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Part I. Overview and Introduction to the Institution

The Report of the Reaffirmation Committee is the final committee analysis and report that includes the findings of the Off- and On-Site Reaffirmation Committees. It will be forwarded to the institution for a formal response. The report and the institution’s response are forwarded to the Commission’s Board of Trustees for action on reaffirmation of accreditation.

The University of Florida is a major public, comprehensive, land-grant, research university, and it is a member of the Association of American Universities. It is Florida’s oldest university, and is one of the largest and most academically diverse public higher education institutions in the nation.

The main campus, consisting of 900 buildings on 2,000 acres, is located in Gainesville, Florida, and is host to over 50,000 students. The University of Florida’s 16 colleges offer over 100 undergraduate programs, over 200 graduate programs, and professional programs in dentistry, law, medicine, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine. Research awards exceed $600 million annually.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee expresses its sincere thanks for the outstanding preparation that went into this site visit. Every one of the Committee’s needs was aptly and courteously met and on-site requests were satisfied promptly and efficiently. Special recognition is extended to Tim Brophy, Cheryl Gater, and their assistants, as well as to Joe Glover and his team.

Part II. Assessment of Compliance

Sections A thru E to be completed by the Off-Site Review Committee and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee. An asterisk before the standard indicates that it will be reviewed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee even if the off-site review determines compliance.

A. Assessment of Compliance with Section 1: The Principle of Integrity

1.1 The institution operates with integrity in all matters. (Integrity)

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found no evidence of lack of integrity.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found no evidence of lack of integrity in the information presented in the Focused Report, the Quality Enhancement Report, and during the interviews held on-site.

B. Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements

2.1 The institution has degree-granting authority from the appropriate government agency or agencies. (Degree-granting Authority)
The constitution of the state of Florida gives the Florida Board of Governors authority to review, approve, and terminate degree programs of universities in the Florida state university system. In addition, the constitution states that each public university is to be overseen by a board of trustees that is responsible to the Florida Board of Governors. Among the responsibilities conferred upon the University of Florida Board of Trustees is the authority to award and establish new degrees, as well as terminate degrees for undergraduate, master's, professional, and doctoral degrees with approval of the Florida Board of Governors.

Evidence: Article IX, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of Florida—provides for Florida Board of Governors authority  
Board of Governors Regulation 1.001—Board of Trustees degree granting authority  
Board of Governors Regulation 8.001—initiate new degree programs  
Board of Governors Regulation 8.012—authority to terminate programs

2.2 The institution has a governing board of at least five members that is the legal body with specific authority over the institution. The board is an active policy-making body for the institution and is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are adequate to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting members of the board are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution.

A military institution authorized and operated by the federal government to award degrees has a public board on which both the presiding officer and a majority of the other members are neither civilian employees of the military nor active/retired military. The board has broad and significant influence upon the institution’s programs and operations, plays an active role in policy-making, and ensures that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from the board except as specified by the authorizing legislation. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting board members are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution. (Governing Board)

The legal governing board of the University of Florida is its Board of Trustees. The state constitution mandates the composition of the Board of Trustees membership, which is to consist of a total of thirteen members with six members appointed by the Governor of the state and five members appointed by the Florida Board of Governors. The remaining two members are the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the President of the Student Body, who serve in an ex officio capacity. A Florida Board of Governors Regulation states that University of Florida’s Board of Trustees is to be “responsible for the administration of its university in a manner that is dedicated to, and consistent with the university’s mission.” Also, the university board shall have “all of the power and duties necessary and appropriate for the direction, operation, management, and accountability of each state university.” The Board of Trustees has the authority to establish committees to address specific functions of the university.
The Bylaws of the UF Board of Trustees holds all board members to the standards of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials and Employees, which is part of state law and has a written conflict of interest policy by which all members must abide. Board of Trustees members are required to submit an annual disclosure form. The Board of Trustees conducts a minimum of four meetings annually which are public.

**Evidence:** Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 – Composition of Board of Trustees; Board of Trustees must exert authority as a whole; responsibility for all aspects of university governance
University of Florida Board of Trustees Disclosure Form and Ethics Policies – absence of financial, contractual, personal, familial, employment interest in university
UF Board of Trustees Bylaws - absence of financial, contractual, personal, familial or employment interest in the university

2.3 The institution has a chief executive officer whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who is not the presiding officer of the board. (*See the Commission policy “Core Requirement 2.3: Documenting an Alternate Approach.”*) *(Chief Executive Officer)*

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 requires that the university president is to serve as the chief executive officer and corporate secretary of the university’s board of trustees. The same Regulation states that the Board of Trustees has the authority to determine the duties and authority of the president. The University of Florida Board of Trustees Bylaws state that the president is the chief executive of the university and is responsible for the overall operation and administration of the university. The president reports to the chair of the institution’s Board of Trustees.

