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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 formative assessment of the first year 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. Brenda Shaw, Director of Title III Administration, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina; and Dr. Leonard E. Dawson, The Dawson Group, Richmond, Virginia. None of these consultants had other professional engagements or relationships with the University. The evaluation was conducted June 2-5, 2008.

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
June 2-5, 2008

1. Monday June 2, 2008
   AID Arrives

2. Tuesday June 3, 2008
   - 9:00-9:45—Opening Discussions with Project Administration Staff (ACC 2nd Floor Conference Room)
   - 10:00-12:00—Workshop on Allowability and Writing Measurable Objectives (Rooms T-114 and REC 133) [Video conferenced to St. Croix]
   - 12:00-1:15—Lunch
   - 1:30-4:00—Project Interviews
     - Sponsored Programs (Room T-114)-Shaw
     - Project Administration (ACC 2nd Floor Conference Rm)-HLS
     - Transitioning University Systems Forward (Room T-116)-LED

3. Wednesday June 4, 2008
   - 9:00-11:30—GIS Curriculum (Room T-213)-LED
   - 9:00-12:00—Academic Approach to Retention, Progression and Graduation (Room T-115 and EVC 807) [Video conferenced with St. Croix]-Shaw
   - 9:00-11:30—Title III Endowment (Room T-116)-HLS
   - 12:00-1:15—Lunch
   - 1:30-3:30—University One Card (Room T-116)-Shaw
   - 1:30-3:30—Improvements to Chemistry Program Infrastructure (Room T-114)-LED
   - 1:30-3:00-- Academic Approach to Retention, Progression and Graduation cont’d. if needed (Room T-115 and EVC 807) [Video conferenced with St. Croix]-Shaw

4. Thursday June 5, 2008
   - 9:00-11:00—Wrap Up/Report Preparation (ACC 2ND Floor Conference Room)
   - 11:00-12:30—Exit Interview (ACC 2ND Floor Conference Room)
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 monthly expenditure reports to her and meets with her directly as needed. He reviews Title III activities with her and receives her input and direction for program inclusion and implementation. 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 is supported 100% by the University provides fiscal monitoring and implementation. That person is responsible for maintaining accounting records for the Title III program and several other federal grant programs.

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) Insure fiscal integrity.

The written Policies and Procedures manual was updated in order to insure 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.

- Expend by September 30, 2008, not less than 50% of any funding carried forward from the previous grant cycle;
- Ensure that the rate of unspent funds at the end of the fiscal year (September 30, 2008) does not exceed 22% of the 2007-08 project award;
- 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, 2008;
- Contract for and complete a formative evaluation of the UVI Title III program by September 30, 2008;
- Comply with all submittal deadlines established by the US Department of Education within the 2006-07 grant year.

Performance Indicators for Project Administration for the 2007-08 grant year include:

- Completion of not less than 85% of the established project goals/ objectives for the 2002-07 grant cycle;
- Completion of not less than 78% of the established project goals/ objectives for the 2007-08 grant year and reduced risk of award reduction;
- Improved staff capability with regard to providing assistance to Project Activity Directors;
- A formal assessment of the institution’s Title III goals and objectives and the capability of the institution’s administration of its HBCU Title III program for internal consumption; and
- Reduced risk of losing funds due to non-compliance with USED mandates.

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 Polices 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: 4.0**

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. Title III program staff is
hosting and will attend the June conference of the National Association of HBCU Title III Administrators, Inc. (June 23-27, 2008) in St. Thomas, VI.

Function Rating: 4.0

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. A budget analysis revealed an average of 58% of the budget has been expended at midpoint of the grant year. Only one activity was decidedly below the anticipated percentage.

Functional Rating: 4.0

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 Formative External Evaluation. This report reflects that activity.

Rating: 4.0
### June 2, 2008 Project Expenditure Monitoring Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Approach to Retention, Progression &amp; Graduation</th>
<th>Original '08 Budget</th>
<th>Revised '08 Budget</th>
<th>Expended**</th>
<th>% Expended</th>
<th>$Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$296,825.00</td>
<td>296,825.00</td>
<td>84,360.30</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>$212,464.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Programs Administration Improvement &amp; Expansion</td>
<td>$45,162.00</td>
<td>45,162.00</td>
<td>19,279.96</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$25,882.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements to Chemistry Program Infrastructure</td>
<td>$314,577.00</td>
<td>314,577.00</td>
<td>280,058.56</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>$34,518.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitioning Forward University Systems</td>
<td>$713,768.00</td>
<td>713,768.00</td>
<td><strong>541,695.16</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>$172,072.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>$198,917.00</td>
<td>198,917.00</td>
<td>98,863.65</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100,053.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,569,249.00</td>
<td>1,569,249.00</td>
<td>$1,024,257.63</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$544,991.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There have been no budget revisions for FY 08  
** Includes expenditures and encumbrances as of June 2, 2008.

**Low spending**,  
Including **$234,273.48 in encumbrances**

### Travel in support of the objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>NCURA Sponsored Programs Administration Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dayle Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Travel</td>
<td>4/1/08-4/5/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Management Concepts Grants Management Certification Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Jarelle A. Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Travel</td>
<td>5/13/08-5/18/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>IDUES 2008 Pre-Application Technical Assistance Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Dayle Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Travel</td>
<td>4/30/08-5/2/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Sponsored Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>USDA/ CSREES Administrative Officer’s Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Steven Goode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Travel</td>
<td>5/4/08-5/8/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Savannah, GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project         | Sponsored Programs              |
| Purpose         | PRIM&R IACUC Essentials Workshop |
| Name            | Diahann Ryan                    |
| Date of Travel  | 3/24/08-3/27/08                 |
| Destination     | Atlanta, GA                     |

| Project         | Sponsored Programs              |
| Purpose         | PRIM&R IRB Fundamentals Workshop |
| Name            | Diahann Ryan                    |
| Date of Travel  | 2/4/08-2/7/08                   |
| Destination     | Los Vegas, NV                   |

| Project         | Sponsored Programs              |
| Purpose         | NCURA Annual Meeting            |
| Name            | Steven Goode                    |
| Date of Travel  | 11/4/07-11/8/07                 |
| Destination     | Washington, DC                  |

| Project         | Sponsored Programs              |
| Purpose         | PRIM&R Annual Human Research Protection Meeting |
| Name            | Steven Goode                    |
| Date of Travel  | 11/30/07-12/5/07                |
| Destination     | Boston, MA                      |

These trips are in support of Sponsored Programs Administration and Expansion project.

