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are being offered to enhance the implementation of the Activity. It is recommended that:

**Recommendation 1:**

One objective be written for this activity that states, “To ensure that the University’s curriculum includes a minimum of one interdisciplinary course offering in Geographical Information System technology by engaging faculty from appropriate departments to design and implement the course and provide training and supporting activities by September 30, 2012”.

**Recommendation 2:**

The objectives as stated in this activity be reworded and designated anticipated results and tasks that will be implemented to attain the proposed objective.

**Recommendation 3:**

As the outcomes are documented after spring 2011, objectives be written in measurable terms by stating in this order, the: (1) desired outcome in numbers and/or percentages (preferably both); (2) methods that are going to be implement to attain the number and/or percentage; and, (3) timeframe for accomplishing the outcome.

**Recommendation 4:**

Since completing progress reports is the only formal reporting mechanism for activity directors to document that they are making satisfactory progress toward the attainment of the activity’s stated outcomes, these reports be detailed and all documentation of completed deliverables be attached to each monthly report as an addendum.

**Recommendation 5:**

The activity director establishes a process for measuring the improvement in program outcomes each year by keeping records (data) documenting the: (1) actual outcomes of the previous year
(that will become the baseline for the following year); (2) number or percentage of improvement that should be attained by the end of the current grant period as a result of funding; and, (3) actual outcome for the current year being evaluated.

**Recommendation 6:**

Objectives be written in measurable terms by stating in this order, the: (1) desired outcome in numbers and/or percentages (preferably both); (2) methods you are going to implement to attain the number and/or percentage; and, (3) timeframe for accomplishing the outcome.

**Recommendation 7:**

If the objective is going to take more than one year to accomplish, the final desired outcome, number or percentage, be divided by the number of years projected to complete the final outcome, and this number or percentage will be doubled each year to calculate the desired outcome for the objective. For example: An activity’s overall desired outcome is 100.00% completion in four years (divide 100.00% by four (4) to get the number or percentage of completion for each year).

- First Year- a desired outcome of 25.00% completion;
- Second Year- a desired outcome of 50.00% completion;
- Third Year- a desired outcome of 75.00% completion; and,
- Fourth Year- a desired outcome of 100.00% completion during the final year.

**Recommendation 8:**

Progress made in the previous quarter that involves data be repeated in the subsequent quarters along with new data reported separately in order to have a total picture of quantifiable evidence at the end of the grant period.

**Recommendation 9:**

If the objective called for an increase in a result, each quarterly report document the number and percentage of the increase attained during that quarter.
Recommendation 10:
Each quarterly report state what was purchased and the changes in instruction and student learning outcomes that were realized as a result of the new equipment be documented.

Recommendation 11:
Each activity director delineates a systematic assessment process that includes strategies and methods that will be used to collect and analyze data, by objective and performance indicator, to document the extent to which the objective and performance indicator have been met each quarter.

Recommendation 12:
Each progress report includes quantifiable data and other outcomes listed by objective to document the extent to which faculty and student performance or unit efficiency has improved as a result of the completion of implementation strategies that require the purchase of equipment and other resources, attendance at conferences, development of centers, to name a few.

Recommendation 13:
A narrative description be written for each activity, by objective and anticipated results, including quantitative and qualitative evidence to document the extent to which the objectives were completed during the grant period.

Recommendation 14:
The activity director ensures that the objectives and anticipated results are measurable (quantifiable) and not tasks (examples of tasks are: to purchase equipment, to network the campuses, to set up a laboratory) and that appropriate assessment methods to collect data and information to support outcomes are identified at the onset of the grant period.

Documents Reviewed
Activity Narrative
Activity Objectives and Anticipated Results
Title III Budget
APRs