**Evidence:** Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 – defines University president as Chief Executive Officer and Corporate Secretary of UF Board of Trustees; confers authority to determine range of university president’s power and authority to Board of Trustees Board of Trustees Bylaws – defines responsibilities of the university president; UF organization chart – reporting structure for the president

2.4 The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service. *(Institutional Mission)*

The University of Florida’s mission statement is a clearly defined, comprehensive statement addressing teaching, research and service. The mission statement is published in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, and the University of Florida Faculty Handbook. The mission statement includes attention to the distinctiveness of the university yet is consistent with that of a major public, research-intensive university with its emphasis on teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and service.
The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional effectiveness is a comprehensive and integrated planning and evaluation process that has resulted in continuous improvement in achieving established goals in support of the institutional mission.

Planning takes place at the state, university and unit levels. State goals and accountability measures are set by the State University System Board of Governors as part of its strategic plan. The Board of Governors requires the university to produce annual reports and University Work Plans. The President sets goals for the university in collaboration with the Board of Trustees as part of the University Strategic Work Plan. These goals are put into action by an executive team composed of the four senior vice presidents plus other administrators strategically selected by the President. The colleges, vice-presidential, and support units also set goals and accountability measures as part of their effectiveness documentation plans. Academic programs establish student learning outcomes and measures in their academic assessment plans.

The narrative describing the institution’s planning process emphasized the following:

- Planning initiatives arise from several sources (e.g., Board of Governors, Board of Trustees, the President, the Senior Vice Presidents, unit leadership, the faculty).
- When an initiative is generated, the effectiveness process begins with planning to determine the direction and the broad steps needed to implement the vision.
- The next step is to establish goals, actions, measures and outcomes for the initiative.
- Then appropriate units and individuals are engaged to strategize for successful goal achievement, and determine the most effective processes and the timeline for action. At this stage of the process, the selection of an appropriate network of individuals and units is constructed to best address the initiative, and these networks are modified over the course of the initiative.
- Once the planning, goal setting and strategizing are completed, the appropriate resource allocation (i.e., personnel and funding) is determined.
- The plan is then implemented, and during implementation the goals are monitored, assessed, and evaluated and data is collected relevant to the actions, measures and outcomes established for the initiative.
- Finally, the data are reviewed and used to modify and improve the university through the successful completion of the initiative.

This institutional planning process is replicated at each level of the planning structure. Documentation and evidence was provided illustrating this process at the state level (State University System and the Board of Governors) and within the University of Florida Strategic Work Plan. Four examples were provided detailing how institutional effectiveness is operationalized: the Task Force on Undergraduate Education, the Innovation Academy, the Common Humanities course, and the Doctoral Education Improvement Plan. Effectiveness
Documentation Plans were also made available for Academic and non-academic units for the past two academic years.

2.6 The institution is in operation and has students enrolled in degree programs. (Continuous Operation)

The University of Florida, established in 1853, has been in continuous operation since, and currently has over 48,000 students in degree programs. As evidence of the University’s operation with student enrolled in degree programs, the University provided enrollment figures by degree level for 2010, 2011, and 2012.

2.7.1 The institution offers one or more degree programs based on at least 60 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the associate level; at least 120 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the baccalaureate level; or at least 30 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the post-baccalaureate, graduate, or professional level. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification for all degrees that include fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit. (Program Length)

The institution awards associate, baccalaureate, masters, specialist, professional, and doctoral degrees, and follows a semester-hour program length. The length of the programs is appropriate to the discipline and degree level and complies with the Florida Board of Governors regulations. With the exception of one program, all other programs at UF fulfill the SACSCOC core requirements listed above. The Master of Laws (LLM) program requires a total of 26 credit hours (which is less than the 30 credit hours listed by SACSCOC). Justification of the institution’s LLM program’s reduced credit hours includes a listing of peer or nationally ranked LLM programs ranging from 21 to 32 credits, with a majority of the programs consisting of 24 credits.

2.7.2 The institution offers degree programs that embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with its stated mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education. (Program Content)

The institution’s mission states that “The interlocking elements — teaching, research and scholarship, and service — span all the university’s academic disciplines and represent the university’s commitment to lead and serve the state of Florida, the nation and the world by pursuing and disseminating new knowledge while building upon the experiences of the past. The university aspires to advance by strengthening the human condition and improving the quality of life.” To fulfill this mission, the university supports the full range of scholarship at the baccalaureate, masters, specialist, doctoral, and professional levels. As outlined in the Academic Program Review 2007-2014, all degree programs are created by department faculty and thoroughly reviewed by college curriculum committees and the University Curriculum Committee to ensure that they are consistent with the University’s mission. At the graduate level courses are reviewed and approved by the Graduate Curriculum Committee to ensure mission consistency. Both undergraduate and graduate courses also undergo another round of assessment and approval by disciplinary experts working on behalf of the State of Florida’s Course Number System. The actual procedure for
all new degrees calls for documented evidence that the degree program relates to the institutional mission statement. The institution included illustrations of the New Undergraduate Degree Flowchart, the New Graduate Degree Flowchart, and the New Professional Degree Flowchart as documentation of this rigorous process.