**Problems Encountered**

No problems were reported or observed which would impede the effective implementation of the Title III grant.

**Program Impact, Conclusions, Recommendations**

Title III continues to have a discernible impact on UVI. Funds are used to supplement University funds in addressing several critical issues facing the University. It is clear that the Territory’s resources are not adequate to support the University’s efforts
to insure a quality education for its students. The University and the Title III staff are to be commended on the excellent manner in which Title III funds have been administered. The process by which activities are selected is commendable. It insures that each activity is integral and important to the vision of excellence established by UVI.

There are no recommendations.

**Persons Interviewed**

Mr. Steve Goode, Director of Sponsored Programs
Mr. Dayle Barry, Title III Coordinator and Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs
Mr. Jarelle Berkley, Grants Administration Specialist
Ms. Joan Ephraim, Grants Accountant
Mr. Moriah Jacobs, Grants and Contracts Supervisor

**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

Introduction

The Transitioning University Systems Forward component is in reality an aspect of one of the core values of the University and its Vision 2012 Program. The effective use of technology to enhance teaching and learning and to improve educational and administrative processes and practices drive this activity. Both the Plan for Curriculum and Technology Support and the Enterprise Applications Improvement Plan are scheduled to be completed by 2012. The curriculum and instructional support area of this activity addresses three key areas: (1) faculty instructional development that emphasizes self development, collegial relationships, and the development of tools and products that enrich learning; (2) faculty technology training and support to build skills in technology and media; and (3) faculty technology areas and appropriate learning environments to create new skill-building and classrooms for faculty and students.

The second area of this activity focuses on improving administrative services. Three key areas, enrollment management, administration and finance, and human resources are emphasized. Activities designed to improve processes and procedures supported by appropriate technology will be key to goal attainment.

Findings

This activity lists five (5) objectives. There are two objectives related to curriculum and faculty improvement and three that are administratively focused. They are listed below, followed by a discussion of the status of each objective and assigned a rating.

Objective 1: By 2012, increase to 60% the number of faculty using the instructional technologies available at UVI.

Anticipated Results:
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:** Work to achieve this objective is ongoing. Training opportunities are being provided to faculty and it was reported that an increase in the number of faculty members utilizing the technology has been observed. However, no baseline data was presented to the evaluator to allow for objective measurement of an “increase to 60%” as outlined in the plan of operation. Even though the First Quarterly Progress Report lists a 28% completion rate for this objective, its accuracy cannot be verified since no baseline data was available. However, the list of specific tasks on the implementation and timelines plan report includes several tasks that have been accomplished. It is reasonable to conclude that ample progress is being made and the objective will be achieved in a timely fashion if the current pace continues.

**Rating:** 2.5

**Objective 2:** Increase participation in training by 50% by 2012 to build capacity among faculty for using UVI’s technology (i.e. smart classroom equipment, e-learning applications)

**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:** Objective 2 is ongoing. Training sessions for faculty have been provided and are continuing at both the St. Thomas and St. Croix locations. They are designed to introduce some faculty members to the technological and learning resources available to
them as well as expand the knowledge of more experienced faculty members. Training materials have been developed and utilized extensively. The TLT Group presented four web-based sessions on the following topics:

1. Using Flashlight for online Surveys 14 participants
2. Friday Live Sharing Best Practices, Teaching with Technology 8 participants
3. Seven Principles of Effective Teaching and Learning with Technology 17 participants
4. Using UVI’s TLT Membership for Professional development 10 participants

In addition, two faculty resource rooms, one on each campus, are being developed and equipped. The space at the St. Croix campus is fully operational and is being utilized by faculty. Computers and other technological resources are available including videoconferencing access. Plans are underway to fully operationalize similar space at the St. Thomas campus. A web portal is also in the developmental stages, a one-stop shop for assessing online instructional resources and information.

A second quarterly progress report was not available at this time. However, it is evident that this objective is on schedule and will be achieved within the time frame set in the plan of operation.

**Rating: 3.5**

**Objective 3:** Improve educational and administrative process in enrollment management services by FY 2008 by reducing processing time by 25% above the benchmark.

**Anticipated Results:**
After implementation the following processes will significantly improve current processes: CAPP, Recruitment Module, Scheduling, Communications, Online Admissions, etc. Additional processes will be implemented as well.
**Status:** Work on this objective is ongoing. With the help of consultants, IT staff reports that room scheduling and enrollment management tasks have been completed and Blackboard interface has also been done. Several other tasks are ongoing including financial aid and improvements, Banner recruiting, and Banner improvements. Online admissions has also been completed and tested. It is clear that this objective is making satisfactory progress but much remains to be done. The First Quarterly Progress Report pegs the completion rate at 25% and it should be higher that that now but the second quarterly report was not available during this visit.

**Rating:** 3.0

**Objective 4:** Improve educational and administrative processes in the Human Resources Department by FY 2009 by reducing processing time by 30% above the benchmark.

**Anticipated Results:**

After implementation, the following processes will significantly improve current processes: online time entry, online personnel requisitions, online check requisitions. Additional processes will be implemented as well.