Person Interviewed

Mr. Steve Henry, CDC Data Manager
ENROLLMENT RECORD MANAGEMENT UPGRADE

Dr. Judith W. Edwin, Activity Director
Dr. Leonard E. Dawson, Evaluator

Introduction

Records management has become a very serious issue in the United States and abroad especially since the tragic events of 9-11 at the World Trade center in New York and other sites in the United States. Institutions of higher education have felt the pressure to maintain accurate and accessible records of both present and past students in a safe environment where data can be accessed in a timely and speedy fashion. There is also added pressure, in this mobile society, where records of graduates and former students must also be readily available and able to be accessed as the need arises. Additionally, the University of the Virgin Islands recognized that it needed to prepare its old transcripts and other records in a format to meet the new challenges and to prevent further erosion and deterioration. The University wrote to the U. S. Department of Education on December 18, 2009 requesting an amendment to an existing program of enrollment management that would add funds to enable them to address this problem. The University recognized that there were thousands of records (primarily transcripts) that needed to be scanned and accessible in order to meet today’s standards of records maintenance and retrieval. Transcripts of former students, as well as other students’ records, were maintained on paper documents at both the main and St. Croix campuses. The over thirty years of cards and paper grade reports had produced over 20,000 documents that needed to be transferred to a new system.

Since 1992, the University has utilized the Banner record keeping system and has stored all of its records in the resource planning system, an integrated student data base and recordkeeping financial system. However, the almost thirty years of records that remain on card stock and paper are extremely vulnerable to decay, fire, hurricanes, and just routine deterioration in their present state.

The solution proposed by the University and supported by the transfer of $36,000 of Title III funds, involved the purchase of Doculex, a system that would scan all of the paper records and store them in a format that would provide easy access and retrieval. This project would
increase the operational efficiency in the records office and give it the ability to respond to former students and graduates’ requests for transcripts in a much improved and timely fashion. Additionally, it would upgrade the University’s records maintenance program and enable it to make better use of critically needed space presently occupied by file cabinets, boxes, and other storage systems.

Dr. Judith W. Edwin serves as the activity director.

**Findings**

The 2009-2010 Enrollment Record Management Upgrade activity (not funded in 2008-2009) listed one objective in its request to the Department of Education. It had no performance indicators although the narrative did suggest some possible outcomes. The objective is listed below, followed by a discussion of its status and given a rating.

**Objective 1:** To reduce retrieval time for 1992 student records from three days to less than ½ hour by July 31, 2010, thereby providing better customer service to alumni as well as former students.

**Status: Objective in Progress/Ongoing.** This evaluator believes that the University was too ambitious in promising that it would take only four months to scan record all of the 20,000+ records in this project. The limited manpower and other logistical problems suggested that more time would be needed to complete this project. However, the University has moved steadily ahead toward achieving this objective and has made good progress in implementing it within the time constraints proposed. The University received a quote of $77,534 for the purchase of the Doculex system on April 14, 2010.

This quote included delivery and installation, two days of on-site training, and an annual maintenance fee of $5,400. The maintenance fee included hardware support. The purchase order was made issued on May 11. However, installation and initial training took place on July 22, 2010. The following individuals were trained on the Doculex system as well as the accompanying software:

Cheryl Mingo  
Program Specialist
The session covered the basics of scanning as well as the retrieval of documents and all the possibilities involved in search elements. The personnel from the St. Croix campus could not attend this session so it was decided that they would be trained by the people from the main campus and another session would be scheduled with personnel from Doculex if needed.

At the time of this visit, it was reported that scanning and recording of records with last names A through E had been accomplished. Assuming even distribution throughout the alphabet (doubtful) this means that approximately one-fifth of the records have been scanned and are available electronically. The originals have been shredded and disposed of. This evaluator was given a demonstration on how the system works and it is indeed fast, timely, and extremely useful. Turnaround time simply depends on the availability of someone to access and perform the function at any given time. The work that is ongoing, or at least most of it, is being performed by an intern in the Office of the Registrar. It is not clear how the staff at the St. Croix campus is involved at this point.

**Rating:** 3.5

**Adequacy of Resources**

The budgeted amount of $36,000 covered only a portion of the total of $77,534 necessary to purchase the system, software, and maintenance costs. The University paid the remaining $41,534 from its own resources. This is an excellent example of leveraging University and federal resources to strengthen an important University function.

**Problems Encountered**

This activity witnessed an early delay in program implementation.
**Summary, Impact, and Recommendations**

The purchase of this equipment and the training of personnel at the University will impact the management and maintenance of transcripts and other sensitive records for quite some time at the University. It is important to have regular upgrades and periodic maintenance reviews in order to prolong the life of the system. Being able to respond to requests for transcripts in a timely fashion should improve the image of the University among its former students and graduates.

The following recommendations are made:

1. Make every effort to protect and secure these sensitive, confidential documents from the possibility of being compromised while this process is taking place. It was observed that they are presently in boxes in an open area and extremely vulnerable.