In addition to assessment and review by the previously referenced departmental and university wide committees, courses and curricula are also assessed by the state as illustrated in the "Board of Governors regulation 8.011" document. In their narrative, the institution describes this multi-step process as beginning "...with the departmental faculty, who complete a proposal and submit this to the college curriculum committee for review and approval. Once college approval is obtained, the proposal is submitted for review and approval by the University Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the UF Board of Trustees. This extensive review process provides ample illustrations of the University's attention to coherence in sequencing, increasing complexity, and linkages between and among program components. A fairly concise description of this process is afforded through the New Degree Flowcharts document. Further, the fact that UF aligns the aims addressed in its mission statement directly back to its Strategic work plan "A Strategic Work Plan for the University of Florida," and the attached "Comprehensive Master Plan" illustrates that the findings from its multileveled approach to assessment informs future university-wide planning.

More specific illustrations of degree programs that are consistent with the university's mission can be found in the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering's mission which folds into the university wide aim "...to lead and serve the state of Florida, the nation and the world by pursuing and disseminating new knowledge..." focusing on operations research and its application to important problems to include Energy Systems, Financial Engineering, Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Medical Decision Making, and Security. Additionally, the PhD in Sociology appeals to the aspects of the University mission that calls for the "fostering of multi-cultural skills and perspectives in its teaching and research for its students to contribute and success in the world of the 21st century," through documented activities to include student awards (i.e. the prestigious American Society of Criminology Division of Color and Crime's Outstanding Student Award); faculty and student publications and community engagements (i.e., The Criminology and Law Speaker Series).

The institution demonstrates that its programs are appropriate to higher education by comparing its programs to state standards and national peers. Specifically, as stated in the narrative all active degree programs undergo a septennial program review mandated by the Board of Governors. Additionally, all of the programs are included in the United States Department of Education's CIP Taxonomy and submit to the Board of Governors, a five-year benchmark plan with target rankings on key performance metrics for national excellence. These assessments include data-driven gap analyses, conducted by the Board of Governors, of the state's job market demands and the outlook for jobs that require a baccalaureate or higher degree. Additional illustrations can be found in specialized accreditation achieved by specific programs.
**2.7.3** In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is based on a coherent rationale. For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification if it allows for fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit of general education courses. *(General Education)*

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee's review of the institution's General Education requirements reveals that the General Education Program constitutes a substantial component of each undergraduate degree as evidenced by the required minimum thirty-six credit hours of general education credits. Breadth of knowledge is ensured through appropriate distribution of these credits across the categories of composition, diversity, internationalism, humanities, mathematics, physical and biological sciences, and social and behavioral sciences. The General Education Committee, comprising faculty, administrators and students, reviews all applications for General Education, Writing Requirement, and Math Requirement courses. Transfer and distance learning students are held to the same standards as all other undergraduate students, and the Statewide General Education Core Project ensures that all students meet or exceed the general education credit hour requirements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with the vice president for student affairs, the associate vice president for student affairs and division assessment team chair, the assistant provost and director of institutional planning and research, the associate provost for undergraduate affairs, the director of institutional assessment, the director of curriculum, one dean, two associate deans, and several academic program coordinators. Information obtained during these interviews verified that the General Education program is based on coherent rationale consistent with the institution's mission. Review of select transcripts confirmed that the program is a substantial component of the curriculum and does not represent skills courses tied to specific majors.

**2.7.4** The institution provides instruction for all course work required for at least one degree program at each level at which it awards degrees. If the institution does not provide instruction for all such course work and (1) makes arrangements for some instruction to be provided by other accredited institutions or entities through contracts or consortia or (2) uses some other alternative approach to meeting this requirement, the alternative approach must be approved by the Commission on Colleges. In both cases, the institution demonstrates that it controls all aspects of its educational program. *(See the Commission policy “Core Requirement 2.7.4: Documenting an Alternate Approach.”)* *(Course work for Degrees)*
The institution provides coursework for degrees at the following levels: Bachelor’s, Master’s, Education Specialist, Engineer (Advanced Master’s in Engineering), Research Doctorate, and Professional Doctorate. Example program information was provided in the following areas: BA History, MS Exercise Physiology, EdS Higher Education, Engineering (Advanced Master’s) Industrial and Systems Engineering, and PhD Food and Resource Economics.

*2.8 The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs. (Faculty)

The State University System (SUS) Board of Governors Regulations requires the review of each academic program on a seven (7) year cycle. A key objective in this review is the determination that the institution provides adequate full time faculty to meet the academic needs of the students. The review ensures that the number of faculty is sufficient to fulfill the essential functions of research, teaching, and service as well as providing appropriate mentorship to students. Appendix 2.8.1 in the compliance document provides detailed information regarding the number and percentage of full and part time faculty across disciplines. This data is disaggregated by site and delivery (on-ground or on-line teaching). Additional measures such as the faculty student ratio, the undergraduate student survey (SERU: Student Experience in the Research University), and data from Academic Analytics provide evidence of the adequacy of the number of full time faculty at UF to fulfill its mission and ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance report and interviewed the associate provost for academic and faculty affairs, the interim dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, an associate dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, and the director of SACSCOC accreditation. The institution demonstrated -- through program review and careful monitoring of faculty activity -- the adequacy of full-time faculty to support the institution’s mission of teaching, research, and service.