**Status:** This objective is ongoing as well. It has as a measure of success a thirty (30) percent reduction in processing time by 2009 on a number of applications. Several tasks are listed as having been completed including online applications for employment, online appointments, and requisitions. Time entry for employees is also up and running. It was observed that training of benefit processors has resulted in increased productivity and less time needed to perform essential tasks. These are all improvements in the area that should be noted. The First Quarterly Progress Report shows a thirteen percent (13%) completion rate. No data is available to factor in the progress made during the second quarter of the grant period.

**Rating:** 3.0
**Objective 5:** Improve educational and administrative process in Administration & Finance by FY 2010 by reducing processing time by 25% above the benchmark.

*Anticipated Results:* After implementation, the following processes will significantly improve current processes: online credit card payment, Grants and Contracts Module, Bookstore interface. Additional processes will be implemented as well.

**Status:** This objective is ongoing. Several specific tasks have been completed with the help of consultants. Accounts receivables improvements, electronic purchase orders, bank reconciliations, electronic budget management, credit card payments and audit reporting improvements are all cases in point. Work remains to be done on financial reporting, bookstore interface and grants and contracts implementation. The First Quarterly Report lists achievement at the seventeen percent (17) level. No other report was available to update additional progress.

**Rating:** 2.5

**Adequacy of Resources**

The budget allocated to this activity is adequate to support the projects and tasks necessary to accomplishment of the objectives. The program is heavily labor intensive and funds allocated ($714,768) account for nearly half of the Title III grant.

**Problems Encountered**

No problems were encountered in this activity.

**Summary, Impact, and Recommendations**

It is clear that this activity is very important to the University and its plan to move to another level of achievement and excellence. The University’s decision to tie much of its future to the integration of technology to both inform decision-making and to
transform the teaching-learning environment is both bold and imaginative. The investment being made in equipment and training in both curriculum and faculty development and in administrative processes and procedures will surely reap dividends in the not too distant future. The objectives listed for this activity are all attainable within the stated timeframes and substantial progress is being made on all of them.

The following recommendations are made for this activity:

1. Objectives need to be rewritten and broken down into more manageable and measurable units for each year of the five year cycle.

2. Benchmarks should be established for each objective.

3. Reports of work completed by consultants should be documented and made available to the evaluators.

**Documents Reviewed**

Activity objectives and Anticipated Results
Individual Activity Budgets
Implementation Strategy and Timelines
Title III Time and Effort Reports
Title III Travel Reports
Information and Technology Services Newsletter
Change of Objectives Memo
Report on Faculty Development Workshops
Description of Web Portal Plan
States of Resources Room Report

**Persons Interviewed**

Ms. Sharlene Harris, Manager, Enterprise Data & User Services
Ms. Suzanne Darrow, ITS Specialist
Ms. Marilyn Henderson, Budget Manager
ACADEMIC APPROACH TO RETENTION, PROGRESSION
AND GRADUATION

Introduction

While the University of The Virgin Islands is experiencing an increase in its student population, the retention rate shows a decline from 75% to 72% over the past two years. The progression rate, 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th} year levels, has remained consistent between 60% and 54% respectively. The graduation rate, however, has fluctuated between 32% and 34% over the past two years. The University reviewed data collected from the 2003-2004 Noel-Levitz Survey and the National Survey of Student Satisfaction (NSSE) to examine UVI students’ attitudes in regards to retention, student satisfaction and student/faculty engagement. It was found that students rated the University low in their satisfaction with “engaged” faculty. Therefore, the University has chosen to address its need for more engagement on the part of students, as well as faculty, which might best be delivered in a focused approach that includes quality faculty-student interaction and social integration. These both play a major role in retention. Therefore, to maintain the existing enrollment and to continue to work toward the goal of a 3000 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 has been established to enhance the development of students both inside and outside of the classroom environment.

Under this Activity, CATS would randomly select a cohort of approximately 20% of the freshman class and provide intentional intervention to encourage academic success and increase persistence among those students. Each year a new cohort will be identified. A tracking system is to be developed; and while other students who make use of the Center will be compared with the cohort that receives intervention, they will not be participants in the Title III tracking system. Additionally, the CATS program will provide programs to assist a random selection of approximately 20% of those students who are placed on “academic probation. The program will include intrusive advisement
and tutorial assistance with the expectation of improving student’s success at the University.

The Office of Access and Enrollment oversees the Campus Advising and Tutorial Center (CATS), a central source for faculty/student interaction and student engagement under this Activity. Additionally, psycho-educational and diagnostic services to support student learning will be provided as an ancillary service for those students presenting a need. The Activity is guided by an Activity Director (University paid), a Sub-Activity Director (CATS Director), and two (2) Writing Center Coordinators at 25% each (Title III). The Retention Support staff and the Academic Advisor Specialist are scheduled to begin June 16, 2008.

Specific Objectives, Implementation Strategies, and Accomplishments

Retention, Progression and Graduation Activity has established the following objectives and related implementation strategies, and achieved the following accomplishments for FY 2007-2008:

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

*Performance Indicators:*

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 freshmen 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. No specific objectives with anticipated outcomes for 2007-2008 were established. The Activity staff were late in identifying a cohort for the first year; therefore, the selection of the cohort was delayed until Spring semester, 2008. No
data was provided on the cohort, and no rate of persistence had been established. The baseline data was not included in the statement of objective; thus, it could not be determined how much progress was anticipated for FY 2007-2008.

