Welcome to The Quick Guide to Improvement Reports, a supplement to the Unit Effectiveness Process (UEP) Handbook aimed at answering the WHO, WHAT, WHEN, WHERE and HOW of assessment reporting at UT Arlington.

**WHO should use the Quick Reference Guide?** Anyone can use this guide, from those who are new to assessment to those who are veterans of assessment.

**WHAT is the Quick Guide to Improvement Reports?** The Quick Guide to Improvement Reports is a supplement to the Unit Effectiveness Process Handbook. The Quick Guide to Improvement Reports calendar which can be found on the IER Website ([www.uta.edu/ier/UEP](http://www.uta.edu/ier/UEP)), instructions for completing the Annual Improvement Report, and references to the UEP Handbook.

**WHEN should I use the Quick Guide to Improvement Reports?** You should use the Quick Guide to Improvement Reports when completing UEP Annual Improvement Report.

**WHERE can I find the Quick Guide to Improvement Reports, UEP Handbook, and Nuventive login?** These are located on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Reporting (IER) web site at [http://www.uta.edu/ier/UEP/index.php](http://www.uta.edu/ier/UEP/index.php).

**HOW do I submit UEP plans and reports?** The UEP Improvement Reports are entered into the Nuventive Improve database at [https: www.uta.tracdat.com](https://www.uta.tracdat.com).

The Quick Guide to Improvement Reports has been designed as a straight-forward and easily maneuverable tool to assist you in the UEP endeavor. If you need additional assistance, please do not hesitate to email us at [UEP@uta.edu](mailto:UEP@uta.edu) or contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Reporting at 817-272-3890.
UEP IMPROVEMENT REPORT GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Improvement Report (IR) is the report that documents any improvements that were actually implemented. The report is completed for each academic year. Improvements reported are to be based on information gleaned through the UEP. Any other improvements, not based on data collected through the UEP (e.g. results of departmental survey, assessment as part of reaffirmation for a professional accreditation) will be considered for inclusion on a case-by-case basis. There is a single report for each unit. In the case of academic units, the singular report is to be used for documenting improvements related to all degree/certificate programs, and stand-alone minors.

Instructions for Completing Form if NO Improvements Were Implemented
Even if your unit did not implement any improvements during the designated academic year, the report must be completed for your unit. In addition to naming the improvement “None”, provide an explanation as to why improvements were not implemented.

Instructions for Completing Form if Improvements Were Implemented
Since improvements documented on this report can be tied to any previous UEP assessment, it is important to provide contextual information about the improvement as well as details of the improvement.

- **Improvement name** → Name the improvement by assigning a number (1, 2, 3, etc.) or with descriptive language.
- **Improvement** → Describe the improvement that was implemented in sufficient detail that it would be clear to someone outside of the unit.
- **How was the need for improvement determined** → Indicate if the assessment was conducted as a part of the UEP or through another assessment initiative. Any previous UEP results can be referenced, including those from the most recently completed UEP cycle as well as those from previous UEP cycles.

It is expected that your unit is implementing improvements based on data collected through the UEP, which is the institution-wide effectiveness process. Improvements that are reported based on data collected from an assessment conducted outside of the UEP will be considered for inclusion on a case-by-case basis.

- **Academic year implemented** → Select the academic year from the option provided.
- **Assessment result that showed a need for improvement** → Describe briefly the assessment findings prompting the improvement. Improvements may also be implemented based on assessment findings that support the achievement of the intended outcome or may be based on inconclusive assessment results. If this is the case, please describe.
- **Estimated value of resources used to implement improvement** → Describe the value of the improvements in **actual or approximate dollar amount**. If the improvement required faculty/staff time beyond their usual responsibilities, estimate the time spent and multiply by approximate hourly rate (suggested rate is $60/Hour).
• **Source of resources used to implement improvement** → Indicate the source of resources by checking the box or boxes with appropriate corresponding source.

• **Semester improvement implemented** → Indicate the semester and year combination that the improvement(s) was/were initially implemented.

*You are able to add the exact number of improvements you need for your report by clicking the green plus sign within Nuvenitve for each improvement.*

**Improvement Report Samples** (sample titles are hyperlinked within the document, click on title to jump to the sample)

- Sample 1 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Learning Outcome, Academic Unit, Master’s Program
- Sample 2 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Outcome, Non-academic Unit
- Sample 3 – No Improvements Implemented, Results of Assessment Inconclusive for UEP Outcome(s), Educational Support Unit
- Sample 4 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Learning Outcome, Academic Unit, PhD Program
- Sample 5 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Assessment(s) Not Included in the UEP, Educational Support Unit
- Sample 6 - Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Outcome, Non-academic Unit
- Sample 7 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Administrative Outcome, Academic Unit
- Sample 8 - Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Learning Outcome, Academic Unit, Undergraduate Program