2.9 The institution, through ownership or formal arrangements or agreements, provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections and services and to other learning/information resources consistent with the degrees offered. Collections, resources, and services are sufficient to support all its educational, research, and public service programs. (Learning Resources and Services)

The institution’s libraries provide resources and services that are appropriate to meet the institution’s mission. The libraries hold over 4,577,222 cataloged volumes; 8,099,054 microforms; 1,255,459 documents; 867,520 maps and images; 629,979 e-books; 78,797 electronic journals; 472 electronic databases; and multiple consortial agreements. Access to materials not owned or licensed by the libraries is provided through mediated and unmediated ILL services.

The libraries also maintain significant research collections to support graduate research programs as well as the broader scholarly community. In addition, more than 100 digital collections of unique resources are made available online through the University of Florida Digital Collections (UFDC). The libraries
administer and host the University of Florida Institutional Repository (IR), a digital archive for the intellectual output of the UF community.

The libraries provide spaces for students to access information and to create projects and presentations for their coursework. The libraries provide a broad range of services including information literacy instruction, a substantial collection of online tools and LibGuides, hosting digital content, and providing technology and research consultation. Additional arrangements are in place to provide distance students with the full range of library services and resources. Reference service is available online and through chat, and students are encouraged to contact their subject liaison directly through the LibGuides. Access to print materials is made available through a subsidized interlibrary loan service.

*2.10 The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that are intended to promote student learning and enhance the development of its students. (Student Support Services)

The institution’s student body of over 48,000 consists of approximately 64% undergraduate and 36% graduate and professional students. The Division of Student Affairs provides support services to students that assist with academic, social, and cultural success of all students. These programs and services have been created to support the academic mission of the university as well as help prepare students for life beyond UF. The Division’s Strategic Plan serves as a guiding, fluid document that is readily utilized to make adjustments based on assessment and evaluation of programs.

There were two primary sources of evidence and documentation to corroborate the programs alignment with the university mission, promote student learning, and enhance the development of students: 1) the 13 departments within the division of student affairs focus on the engagement, development, learning and academic success of undergraduate and graduate students. Students who are at off-site locations have access to many services and departments such as The Career Resource Center, Health Promotions, Disability Resource Center, and many other services. A copy of the division organization chart was provided to help understand the structure; 2) The division described ways in which programs and services support the academic mission of the university and focus on creating and celebrating a diverse community of students. The division provided solid examples of ways it utilizes assessment to change, create, or eliminate programs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification and interviewed the vice president for student affairs and the assistant vice president of student affairs and division assessment team chair. The findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee have been verified. UF offers appropriate student support programs and activities available to students at all locations.

2.11.1 The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. The member institution provides the following financial statements: (1) an institutional audit (or Standard Review Report issued in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services issued by the
AICPA for those institutions audited as part of a systemwide or statewide audit) and written institutional management letter for the most recent fiscal year prepared by an independent certified public accountant and/or an appropriate governmental auditing agency employing the appropriate audit (or Standard Review Report) guide; (2) a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, which represents the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the most recent year; and (3) an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal procedures, and is approved by the governing board. (Financial Resources)

The institution operates on a fiscal year ending June 30. Based on the criteria contained in the Governmental Accounting Standards Board’s (GASB) Codification of Governmental Accounting and Financial Reporting Standards, the University of Florida is a component unit of the State of Florida and its financial balances and activities are reported in the State’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. The audit is conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in the Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. The FY 2012-13 audit performed by the Auditor General of the State of Florida, was not available at the time of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s review. The institution noted that the report will likely not be available until December 2013.

State appropriations at the University of Florida declined $93 million, or 15 percent, from FY 2008-09 to FY 2011-12. During the same period, net student tuition and fees increased $91.5 million, or 40 percent. The University provided a Statement of Financial Position of Unrestricted Net Assets for three of the last four years. Per the statement, the University’s unrestricted net assets, excluding gains and losses on investments, reflected a decrease by $4.7 million to $107.8 million for as of June 30, 2011 and an increase by $52.0 million to $159.9 million as of June 30, 2012. The institution did not provide such a statement for the most recently completed fiscal year (FY 2012-13).