The objective was presented as 100% achieved on the second quarter report. Persistence would be tracked over a year’s time period, as this cohort was to be made of first-time freshman students who persisted from freshman year to sophomore year. By the cohort being selected in their second semester of their freshman year, the objective status cannot be determined to be complete until the students’ sophomore year. In this case, that would be a persistence of only the second semester of the freshman year to the sophomore year. Therefore, the Director has decided to restart the study, and will identify a new cohort Fall 2008. Thus, this objective has not been fully achieved at this point. A cohort was identified and intervention was provided, which would suggest results of those students’ performance at the end of the semester could be reported, but this documentation was not provided. The Director reported that program staff are currently setting up a design for the program and continue to look at methodology. Data provided was on persistence of the entire population of the full-time freshman to sophomore student, from 2005-2006, but no was data provided on the cohort for 2007-2008.

**Rating: 2.0**

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

**Performance Indicators**

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. There were also no measurement of anticipated outcomes established for 2007-2008. It was not clear whether a group of students on academic probation had been identified during the current academic year, as the 2\textsuperscript{nd} quarter reported stated that the cohort would be made up of those students placed on academic probation at the end of the Fall 2008 semester, which has not occurred yet. Therefore, no data could be provided to suggest that an increase in any identified population had been made in their performance during this academic year, 2007-2008. It was not reported whether or not the student group which was on academic probation was removed after one semester of interaction in this project as stated in the performance indicators.

The methodology for tracking the persistence rate of this group of students was identified as the Student Progress Monitoring System. This system will be used to monitor the prescription of intervention outlined for those identified at the end of the Fall 2008 semester: these students will continue to work with their assigned academic counselor; follow an academic advising paradigm, mandating immediate repetition of any course failed, repetition of gateway or prerequisite courses in which students received less than a “C” grade; attend tutorials; and take advantage of other appropriate personal and academic resources as referred. However, none of this has taken place this grant year, but the plans are being put in place. Therefore, less that the 50% reported has been achieved.

**Rating: 2.0**

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

**Performance Indicators:**

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: In process. No percentage of progress was established for 2007-2008 in this objective. No travel has occurred to attend the planned professional conferences and meetings to enhance the skills of the staff in the First Year Experience. One trip is anticipated for the month of July 2008. Program staff from St. Thomas traveled to the St. Croix campus to provide training for the staff of CATS, the Writing Center, and the Math and Science Enrichment Center on the Student Progress Monitoring System to assure accurate, detailed information is obtained on individual student progress, interventions, and monitoring of those participating in the program. Evidence of these training sessions needed to be provided to document the completion of the tasks.

The Director of CATS is reviewing the academic success of student cohorts entering in Fall 2007 and Spring 2008. Final grades indicate a high rate of failures in the basic skills courses, as high as 90%. A review is also being done of the courses these students took in the second semester. There is some confusion created by this reporting in the quarterly report, as the discussions indicated that a cohort had not been selected for Fall 2007. This needs to be further clarified in the next reporting cycle.

Rating: 1.5

Objective 4: To enhance 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.

Performance Indicators:

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. No percentage of progress was established for 2007-2008 in this objective. The Freshman Year Development Seminar (FDS) courses has a unit
included on career exploration. The curriculum for this particular section of FDS courses in this block may be 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 will be 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 is being added to the Learning Community/block of courses developed for undecided students. The Counselor will coordinate faculty in the block established for the Fall 2008 cohort.

Rating: 2.5

**Objective 5:** To increase the graduation rate by 5% by December 31, 2011.

**Performance Indicators:**

5.1 The graduation rate of 32% will show an incremental increase within five years.

5.2 The new rate will therefore be 35% which will be within the norm for the average HBCU. Comparison of graduation rate will constitute this measurement.

**Status:** This objective cannot not be measured at this time, as no parameters had been set for 2007-2008. The established cohort should be the only group included in the reporting of graduation rates, and not the rate for the entire population.

Rating: 1.0

**Adequacy of Resources**

The FY 2006-2007 Title III budget of $296,825 provides funding support for personnel, travel (15,204), supplies ($19,000), contractual ($52,100), and other ($42,000). The budget appears to be adequate for the implementation of the Activity. There have been no equipment purchases, and no travel has been completed.
Problems Encountered

The Activity receives support of two faculty at 25% each to serve as Writing Center Coordinators. However, there was no report from these staff included in any of the quarterly reports to reflect their contributions to the achievement of objectives. While many of the students using the Center are not freshmen, but rather students preparing for the required English Proficiency Exam, data should be reported on these students’ attendance and their progress in accomplishing this graduation requirement. While these data were not included in the quarterly reports, the two Writing Center Faculty Coordinators reported the following via email regarding students seeking help with the English Proficiency Exam and student performance on the EPE:

Fall 2007: 8 Students Registered for ENG 051; 7 passed, 1 failed

On the St. Croix Campus: 47 Students Took the EPE. 34 passed, 13, failed.

No data were reported for the St. Thomas campus. No usage data were provided for the Writing Center; however, student workers’ time sheets were provided for the Writing Center, CATS Center, and the Math and Science Center. These data should be included in each Quarterly Report as well. The data provided on the student passage rate of the 185 students who took the English Proficiency Examination Spring 2008 (41%) should be reported, as it was reported that many of the students using the Writing Center are preparing for this exam, and student tutors supported by this Activity are engaged in the work with these students.

Mini-grants were awarded to seven of the nine faculty who submitted proposals to address the Activity’s efforts to create opportunities for more student/faculty engagement activities outside of the classroom. There was no reporting on this activity as well, however, the competitive proposals were provided for review. These projects are expected to be completed in the coming months, at which time faculty will receive a stipend. Also, a third Title III supported activity was not included in the quarterly reports. Funds were allocated to contract with a psychologist to provide counseling and diagnostic services to the University. Dr. Romona Moss was contracted to provide psycho-educational services for students with learning disabilities, unique learning styles and special needs as needed; conduct workshops for student in the Freshman Development classes; and provide psychological services to student during the last two
weeks of the semester to include final exam seek. She provided services and conducted an anxiety workshop and will conduct more workshops in the fall, which will be open to freshmen through skills classes and the FDS class. The contract with the individual was sent via email for review. It is important that all areas that receive support under the Activity provide reports or reports are included in the quarterly and annual reports.