2. Identify some funds (possibly from carry-over Title III activities) if possible and pay a cadre of persons overtime to speed up this process and bring it to conclusion as soon as possible. The Christmas break may afford an opportunity to accomplish this.

3. The University should make changes of this nature internally by simply documenting the transfer of funds in the University’s records and notifying the Department of Education of the change. The amount and nature of the transfer falls within the University’s discretionary authority. This would speed up implementation of minor changes since the University would not need to wait for approval from USDOE and would reduce the paperwork and manpower burden on both entities.

**Documentation**

Letter to Department of Education, dated December 19, 2009

Three Quarterly Progress Reports

Quote from Spenceley Office Equipment

Equipment Maintenance Contract

Purchase Order dated May 11, 2020

Report for Title III Records Project
Persons Interviewed

Dr. Judith Edwin, Activity Director
Introduction

This activity came into being through a request from the University to utilize unexpended funds (7.832) from the Community Engagement and Lifelong Living Activity to Institutional Planning and Research. The objective was to improve the capability in the office by providing professional development activities to two staff members. The University stated in its request, “While this proposed activity is not specifically incorporated in the institution’s Comprehensive Develop Plan (CDP), it is consistent with both VISION 2012, the institution’s strategic plan, and with the Title III CDP. With the reliance of the institution and the Board of Trustees on verifiable data, it is essential that the infrastructure of OIRP continue to be developed and stabilized.”

Ms. Laurie Blake served as activity director.

Findings

The 2009-2010 Amendment to the Strengthening Institutional Research and Planning Activity listed one overall objective. It is stated below, discussed in some detail and given a rating.

Objective 1: To improve and strengthen the Office of Institutional Research and Planning.

Status: The University proposed to provide professional development training for two members of the staff in this office. The Institutional Planner needed training on how to automate the University’s Fact Book to be developed and published on APEX an Oracle tool that facilitates the publishing of web applications. The Institutional Planner would receive training on the use of the software. Ms. Laurie Blake received this training on-line and was not required to travel to Orlando, Florida as outlined in the proposal. Oracle University guaranteed the same expert facilitators in its Live Virtual Class and declared it comparable to its on-site, in-class version.
Ms. Laurie Blake participated in the Oracle training on January 26, 2010. Class hours were from 12:00 noon until 8:00 p.m. The following course objectives were covered:

- Design web applications using standard architectures, protocols, technologies and components;
- Configure JFS within the web container
- Design views using JSF and El
- Design custom components using Facelets
- Integrate navigation flow/redirection
- Integrate models and views using events
- Validate application data conversion
- Identify, Capture, and Resolve Errors
- Integrate Security
- Test, package, and deploy applications

It was reported that the on-line training was professionally done and satisfied the objectives that the University identified.

The University also proposed professional development opportunities for Ms. Andrea Ruan, the Administrative Assistant who had not been able to avail herself of any organized skills development activity in three years. She attended the American Management Association Skills for Administrative Professionals on December 7-9, 2009. The curriculum was divided into four sessions: (1) Mastering Change with Management Skills; (2) Find-Tuning Your Team Skills; (3) Controlling Your Workday, and (4) Communicating with Credibility. It was reported that the sessions were very interesting and that a lot was learned. However, Ms. Ruan observed that the curriculum and the treatment of the topics were more suited to the large corporate environment than the small non-profit sector such as UVI.

**Rating: 3.0**

**Adequacy of Resources**

Funds were adequate for these professional development activities. Some savings were achieved because no travel and lodging expenses were incurred as a result of the decision by Ms. Blake to complete here training on-line.
**Problem Encountered**

The director (previous activity director) resigned her position in September, 2010 and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning was without management direction at the time of this visit. There was no way to validate the impact of the training received on current operations.

**Summary, impact, and Recommendations**

It was impossible to assess the impact of the training on current operations during this visit. The Factbook had not yet been published on APEX, the Oracle tool, at the time of this visit. It can be viewed on the University’s website.

It is recommended that the University make use of its authority to implement minor changes such as this one by simply making an internal adjustment and *notifying* the Department of Education.