The institution reviewed the merits of a Responsibility Center Management budget system in 2008. The model was implemented beginning in FY 2010-11 based on FY 2009-10 costs. The Chief Financial Officer serves as chair of the RCM Committee. The budget documentation provided included the rules and calculations related to the RCM model and minutes documenting Board approval of the FY 2012-13 and earlier budgets. However, a summary of an annual budget was not provided, and the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find sufficient documentation to determine if the annual budget is preceded by sound planning and is subject to sound fiscal procedures.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documentation, including the Focused-Report, and interviewed the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, the vice president and chief financial officer, and the associate vice president and deputy general counsel. The audited financial statement is included in the Focused Report and includes the auditor’s statement dated December 20, 2013. State appropriations at the University of Florida declined by $42M from FY 2011-12 to FY 2012-13, a reduction of 8%. This cut follows the reduction noted by the Off-Site Committee Evaluation, a loss of $93M, or 15 percent, from FY 2008-09 to FY 2011-12. The total reduction over a five-year period appears to be $135M, a reduction of 21.8%. The University’s net student
tuition and fees increased by $32M, a gain of 10 percent from FY 2011-12 to FY 2012-13. Net tuition and fees have increased by $107M from 2009-10 to 2012-13, a 30 percent increase.

The institution provided the separate, unaudited Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position for Unrestricted Funds that includes the fiscal years from 2009-10 to 2012-13. Unrestricted Net Position reduced by $41.9M to $119.3M to end FY 2012-13. The institution’s Annual Financial Report for FY 2012-13 notes that there was an increase in liabilities in the amount Due to Component Units of more than $65.3M.

In its Focused Report, the University provided a summary of the annual budget adopted on December 5, 2013. The summary is at a very high level and provides four years of actual revenue and expenditures for FY 2008-09 to FY 2011-12. The Focused Report did not provide a budget document. The budget adopted indicates the 2013 year budget and confirms that it was adopted by the Board of Trustees on December 5, 2013. That would have been after the conclusion of the fiscal year. Prior to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s visit there was not anything provided to indicate the Board actually reviewed and adopted the budget, nor is there an explanation of why the timing does not appear to align with the year. This was rectified during meetings with Matthew Fajack, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, who provided documentation that confirmed approval of the annual budget after review by the Trustees.

The institution included the Responsibility Center Management (RCM) operating manual, which is the budget methodology utilized as its budget system. In addition, the institution provided a training manual for the RCM model. While these documents are extensive, prior to the on-site committee visit there was no evidence the RCM model was put into action with actual unit budget data and a summary of the budget for the 2012-13 fiscal year. However, during the campus visit, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee confirmed via Matthew Fajack, the vice president and chief financial officer, and the University Provost, Joe Glover, (along with related documentation) the implementation of a modified RCM model and the impact this model has had on strategic resource allocation.

The institution provided the most recent audit that shows financial stability. In addition, the budget information provided during the site visit does indicate that a modified RCM model has been fully implemented and the most recent operating budget has been approved by the Board of Trustees.

2.11.2 The institution has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. (Physical Resources)

Campus planning in the State University System is governed in Florida by Chapter 1013.30 of the Florida Statutes, which requires campus plans to cover a period of at least ten years. The institution’s current master plan, for 2005 – 2015, is well conceived and addresses many issues related to urban design, future land use, academic facilities, support and clinical spaces, etc. According to the 2009 Educational Plant Survey, the institution has a 2,000-acre campus and more than 900 buildings (including 170 with classrooms and laboratories). The northeast corner of campus is listed as a Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places. The residence halls have a total capacity of 7,500 students and the five family housing villages house more than 1,000 married and
graduate students. The survey assumed basically flat enrollment at least through FY 2013-14. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find sufficient evidence, however, to determine the sufficiency of the existing University physical resources to support the institution's programs and services.

In the Focused Report provided to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee, the University provided a summary survey of space by category. According to the University, the Florida Board of Governors requires a comprehensive survey of space every five years to determine the University's ability to accommodate educational programs, student enrollment, personnel and serves. This Educational Plant Survey requires facilities inventory validation and needs assessment. The survey was last completed in the 2008-09 year and will be completed again on the five-year cycle in 2013-14. The University of Florida provided a current satisfactory space review and concluded that all areas except gymnasium support and instructional media are sufficient. In the context of state formula plant survey needs, the university appears to fall behind in each category of space when comparing current satisfactory space with the plant survey need. But based on the site review, and further analysis of space it was determined that the institution is making good progress on adding new space for research, learning and student support needs. Additionally, the institution noted the square footage gains in research space and noted that the research space available for new faculty is expected to support the University's pre-eminence plan. These needs will be met in part by new space but also the reconfiguration of existing space. Reviewers confirmed that these space enhancements are in progress during the on-site review.

The institution provided sufficient information in the Educational Plant Survey that confirms adequate physical resources to support the programs and services as they move forward with their strategic initiatives.

2.12 The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. (Quality Enhancement Plan)

The institution developed an acceptable QEP. See Part III for additional information.

C. Assessment of Compliance with Section 3: Comprehensive Standards

3.1.1 The mission statement is current and comprehensive, accurately guides the institution's operations, is periodically reviewed and updated, is approved by the governing board, and is communicated to the institution's constituencies. (Mission).

The mission of the University of Florida is a shared responsibility of all level of the higher education hierarchy in Florida. The Board of Governors, the Board of Trustees, the administration, the faculty and students contribute to its development. The comprehensive mission statement is periodically reviewed and revised to reflect the evolving nature of the university. The distinctive qualities of the university are captured in the mission. Student learning is
addressed as an outcome of teaching and research, and the mission addresses the levels of degrees offered.