Summary

The Campus Advising and Tutorial Center supports the University’s mission into retaining academically successful students through graduation over a period of five (5) years. This project addresses Vision 2012 objectives, as well as implements strategies designed to enhance both the vision, mission and core values of the institution. One of UVI’s strengths is to develop the concept of students first while maintaining a strong foundation of excellence, teamwork and collegiality. Through the CATS program, UVI will benefit tremendously from a focused and institutionalized approach to advising and faculty interaction.

During this first two quarters of the grant, the Activity has sought to outline a method of intervention and tracking to assure that the cohorts of first-time freshmen and students on academic probation will be able to persist and graduate from the University. Overall, this Activity has the potential to significantly impact the University’s overall retention and graduation rates. For continued success of the program, the following recommendations are offered:

Recommendations

1. That statistics that were reported on completion of each objective be reviewed for accuracy;
2. That all funded positions on the grant provide input for the quarterly reports, such as the Writing Center, Professional counseling and diagnostic services contracts, mini-grants that are being offered to encourage student / faculty engagement;
3. That consulting services (workshops conducted) be included in the reporting;
4. That the program methodology and tracking system be more clearly delineated and defined and progress toward completing the related objective be stepped up so that progress can be shown by the end of the fiscal year;

5. That objectives and performance measures be established for each year of the five-year plan; and

6. That all objectives be written to assure they are measurable, reasonable, allowable, and time specific.

Documents Reviewed
FY 2007-2008 Plan of Operation
FY 2007-2008 Budget and Budget Summary
Quarterly Progress Reports, (October – December 2007 and January – March 2008)
Title III Newsletter, April 2008
Proposals for Student/Faculty Engagement Outside the Classroom
Block Schedule (Sample-Business) with Permission Slip for CATS’ Access to Students’ Records
Email Reporting Data on English Proficiency Exam

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, Freshmen Development (Via Teleconference)
Ms. Trudy Golphin, Program Coordinator (Via Teleconference)
CHEMISTRY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT

Introduction

This activity is 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. The lack of adequate laboratories and analytical equipment at UVI prevents the institution from serious consideration by ACS. Funds requested to support this activity are being utilized to correct this problem. Some outdated, inoperable, instrumentation and equipment will be replaced and new equipment will be purchased. Laboratory upgrades and teacher training are also included in the plans.

Funds have been requested for three years ($738,400) to achieve the goals of the activity.

Findings

This activity lists five objectives to be achieved over the five year grant period. They are listed below, followed by a discussion of each, and a rating provided where appropriate.

Objective 1: ACS accreditation will be achieved by December 31, 2010.

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

Status: This objective is scheduled to be achieved in 2010. Even though equipment is being purchased and faculty trained to comply with ACS standards, it is doubtful that the timeline
established will be met. The formal process in likely to take longer and the target date will need to be revised. Hiring of an additional chemistry professor is a priority for ACS and plans are underway to accomplish that.

**Rating:** 2.5

**Objective 2:** By December 31, 2009 all upper level chemistry majors will be capable of using the equipment that is considered standard for chemistry major.

**Anticipated Result:**

We will use a combination of grades achieved in analytical and physical chemistry courses combined with standardized test banks to monitor student success. Grade average increases from B to A and test averages in excess of 80% will be considered a successful measure.

**Status:** This objective is projected to be achieved by 2009. It is ongoing since some students are presently utilizing the installed new analytical equipment. Faculty will continue to monitor the installation and use of the equipment and begin to keep records, both anecdotal and statistical, on student usage.

**Rating:** 2.0

**Objective 3:** By December 31, 2009 the chemistry program will increase the number of graduates attending graduate school in chemistry after leaving UVI.

**Anticipated Result:**

We consider a greater than 50% increase in graduate school attendance with a 90% rate of obtaining advanced degrees will be a measure of success.

**Status:** This is a very ambitious objective and probably should be revised and a new date set for measuring achievement. December 2009 (approximately 18 months away) is too soon to measure and attribute impact given the status of implementation of the program at UVI. Plans are ongoing.
Rating: 2.0

Objective 4: By December 31, 2009 the chemistry program will increase the number of students majoring in chemistry and attending graduate school in chemistry after leaving UVI.

Anticipated Results:
We expect to increase the number of chemistry majors by 6 to 8 per year and to increase the graduate school enrollment by UVI graduates by 80% over the current level.

Status: This objective is scheduled to be achieved in 2009. Efforts are ongoing but it will probably take longer for results to be realized.
Rating: 2.0

Objective 5: By December 31, 2009 UVI will begin to see a new cadre of science teachers in the Territorial Schools.

Anticipated Results:
Graduating at least one chemistry major a year who will seek employment as a chemistry teacher in the territorial school system.

Status: This objective is ongoing and will impact the school system in the not too distant future. The paucity of qualified chemistry teachers will be a factor and immediate employment should be possible once productivity is increased. The projected incremental increase from 6 to 8 is reasonable and understandable.
Rating: 2.0

Adequacy of Resources
The amount requested for the upgrades envisioned in the chemistry program appear to be adequate to achieve the objectives as outlined in the activity. No personnel costs are included.
UVI is to be commended for its commitment to this program by providing necessary staff resources to teach the courses and man the labs. This fact should weigh favorably with the American Chemical Society.

**Problems Encountered**

Renovation work needs to begin as soon as possible on needed laboratory space in order to safeguard and utilize new equipment purchased. Additionally, installation of purchased equipment not yet installed should become a priority.