**Documentation**

Letter to DOE dated August 19, 2009

Three Quarterly Progress Reports

Application for Title III Carry Forward Funds

**Persons Interviewed**

Ms. Laurie Blake, Activity Director

Mr. Andrea Luan, Administrative Specialist/Office Manager
TITLE III ENDOWMENT

Ms. Adrina Scott Elliot, Activity Director
Dr. Leonard E. Dawson, Evaluator

Introduction

The legislation authorizing expenditure of funds under Title III, Part B of the Higher Education Act, as amended, makes provision for institutions to use up to twenty percent of a grant in any given year for endowment purposes. There is a one-to-one match required of the institution. The funds must be invested in relatively safe instruments for a period of time after which the government considers the terms of the agreement met and the institution gains full control of all of the monies, including interest and dividends on the corpus. The University recognized that this program is an excellent opportunity to begin to secure the financial stability of the institution. Consequently, it decided to participate in the program during the 2007-2012 grant cycle as follows:

Table 1. Annual fund raising targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>UVI Commitment</th>
<th>Title III Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart outlined the fund raising goal projected by the University by 2012 along with the Title III match from the U. S. Government for a total corpus of $210,000, less interest earned.

Findings

The Title III Endowment activity had the same objective for the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 grant years. It is listed below along with the anticipated result for the second year. The status of each is discussed and given a rating.
Objective 1:  (2008-2009 and 2009-2010) To raise a minimum of $20,000 each year By September 30 for the Title III Endowment Program.

Anticipated Result 1.1: The Title III Endowment Fund will have a balance of not less than $90,000 by September 30, 2010.

Status: This activity was successful in both the 2008-2009 grant years in achieving the match of $20,000 per year for endowment purposes. A September 10, 2010 statement issued by Seslia Securities, the company that controlled the portfolio, revealed that $90,188.93 was in the account at that time. No Title funds had been drawn down and deposited in the account since October 9, 2009. The University is obviously eligible to draw these funds and deposit them in the Title III Endowment Account. However, the anticipated result of a balance of not less $90,000 was achieved.

Rating: 4.5

Adequacy of Resources

Resources were adequate to achieve all of the objectives during the two years in question. No personnel, travel, or other costs were budgeted for these activities and UVI staff, including the activity director, performed services to achieve these objectives with no cost to the grant.

Problems Encountered

The activity director reported that the decision to transfer the endowment portfolio to the University of the Virgin Islands Foundation was unduly long and complicated. However, it did not affect the implementation of the tasks to achieve the fund raising goals.

Summary, Impact, and Recommendations

The University has succeeded in the last two years (2008-2010) in raising the funds needed to match Title III funds of $20,000 per year. This means that a total of $80,000 has been raised during this period for endowment purposes. The University has developed a set of guidelines for drawing down the funds from the federal treasury when the match has been achieved. They list six steps to be undertaken by the University and assign responsibility to
designated staff person(s) at the University. Timelines for completing the task are also included. It was reported that all matters of the relationship with the Foundation the University have been settled and the funds have now been properly transferred to the Foundation. It is believed that this development will result in better investments for the money and eventually better returns. The Agreement between the two entities, entered into on January 21, 2010, includes all of the proper safeguards and legally binds both parties to responsible handling of these funds. It is this evaluator’s opinion that the Agreement meets the legal requirements of 34 CFR. Part 628.

There are no recommendations for this activity.

**Documentation**

2008-2009 Endowment Objectives  
299801919 Endowment Objectives  
2008-2009 Endowment Quarterly Reports  
2009-2010 Endowment Quarterly Reports  
Institutional Match and Endowment Drawdown Procedures Document  
Title III Endowment Activity Report (fiscal)  
Official Agreement between UVI and FUVI  
January 21 Letter from Dayle Barry to USDOE re Transfer of Funds for On-line Giving  
2009-1010 Performance Report on On-line Giving

**Person Interviewed**  
Ms. Adrina Scott-Elliott
INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT CAPACITY BUILDING-ONLINE GIVING

Ms. Adrina Scott Elliot, Activity Director
Dr. Leonard E. Dawson, Évaluator
Dr. Haywood L. Strickland, Document Reviewer

Introduction

This activity was initiated through reprogrammed unexpended funds from the Geographic Information System Curriculum and the Community Engagement and Life Long Learning Accounts. Permission was granted from the program officer, Ms. Bernadette Miles to utilize $16,000 from GISC and $5,920 from CELL for a total of $21,920 to support the activity. The intent of the activity was to increase institutional support through the purchase and implementation of Blackbaud’s Sphere eMarketing basic software package. The Administration believed that the utilization of this technology would provide “a seamless, convenient and real time opportunity for the institution’s constituents to support the Annual Fund, thus increasing overall gifts to the University.”