The mission statement is comprehensive, guides the institution's operations, is periodically reviewed and updated, is approved by the governing board, and is communicated to the institution's constituencies.

Of note is the current 2012-13 proposed mission revision that at the time of the submission of the Compliance Report, was still under review. Participation by student government, faculty senate, and Board of Trustee members is a testimony to the ongoing, broad-based participation and systematic review & development of the institutional mission statement.

3.2.1 The governing board of the institution is responsible for the selection and the periodic evaluation of the chief executive officer. (CEO evaluation/selection)

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 confers the responsibility for selection of the president of the university to the UF Board of Trustees. It also defines the processes and requirements for the selection and evaluation of the president. The University of Florida Board of Trustees determined that the process by which the UF president would be selected should be through utilization of a search firm. The Board of Trustees approved a Presidential Search Planning Committee representing a broad constituency including trustees, faculty, students, staff, alumni and others. The search planning committee worked with the search firm to identify an appropriate candidate. The board of trustees selects a candidate and submits that candidate to the Florida Board of Governors for approval at a confirmation hearing. The Board of Governors must have a two-thirds majority vote to deny approval of the Board of Trustees' selected candidate.

Criteria used to assess the president's performance include goals set by the Governance Committee of the Board of Trustees in consultation with the president. These goals are linked to the university's strategic objectives. The Governance Committee reviews the performance of the president of the university annually with reference to the set goals. The performance evaluations of the president are documented in the minutes of the Governance Committee.

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 requires that the university's board of trustees conduct an annual evaluation of the president and submit its findings and recommendations to the Board of Trustees for approval. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents which demonstrated this annual evaluation.

Evidence:
- Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 – Board of Trustees responsibility to select university president and define selection process & requirements
- Presidential Search Documentation – Board of Trustees process for identification and selection of presidential candidates
- UF Board of Trustees Minutes, October 8, 2003 –board of trustees role in selection of president
- Governance Committee Minutes, December 1, 2011 – minutes indicate that evaluation of president is submitted to the Board of Trustees
3.2.2 The legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution's governance structure: (Governing board control)

3.2.2.1 The institution's mission

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 confers the responsibility for oversight for all aspects of the university's governance including operating control of its mission to the UF Board of Trustees. Regulation 2.002 requires that the UF Board of Trustees create and submit a work plan and annual report to the Florida Board of Governors. Included as a feature of this report is a review of the institution's mission and vision for the next five to ten years. The Florida Board of Governors requires that the institution's mission must be consistent with the mission and purposes of the State University System as defined by the Board of Governors.

- Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 – delegation of responsibility for university oversight to Board of Trustees; require that the university's mission be consistent with State University System mission as defined by the Board of Governors
- Florida Board of Governors Regulation 2.002 – requirement that Board of Trustees submit an annual work plan and annual report that addresses the university's mission and vision
- UF Work Plan 2012-2013 – detailed contents of work plan submitted to the Florida Board of Governors by the UF Board of Trustees

3.2.2.2 The fiscal stability of the institution

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 confers the responsibility for oversight for all aspects of the university's governance to the UF Board of Trustees. Also permitted by the same Regulation, the UF Board of Trustees may create subcommittees to oversee aspects of the university’s operations. The UF Board of Trustees has designated a subcommittee, the Finance and Facilities Committee, to oversee the financial state of the university. This Committee is responsible for review and approval of the institution’s operating and capital budgets and annually submits its findings and decisions to the Board of Trustees for its approval. Florida Board of Governors Regulation 9.007 states that the Board of Trustees must then submit the approved university budget to the Board of Governors for its approval and Regulation 9.009 describes the format in which it is to be submitted. The submitted budget plan must demonstrate compliance with general legislative intent for expenditure of the appropriated state funds and with the Board of Governors guidelines and priorities. The president of the university is responsible for implementation of the university’s operating budget in accordance with relevant Board of Governors Regulations and Board of Trustees policies.

Evidence:

- Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 – Board of Trustees responsibility for oversight of all aspects of university's governance
• Florida Board of Governors Regulation 9.007 – Board of Trustees must submit the university’s budget to the Florida Board of Governors for approval
• Florida Board of Governors Regulation 9.009 – required format for submission of university’s budget to Board of Governors
• Finance and Facilities Committee minutes, June 7, 2012 – responsible committee’s approval of university’s budget
• Board of Trustees minutes, June 8, 2012 – shows Finance committee’s submission of budget to Board of Trustees for approval

3.2.2.3 institutional policy

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 confers the legal governing authority of the university to the UF Board of Trustees. It further describes the role of the university president with regard to his authority to oversee all operations of the university as well as his responsibility to the UF Board of Trustees for that oversight. The UF Board of Trustees may enact, modify or repeal university regulations using a Board of Governors-approved procedure. UF Board of Trustees Resolution R07-37 describes the authority delegated to the university president and allows the CEO to authorize designated university administrators to implement and enforce university policies in accordance with the conditions described in that Resolution.