**Summary, Recommendations, and Impact**

This activity has ambitious goals and seeks to have an impact on a much-needed dearth in chemistry teachers and in preparation of minorities in the sciences. Even though the numbers are small in the beginning, chances of growth are good with proper stewardship and commitment. The faculty is dedicated to improving the program and has the expertise to do so. Of critical importance will be the new hire to teach in the program. The following are recommended:

1. Time line should be reviewed and adjusted in Objectives 1, 3, and 4.
2. Renovation work should begin as soon as possible on laboratory space for the new equipment.
3. Installation of the new equipment purchased should proceed as soon as possible.

**Documents Reviewed**

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

**Persons Interviewed**

Dr. S. Latesky, Activity Director  
Dr. T. Archibald, Professor of Chemistry
Introduction

The Sponsored Programs Administration Improvement and Expansion Activity seeks to improve and extend the services provided by the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP). The Activity is 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 are 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 will need to increase its efforts and success of achieving awards. The Office of Sponsored Programs provides assistance to St. Croix-based faculty and staff, but is unable to deliver services that approximate the services provided to St. Thomas faculty and staff.

Management and reporting of proposal and award data are largely done manually. As UVI seeks to improve and expand the administration of Sponsored Programs, efforts will be 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 is guided by the Director of Sponsored Programs, responsible for administration and proposal writing, an Assistant Director of Sponsored Programs (85%), who handles post-awards, and a Sponsored Programs Coordinator (20% of salary paid by the grant), who provides post-award support and administrative services.
Specific Objectives, Implementation Strategies, and Accomplishments

Sponsored Programs Administration Improvement and Expansion Activity has established the following objectives and related implementation strategies, and achieved the following accomplishments for FY 2007-2008:

Objective 1: To improve client satisfaction with OSP services on the STX campus by September 2009 through providing more services in-person.

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

Status: In process. The Activity experienced a number of delays in implementing the plan. A good deal of time was spent in preparation and moving into the new facility September 30, 2008. Additionally, the staff could not acquire space at the St. Croix campus due to the fact that no space allocation policy was in place. 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, will provide technology equipment for the facility. The staff has been meeting with faculty at the St. Croix campus to create a greater presence on the campus; however, there needs to be documentation of these contacts and outcomes. Because of the delays that occurred, the anticipated client satisfaction survey will be conducted September 1, 2008. Results: Staff are now helping those faculty and staff who have grants or who are seeking grants; thus, the climate seems to be changing on the St. Croix campus with regards to the OSP office and grants application and monitoring.

Rating: 2.0

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.

**Status:** 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. There needs to be documentation that this increase is actually a result of the impact of the Activity since October 1, 2007.

**Rating:** 2.5

**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:** The volume of competitive grants received by the St. Croix staff increased from one in FY 2007 to two in FY 2008. The dollar amount increased by 58%, from $83,400.00 in FY 2007 to $1,692,274.00 in 2008. Again, there needs to be documentation that this increase is actually a result of the impact of the Activity since October 1, 2007.

**Rating:** 3.0

**Objective 4:** To increase by at least 10% annually in participation in training sessions.
Anticipated Results:

4.1 Number of faculty/staff attending sessions.

Status: In process. The amount of increase that was gained could not be determined, as no baseline data were provided in order to make a comparison. However, the Activity narrative delineates that at least two sessions will be conducted annually. Two workshops on Proposal Budgeting were conducted on both campuses for faculty and staff. Sign-in sheets of participants (total of 29 participants) were available for review for three of the four workshops, but no formal evaluations were conducted. The verbal feedback from the workshop attendees was very positive. Plans are being made to develop an instrument to use when conducting such workshops.

Rating: 3.0

Objective 5: To improve tracking of proposals and awards, by September 30, 2009.

Anticipated Results:

5.1 Implementation of a tracking database.

Status: Ongoing. No discussion on this objective was actually held; no indication that a database needs have been identified, no acquisitions of needed software were made, nor were outside consulting services determined. The Quarterly Report described the objective as on-going, but no evidence of accomplishments were provided. It could not determine what the 25% completion provided on the Quarterly Report represented since no data were provided to show what has actually been done relative to the expected outcome. The objective was merely described as ongoing.

Rating: 1.0

Objective 6: To provide professional development for OSP staff by September 2009.
**Anticipated Results:**

6.1 Participation by all members of OSP staff annually in relevant courses or workshops.

**Status:** This objective is not stated in measurable terms, and does not state a projected outcome for the 2007-2008 fiscal year. However, in the narrative the anticipated outcome is that the OSP Director and staff would attend at least one workshop annually on topics directly related to pre- and post-award administration of sponsored programs. Each of the OSP staff members attended at least two professional workshops to enhance their knowledge in the field. The Program Coordinator attended the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee Administration workshop in Atlanta, GA, March 24-27, 2008, and the Institutional Review Board Administrator 101 workshop in Las Vegas, NV, February 5-6, 2008. The Director of OSP attended the NURA Annual Meeting and Workshop in Washington, DC, November 4-8, 2007, and the USDA/CSREES Administrative Officers’ Conference held in Savannah, GA, May 4, 2008. Ordinarily, it is expected that the staff would be more proficient in carrying out their duties, providing more assistance based on knowledge gained during conferences, workshops, and training experiences; and it is expected that OSP staff professional development would lead to improvements in workflow processes, growth in proposals and awards, and reduction in negative outcomes, such as audit findings and disallowed costs. The Activity Director needs to find ways to measure such outcomes. All appropriate travel documentation is on file in the Activity Director’s office, including travel requisitions, travel reports, etc.