Note: The information contained in the samples is for illustration purposes only and may not represent actual assessments.
Improvement Report

XX-XX COE – Bioengineering

**Improvement:** During the 2016-2017 UEP cycle, 22% of undergraduate students did not achieve the minimum criterion for success, a score of 3 or higher on their ability to identify relevant mathematical, scientific, and engineering methods to formulate and solve the problem from a bioengineering perspective. In response to these results, in fall 2017, the bioengineering department faculty developed four new courses that can be utilized as curriculum electives: BE 2310 (Engineering Approaches to Solving Clinical Challenges), BE 4312 (Tissue Biomechanics and Bioengineering), BE 4314 (Medical Implants), and BE 4388 (Biomedical Product Design and Development). The new courses are intended to help students in identifying appropriate methods to perform analyses and solve problems from a bioengineering perspective. The impact of these changes on student learning will be assessed in the 2018-2019 UEP cycle.

**How Was the Need for Improvement Determined:**
By an outcome assessed through the UEP.

**Academic Year Implemented:**
20XX-20XX

**Assessment Result that indicated the need for improvement:**
In an administrative review it was determined that the current undergraduate students were not achieving the required scores necessary in identifying relevant mathematical, scientific, and engineering methods to formulate and solve bioengineering problems. To assist bioengineering students, the department made the decision to add four courses to hopefully help faculty ensure that students receive the necessary methods needed to conduct analyses and problem solving in program.

**Estimated value of resources used to implement improvement:**
$0.00

**Source of resources used to implement improvement:**
Reallocation of unit resources

**Semester the Improvement was Implemented:**
Spring 20XX
**Sample 2 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Outcome, Non-academic Unit**

**Improvement Report**

**XX-XX DAR – Development and Alumni Relations**

**Improvement name:**
Using Fundraiser Performance Management to measure and track officer performance.

**Improvement:**
In November 2019, the annual giving programmatic elements of direct mail, email and phone-a-thon was outsourced to Ruffalo Noel Levitz. Their expertise with multi-channel campaigns was leveraged to increase donor and dollar support from annual gifts of $1- $24,999. It was determined that this approach would allow for enhancements in strategy and the use of best practices would provide growth for UTA's efforts.

**How was the need for improvement determined:**
By an outcome assessed through the UEP.

**Academic year implemented:**
20XX-20XX

**Assessment result that indicated the need for improvement:**
While the outcome related to increasing total charitable support was achieved, assessment showed that inconsistent data entry and the lack of a system that provided clear and understandable reports caused officers to be unsure of their progress. This made it difficult for management to hold officers accountable for reaching their metrics and reporting on effort and progress was limited.

**Estimated value of resources used to implement improvement:**
$132,000

**Source of resources used to implement improvement:**
Reallocation of school/college/division resources

**Semester the improvement was implemented:**
Summer 20XX
Sample 3 – No Improvements Implemented, Results of Assessment Inconclusive for UEP Outcome(s), Educational Support Unit

Improvement Report
XX-XX SA – Relationship Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention

Improvement name: None
The Relationship Violence and Sexual Assault Prevention program remained understaffed. The full-time staff position overseeing programming, assessment, outreach initiatives and department functions was vacant. The new staff member was hired in November 2018, not adequate time to implement improvements other than establishing their role in the new position. Other contributing factors for the department, the supervisor of the department was out on leave and returned February 2019 and the department moved physical locations, the office relocated to a new building where priorities were logistics around the space relocation. Once staffing is full, we’ll be able to move forward with desired improvements.

How was the need for improvement determined: By an outcome assessed through the UEP

Academic year implemented: 2018-2019

Assessment Result that showed need for improvement: none

Estimated value of resources used: 0 Source of resources used to implement improvements: Reallocation of unit resources

Semester Improvement Implemented 2018-2019: Fall 2018
Sample 4 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Learning Outcome, Academic Unit, PhD Program

Improvement Report
XX-XX COED - ELPS– Educational Leadership & Policy Studies

Improvement name:
Elimination of on-campus K-12 Med admission

Improvement:
Low enrollments in K-12 MEd on-campus courses drove the elimination of on-campus K-12 MEd admissions. It was not a financially sustainable model. We made this decision last year and implemented it this year. In our case, the elimination of on-campus K-12 students allow us to focus faculty resources, processes and efforts for our K-12 students to the online program; for our on-campus students, it means we don’t have to continue to have to figure out how to provide content from two domains (K-12 and higher education) to one class, so the elimination allows us to focus and improve our on-campus courses. The data that contributed (not drove) the decision was continual decline of on-campus K-12 students.