Evidence:
• Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 – designates authority of UF Board of Trustees; describes role of university president and his reporting structure
• Board of Governors Regulation Development Procedure – describes procedure by which Board of Trustees can develop university regulations
• UF Board of Trustees Resolution R07-37 – delegates authority to university president and allows him to delegate authority to oversee aspects of university to other senior administrators

3.2.3 The governing board has a policy addressing conflict of interest for its members. (Board conflict of interest)

UF Board of Trustees members are required to abide by the State of Florida Code of Ethics for Public Employees and Officials, the University of Florida Guidelines, Policies, and Procedures on Conflict of Interest including Financial Interests, as well as the UF Board of Trustees ethics and conflict of interest policy found in the board’s bylaws. The board of trustees’ conflict of interest policy requires that board members must submit an annual financial disclosure statement and an annual ethics affirmation. At the beginning of their term of service, board of trustees members are oriented to these policies and requirements. Examples of instances of conflict of interest disclosure and the manner in which the board dealt with them including the application of voting conflict provisions of the board’s policy can be seen in Board of Trustees minutes from December, 2011 and May, 2012.
Evidence:

- **Chapter 112 Part III Florida Statues** – describes state requirements regarding conflict of interest for all state officials;
- **UF Conflict of Interest Guidelines** – describes UF conflict of interest policy including examples of prohibited situations and relationships
- **UF Board of Trustees Bylaws** – requires annual financial disclosure submission and ethics affirmation
- **UF Board of Trustees minutes of December 2011 and from May, 2012** – Examples of board of trustees member conflict of interest and board’s action in these matters

3.2.4 The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence. *(External influence)*

The state constitution of Florida mandates the composition of Boards of Trustees of each public state university, stating that has 13 members with six appointed by the governor, five by the board of governors and two from the university representing the faculty senate and student body. Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 adds further regulations, stating that the board of trustees members five-year terms of service are staggered among appointed board members, that they may be appointed for additional terms and that they must by the Florida Code of Ethics, which requires that “public officials be independent and impartial and that public office not be used for private gain other than the remuneration provided by law...” These requirements and regulations prohibit external influence on UF Board of Trustees members.

Evidence:

- **State of Florida Constitution** – describes required composition of Board of Trustees
- **Board of Governors Regulation 1.001** – defines terms of service and timing
- **Chapter 112 Part III Florida Statues** – contains Florida Code of Ethics applicable to all public officials and employees
- **Board of Trustees Duties and Responsibilities** – describes requirement for board members loyalty to the university
- **286.001 Florida Statues** – Florida sunshine law noting that all Board of Trustees meetings are public meetings and no resolution or action of the board can be binding unless it is done publically

3.2.5 The governing board has a policy whereby members can be dismissed only for appropriate reasons and by a fair process. *(Board dismissal)*

The Florida constitution states that a board of trustees shall govern each public university. The constitution further specifies that dismissal of a board of trustees member shall be for cause and specifies that the Governor of Florida may suspend a state officer for malfeasance, misfeasance, neglect of duty, drunkenness, incompetence, permanent inability to perform official duties, or commission of a felony. The Florida Senate would then determine whether a board member should be removed from office. The Florida Board of
Governors has the authority to remove for cause a member of the board of trustees that had been appointed by them. The UF Board of Trustees Bylaws also acknowledges that members may be removed for cause by the Florida Board of Governors. A Florida Board of Governors Regulation states that the chair of the board of trustees should notify the state Governor or the Florida Board of Governors if a member of the board of trustee has an unexcused absence for three or more consecutive meetings. In these cases, the Florida Board of Governors may remove the board member. No examples of the implementation of these policies are available as no UF Board of Trustees member has ever been dismissed.

Evidence:

- State of Florida constitution (page 112) – establishes the composition and responsibilities of public university’s boards of trustees
- State of Florida constitution (page 40) – describes policy and process for suspension of an appointed official including by the state governor and final decision of dismissal or reappointment by the state senate
- UF Board of Trustees Bylaws – restates the process for dismissal from the board of trustees

3.2.6 There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy. (Board/administration distinction)

The Florida Board of Governors empowers the UF Board of Trustees with “all of the powers and duties necessary and appropriate for the direction, operation, management, and accountability” of the University of Florida, thus making the board of trustees the policy-making authority for the university. The UF Board of Trustees Resolution R07-37 authorizes the president of the university to “manage and administer the university and to exercise all the powers, duties and authorities of the university” except those powers reserved for the Board of Trustees or Florida Board of Governors according to their own resolutions and regulations. The president may further delegate authority for oversight of aspects of the university’s operations to other senior administrators. Faculty is represented in the governance of the university through the Faculty Senate, which is the legislative body of the university and is empowered by the university constitution to legislate with regard to areas such as the educational policies of the University, criteria related to faculty advancement and academic regulations affecting students, among others. The president of the faculty senate sits on the UF Board of Trustees and reports senate recommendations to that body.