**Rating:** 3.5

**Adequacy of Resources**

The FY 2007-2008 Title III budget of $45,162.00 provides funding for the Sponsored Programs Coordinator who is responsible for Post-Award Administration (20%). The budget line items are for personnel ($12,112), travel ($20,750), supplies ($7,300), contractual ($1,500), and other ($3,500). The budget appears to be adequate for the implementation of the Activity.
Problems Encountered

The Activity has experienced some delays particularly as a result of the amount of time was spent during the first quarter in preparing and moving into the new facility, September 30, 2008. Additionally, the staff could not acquire space at the St. Croix campus due to the fact that no space allocation policy was in place. In February 2008, Sponsored Programs was able to acquire the use of a room on the campus on Fridays and will now be able to move forward once the new academic year begins and faculty are in place for the fall semester. In spite of these delays, the Activity continues to progress toward bridging the gap between the OSP services offered to the St Croix campus and enhancing the services provided on the St. Thomas campus.

Summary and Recommendations

This Activity supports the VISION 2012 framework under Objective 1.F: “Increase scholarly, research and outreach activities that enhance student learning, respond to community needs, and/or generate new knowledge that also meets peer-reviewed standards.” It also supports Objective 2.B: "Ensure enhanced customer service delivery and improved operational results (with specific measurements to be defined) by redesigning administrative and educational processes.” But most importantly, it is an important part of the University’s strategy to achieve Objective 3.D: “Increase mission-centered grant acquisitions that support and promote research and community development.”

The Activity is making progress toward completing the following:

1. Launching a subsidiary office on the STX campus, by establishing an office staffed on a part-time basis by staff members traveling from St. Thomas.

2. Expanding training offerings to faculty and staff at the St. Croix campus by conducting more training sessions aimed at both pre-and post-award sponsored programs administration. These would range from small group sessions focused on specific disciplinary interests to large broadly-focused sessions. Activities would be held on both campuses, as well as using video-conferencing where practicable.
3. Providing professional development for OSP staff.

The Activity, once fully implemented, will be a valuable asset to the University. To continue in this vain, the evaluation team offers the following recommendations:

1. That a method of documenting services provided to faculty and staff on both campuses be determined and implemented;
2. That comparative data be provided on the increase in the percentage of increase in participants in the annual training provided to faculty/staff on OSP related topics;
3. That an evaluation instrument be developed and administered to determine the impact of the workshop sessions that are conducted; and
4. That the tracking system be clearly delineated and defined and progress toward completing the related objective be stepped up so that progress can be shown by the end of the fiscal year;
5. That objectives and performance measures be established for each year of the five-year plan; and
6. That all objectives be written to assure they are measurable, reasonable, allowable, and time specific.

**Documents Reviewed**
FY 2007-2008 Plan of Operation
FY 2007-2008 Budget and Budget Summary
Quarterly Progress Reports, (1st and 2nd Quarters)
Workshop Sign-in Sheets (March 7, 2008, April 11, 2008, and April 17, 2008)
Travel Requisitions
Travel Reports
Time and Effort Report (1st Quarter)
Charts of Proposals Submitted 1st and 2nd Quarters, 2006-2007
Charts of Proposals Submitted 1st and 2nd Quarters, 2007-2008

**Persons Interviewed**
Mr. Steven Goode, Director, Sponsored Programs and Activity Director
ONE CARD SYSTEM PROPOSAL

Introduction

The proposal is a very comprehensive and well thought-out plan, which if implemented, should serve the University well. It is critical that with the number of components contained in the plan, that a unified oversight structure be devised. The Activity proposes to be implemented in four phases over a three year period. This program would allow the University to enhance and improve the students’ experiences, simplify ID card production, support enrollment management, provide centralized and integrated card production operations, enhance cardholder convenience, improve administration of the meal plan, foster greater school identity and school spirit, reduce cash payments and cash handling requirements, provide secured payment devises, and increase revenues and revenue sharing opportunities.

The proposal is most certainly aligned with the University’s commitment to achieve the goals outlined in VISION 2012, to realize greater institutional effectiveness and improved performance, and to improve systems and processes. Acquisition of this system would strengthen information technology infrastructural capacity to support improved administration and management of essential services impacting students, as well as faculty and staff. The functionality of the One Card System would include, identification management of students and staff; financial transaction management for food services, bookstores, parking, vending, laundry, etc.; printing and copying management and library privileges; access control and security integration; monitoring student services usage; establishing baking and other off-campus relations; and enhancing institutional capacity through technology.

With there being two campuses of the University of the Virgin Islands, the One Card System would reduce the many varying technologies used to service students and staff on both campuses. This system would integrate and centralize the identification and card payment capabilities across the two campuses.
Observations

The objectives of the proposal often contain several sentences with several outcomes included in one objective. It is best to have only one idea in each objective with measurable outcomes and timelines. The proposal developers will need to utilize the forms provided by the Title III Office for presenting objectives and performance measures and the implementation strategy to assure that the alignment of these items is consistent with Title III formats and requirements and external and Annual Performance Report (APR) evaluation expectations.

Because of developments that overlap with some of the plans of this proposal, the developers of the proposal should engage in a conversation with University officials regarding the inclusion of these plans in this proposal and establishing a means of unified implementation of a comprehensive program, which this proposal certainly sets forth.

In light of these events and the fact that the proposal was not approved to be implemented in 2007-2008, as the established timeline indicates, the staff will need to revisit the plan and revise it to fit the institution’s decisions about when the project will begin and the length of time it will be funded under the Title III grant.

Suggestions and Recommendations for Rewriting Activity Objectives

It is recommended that a review each of the objectives be conducted and revised to make sure to make them more focused and measurable.

Performance Measures

What to measure?

- A specific achievement/accomplishment;
- Change in a level of achievement/accomplishment;
- Achievement/accomplishment (or change) compared with other students or institutions.

Components of Performance Measures

- That which will be changed;
- The amount of change that is expected;
- Who or what will change;
- When the change will take place;
- How the change will be measured.
Please remember! Activities or tasks are not performance measures.

- **Objectives** should be relevant, focused, and measurable.