Several outcomes are anticipated as a result of the activity’s thrust. They were:

- Giving donors the option to make donations using internet technology; ultimately increasing donor participation levels.
- The ability to reduce IA’s line item print and postage cost by using email solicitations and online donation initiatives.
- Building the capacity of the already existing Raiser’s Edge donor database system to solicit donations, collect data, and offer basic email tools, i.e., eNewsletter management, auto-fill online forms, recurring email schedules and to launch fundraising campaigns.
- Developing donor profiles using Sphere eMarketing reporting tools.
- Developing comparative reports for online donors vs. traditional giving.
- Allowing IA to reduce the amount of paper stock generated from its offices.
- Establishing baseline data for number of hits and visits to UVI’s web site.
Findings

Two objectives were established to provide the parameters for activity implementation. The objective and the anticipated results are indicated below.

Objective 1: To increase donor participation through gifts made online to the Annual Fund by (4) percent above the 2008 baseline of $1.2 million dollars by September 30, 2012. Short-term targets include: A. a one (1) percent or $12,000 increase to the Annual Fund through online giving initiatives, which would include email solicitations, online giving and email event notices by September 30, 2012. B. a second one (1) percent, or total of $24,000 increase above the 2008 baseline by September 30, 2011; and C. an increase of an additional two (2) percent or total of $48,000 above the 2008 baseline by September 30, 2012.

Increase donor participation levels and contributions by 4% above the 2008 baseline, leading to improved fiscal stability at the institution.

Status: Achieved.

The activity was begun in the spring of 2010. The programmatic thrust was built on the earlier emphasis on Blackbaud’s Raiser’s Edge and upgraded technology to accept the Sphere eMarketing Applications. Training and revised reporting forms were instrumental to prepare the institution for the changeover.

As a result of the new activity, it was anticipated that donor gifts would increase over 2008 baseline of $1.2 million in the following increments:

$12,000 or 1% by September 30, 2010, $24,000 or 2% by 2011 and $48,000 or 4% by 2012. The Annual Report revealed that the funds raised were $1,455,734 for a 15% increase over the baseline.

Rating: 4.5

Objective 2: To populate the Raiser’s Edge baseline with 10,000 active email addresses, thus reducing the cost of mail solicitations using USPS, saving
30 percent, or $3,000 below baseline by September 30, 2012. A. a 10 percent or $1,000 decrease to the operational cost of Annual Fund printing and postage by sending more email solicitations by September 30, 2010. B. a 20 percent, or $2,000 decrease below the 2008 baseline by September 30, 2011; and C. a 30 percent decrease or $3,000 below the 2008 baseline by September 30, 2012.

Reduce Institutional Advancement’s operational cost of printing and postage by $3,000 by the end of fiscal 2012, thus improving operational effectiveness.

**Status:** In process.

The primary anticipated outcome of this objective was a reduction in print and postage budget line items costs. The 2008 baseline costs were $10,000. Over the three year period of 2010-2012, the activity intends to transition from USPS to email for information dissemination. The eMarketing software will enable the office to store 10,000 active email contacts and send 250,000 emails a year.

It is anticipated that there will be incremental reductions in costs over the next three years over the 2008 baseline as follows: 2010-$1,000 or 10%; 2011-$2,000 or 20%; 2012-$3,000 or 30%.

The objective was not realized. Costs were higher, going from $12,476 in 2009 to $13,613 in 2010.

**Rating:** NR

**Adequacy of Resources**

Resources requested were sufficient to undergird the limited programmatic thrust of this activity.

**Problems Encountered**

No problems were reported or observed that affected the implementation of the activity.
Summary

This activity only began implementation in the spring of 2010. Though there were some successes. It will take a longer period of time to determine its true impact. The capacity to effect great change and realize anticipated results is certainly evident. By 2012, the objective should have been implemented in an effective manner.

There are no recommendations.

Documentation

January 2010 letter requesting and receiving approval for transfer of funds

2009-2010 Performance Report on On-line Giving

Activity Report

Person Interviewed

Ms. Adrina Scott-Elliot

Document Review by Dr. Haywood L. Strickland