How was the need for improvement determined:
By assessment NOT related to the UEP.

Academic year implemented:
20XX-20XX

Assessment result that indicated the need for improvement: Continuously low enrollments in on-campus courses: EDAD 5389, EDAD 5383, EDAD 5384, EDAD 5381, EDAD 5399. These were so low they did not meet UTA approvals to run on-campus courses.

Estimated value of resources used to implement improvement:
$0.00

Source of resources used to implement improvement:
No resources to eliminate K-12 Med admissions.

Semester the improvement was implemented:
Fall 20XX
Sample 5 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Assessment(s) Not Included in the UEP, Educational Support Unit

Improvement Report
XX-XX AA– University Libraries

**Improvement name:**
Study Spaces Electrical Power

**Improvement:**
UTA Libraries purchased 4 Omnicharge power stations to improve the study experience at the libraries.

**How was the need for improvement determined:**
By assessment not related to the UEP.

**Academic year implemented:**
20XX-20XX

**Assessment result that indicated the need for improvement:**
We conducted the LibQual survey, http://www.libqual.org/home, in spring 2019. Two of the questions with the largest gaps between perceived and desired level of service were related to study spaces. The comments also indicated a desire for more electrical outlets in the library.

**Estimated value of resources used to implement improvement:**
$7400

**Source of resources used to implement improvement:**
Reallocation of unit resources

**Semester the improvement was implemented:**
Spring 20XX
Sample 6 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Outcome, Non-academic Unit

Improvement Report
XX-XX PRES – Legal Affairs

Improvement name:
Contract Review

Improvement:
To fix this, we will change from provided to the appropriate signer to reviewed and returned to the originator with comments or to the appropriate signer within 5 business days

How was the need for improvement determined:
By an outcome assessed through the UEP.

Academic year implemented:
20XX-20XX

Assessment result that indicated the need for improvement: In 18-19 one outcome was that contracts will be reviewed in a timely manner. To evaluate this, a report from the Legal Files software would be generated on an annual basis for the University Attorney to capture the number of days between when a request was received, and the response was provided. The outcome will be met if 95% of contracts are provided to the appropriate signer within 5 business days. Through the process we learned that our tracking software did not fully track this data and we've realized that the outcome needs to be better assessed.

Estimated value of resources used to implement improvement:
$0.00

Source of resources used to implement improvement:
Reallocation of unit resources

Semester the improvement was implemented:
Fall 20XX
Sample 7 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Administrative Outcome, Academic Unit

Improvement Report
XX-XX COS– Mathematics

Improvement name: Enhancing Math 5307 Instruction

Improvement:
We plan to add a graduate teaching assistant in the class as a tutor and students can have additional time with the GTA for problem solving.

How was the need for improvement determined:
By an outcome assessed through the UEP.

Academic year implemented:
20XX-20XX

Assessment result that indicated the need for improvement:
In Fall 2017, there were 13 students who took the course Math 5307. 13 students took the final exam. 9 (69%) of the students in this course score acceptable or higher in the final exam. 70% passing will be the successful outcome.

Estimated value of resources used to implement improvement:
$9,000

Source of resources used to implement improvement:
Reallocation of unit resources.

Semester the improvement was implemented:
Fall 20XX
Sample 8 – Improvement(s) Implemented, Unachieved UEP Learning Outcome, Undergraduate Program

Improvemen Report
XX-XX COB - Marketing

Improvement name:
Modified assessment instrument used for MARK 3321

Improvement: We modified the quiz used to assess "application of marketing concepts" in MARK 3321 courses. We expanded the instrument from 5 items to 8 items so that two questions - one knowledge question and one application question - were used to assess each of the four concepts. After making this change, there was much less variance in student performance across the four assessed concepts, with marketing concept having the lowest correct percentage (73%) and the marketing mix having the highest correct percentage (87%). Overall, the gap between students' strongest concept and their weakest concept was reduced from over 36% to under 15%. We feel this is a much more accurate picture of their mastery of these areas.

How was the need for improvement determined:
By an outcome assessed through the UEP.

Academic year implemented:
20XX-20XX

Assessment result that indicated the need for improvement:
UEP data showed there was a great deal of variance in student performance across the four concepts we're assessing in the MARK 3321 quiz for the intended outcome "application of marketing concepts". The students scored the lowest on "Marketing Concept" with only 55% of the students answering the associated question correctly, and the highest on "marketing mix" with 91.5% of the students answering the question correctly. We realized that this variance was like due in part to our use of different types of questions to assess the concepts. Some concepts in the quiz were being assessed with knowledge questions, while others with application questions

Estimated value of resources used to implement improvement:
$0.00

Source of resources used to implement improvement:
Reallocation of unit resources

Semester the improvement was implemented:
Fall 20XX