- **Measurable objectives** should be specific, quantifiable (data-driven), achievable, realistic, and time specific.

  **Example:** To increase by 2% the critical thinking skills of at least 50% of the freshman and sophomore students who have demonstrated deficiencies in these areas by 2012.

- **Performance measures** should answer What, How Much, Who, and When.

  **Example:** 250 faculty and academic support staff will have been trained to integrate critical thinking into college courses that enroll large numbers of first and second year students by 2012.

**Outcome measures** are not process measures.

**Process Measures** are data used to demonstrate the implementation of activities. These include products of activities and indicators of services provided. Process measures provide documentation of whether an Activity is being implemented as originally intended. For example, process measures for a mental health court Activity might include the number of treatment contacts or the type of treatment received.

**Outcome measures** represent the actual change(s) or lack thereof in the target (e.g., clients or system) of the Activity that are directly related to the goal(s) and objectives. Outcomes may include intended or unintended consequences. Three levels of outcomes to consider include:

- **Initial outcomes:** Immediate results of an Activity.
- **Intermediate outcomes:** The results following initial outcomes.
- **Long Term:** The ultimate impact of an Activity.

**Example:**

**Outcome Measure:** Based on pre- and post-tests, 50% of the freshman and sophomore students enrolled in critical thinking skills and writing related courses will demonstrate a 20% increase in their skills level by 2012.

**Baseline:** Forty percent (40%) of the freshman and sophomore students demonstrated a 20% increase in their skills in critical thinking and writing during the 2007-2008 academic year.
➢ “More objectives and measures” does not equal better objectives and measures.

Documents Reviewed
Proposal Request, One Card System, 2007-2012

Persons Interviewed
Ms. Lily Mae Durant, Associate Campus Administrator for Operations, Campus Operations
Ms. Charlene Harris, Enterprise Data and User Services Manager, ITS
GIS CURRICULUM

Introduction
The University is planning to insulate and implement a Geographical Information System program with funding from Title III. Curriculum development, faculty approved, and teaching of actual courses will begin in 2009-2010.

Findings
This activity lists five objectives that are scheduled to begin in 2008-2009 and continue through 2011-2012. They are listed below but no status or rating are provided since none of them are operational at the time of this evaluation.

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

Anticipated Results:
Faculty from other departments and partners will enhance the GIS curriculum based on UVI educational needs and USVI local needs. Success will be measured by recommendation and accompanying report for UVI’s GIS curriculum.

Objective 2: Determine feasibility of different GIS curriculum scenarios by steering committee under leadership of CDC by September 30, 2009.

Anticipated Results:
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. A recommendation along with justification will be issued.

**Objective 3:** Enhance the delivery of GIS education through professional training and development for faculty until September, 2012.

**Anticipated Results:**
Faculty who participate in training and attendance at conferences/workshops will be able to provide an approach proven and recommended by the GIS community. The measure of success will be based on the evaluations forms students as to the success of their class interactions.

**Objective 4:** Place GIS course within best fitting division(s) by September 2010

**Anticipated Results:**
Discussions with potential divisions have already begun. 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:** Teach first class by September 30, 2010.

**Anticipated Results:**
We anticipate a GIS class to be taught by the beginning of the second year. Success will be measured by comparing student surveys at the beginning and at the end of the class.

**Summary and Recommendations**
The development of a curriculum to teach Geographical Information Systems technology to students is a laudable goal. The utility of trained persons in GIS in the Virgin Islands where both campus are located is obvious. The technology can be tremendous assistance in many public areas including postal service, public safety
including fire and rescue and island police. In addition, its application to medical services is also clear. Developing the training and certification at UVI is a very positive development.

The following recommendations are made:

1. It is not clear how much faculty input and involvement have been a part of the development of this program. It is imperative that leadership and ownership of the program be vested in the appropriate division(s) of the faculty at the University.

2. Advice should be obtained from other institutions who have started similar programs. The name of one such institution has been given to the UVI team.

Positive signs are (1) identification of steering committee members; (2) review of the GIS curriculum models; and (3) informal and formal discussion with faculty members.

**Persons Interviewed**

Mr. Sylvio Mannel- CDC Coordinator

Mr. Steve Henry-CDC Data Manager
**TITLE III ENDOWMENT**

**Introduction**

The University of the Virgin Islands has requested support from the Title III program to establish an endowment over the five year period of the 2007-2012 grant cycle. It is clear that the need for an endowment is essential and crucial to the long-term viability and stability for any institution of higher education. Sustainability of developing institutions and the ability to provide a competitive education rests in the long run on reducing reliance on student aid income and governmental funding.

The activity as proposed is a modest beginning but it has the potential to grow as donors are identified over time. It is anticipated that the funds will be allowed to grow. The corpus will be restricted; at some time in the future details relative to utilization of income accrued will be determined.

**Objectives, Outcomes and Timeliness**

(1) To raise a minimum of $65,000 for the Endowment challenge fund to be matched by $65,000 from Title III by 2012. The annual targets are as follows:

<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>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Findings**

The activity is under the leadership of Dr. Ardrina Scott-Elliot and the supervision of Dr. Henry Smith, Interim Vice President for Institutional Advancement. The implementation is in process. There are no definable outcomes at present. The evaluator discussed the possible lodgement of the endowment with an independent foundation. It was recommended that the University maintain control of the endowment under the guidance of the Board of Trustees.

**Summary**

It is clear that this activity will have significant impact on the University in the future. Endowment building is crucial to sustainability and viability. There is a need to establish ultimately what the larger endowment goals are and the utilization of income accrued. It is recommended that for the present any income earned would become a part of the corpus until it becomes meaningful.

**Persons Interviewed**

Ms. Ardrina Scott-Elliott, Activity Director
Dr. Henry Smith, Interim VP for Institutional Advancement