The institution has a clear distinction between its policy-making element represented by the Board of Trustees and the element responsible for policy implementation and enforcement, which is the university president, and his designated appointees. The Faculty Senate has input into university policy and its implementation through its legislative authority.

Evidence:

- Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001- Board of Governors confers policy-making authority to UF Board of Trustees for the U of F
• **Delegation of Authority – President (BOT Resolution 07-37)** – UF Board of Trustees delegates authority to manage and administer the university to the president
• **Delegation of Authority – Provost** – presidential authorization that provost has oversight authority for academic affairs
• **Faculty Senate Bylaws** – describes faculty senate as legislative body of university and the areas over which its authority is designated

**3.2.7** The institution has a clearly defined and published organizational structure that delineates responsibility for the administration of policies. **(Organizational structure)**

The Florida Constitution and the Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 both state that state public universities are to be administrated by a board of trustees. The same Florida Board of Governors Regulation states that the university’s board of trustees is to establish the powers and duties of the university president and that the president is the CEO of the board and its corporate secretary. The UF constitution states that the president is to appoint the provost and other senior administrators and designate their scopes of responsibility. These senior administrators report to the president who, in turn, reports to the chair of the UF Board of Trustees.

Evidence:

• **State of Florida constitution (page 112)** – identifies that each public university will be overseen by a board of trustees
• **Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001** – authorizes UF Board of Trustees with all power and duty necessary to oversee all aspects of the university
• **UF Board of Trustees Bylaws** – describes the composition of the Board of Trustees and the range of its authority over university
• **UF Board of Trustees** – delegation of authority to president (Res 07-37) - delegates authority to university president and allows him to delegate authority to oversee aspects of university to other senior administrators
• **UF organization chart** – shows reporting structure for senior administrators to president and president to Board of Trustees

**3.2.8** The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience and competence to lead the institution. **(Qualified administrative/academic officers)**

The institution has a qualified and seasoned group of senior level administrators and academic officers who have the appropriate credentials and experience to lead their respective units. Documentation includes the CVs, description of duties, and organizational charts for all academic officers.

To ensure there is a diverse candidate pool of applicants, the University of Florida's Division of Human Resources Academic Personnel departments utilize the Faculty Tool Kit and a search firm. The Faculty Tool Kit was provided as documentation of the expectations and processes for identifying and selecting candidates. The Faculty Toolkit provides examples of ways to conduct phone
interviews, appropriate questions to ask candidates, and steps to make the final offer and close the search process.

In terms of evaluation of academic and administrative officers, there is a solid system for review of the president (Board of Trustees), senior vice president and vice presidents (President), and the academic deans (Provost).

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Institution’s Compliance Report and supporting documentation, and interviewed the associate provost for academic and faculty affairs and the vice president for enrollment management and associate provost. The findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee were confirmed. The institution has qualified senior level administrators and academic officers who are systematically reviewed.

3.2.9 The institution publishes policies regarding appointment, employment, and evaluation of all personnel. (Personnel appointment)

The institution presented evidence of publishing of policies related to appointment, employment, and evaluation of staff and faculty in particular and all employees in general. These policies and practices are published in the TEAMS and USPS Employee Handbook and the Faculty Handbook, and both of these documents were provided as evidence of compliance.

3.2.10 The institution periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators. (Administrative staff evaluations)

The institution has a comprehensive and robust annual evaluation processes for its administrative officers – president, provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, and the deans. The use of an external firm (IDEA Online) assists the university in managing and maintaining the integrity of the review process. The documentation included examples of redacted, completed evaluations for the academic officers, faculty opinion surveys, and a program review.

3.2.11 The institution’s chief executive officer has ultimate responsibility for, and exercises appropriate administrative and fiscal control over, the institution’s intercollegiate athletics program. (Control of intercollegiate athletics)

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 states that the university’s board of trustees is to establish the powers and duties of the university president. UF Board of Trustees Resolution 07-37 delegates authority for administration of the university and specifically notes that he has the authority to develop, approve, implement and govern inter- and intra-collegiate athletics programs, policies, and procedures of UF. The University Athletic Association, a direct-support organization incorporated in 1929 by circuit court of the state of Florida, is responsible for support of the university’s intercollegiate athletic programs. The president of the university retains full authority over all intercollegiate athletics as he serves as the chairman of the board of directors of the UAA and appoints all of its members. The job description of the university’s athletics director in the evidence as well as the institution’s organization chart reflect that the institution’s
athletic director is appointed by and reports directly to the president of the university.

External monitoring mechanisms such as the NCAA also assure that appropriate institutional oversight mechanisms and policies are in place. The University of Florida has been in compliance with the NCAA certification process and the evidence shows the most recent certification in 2006 with an application submitted in 2012.

Evidence:

- **UF Board of Trustees** – delegation of authority to president (Res 07-37) – designates president to have authority over all university administration; specifically states that president is to have authority over inter-collegiate athletics
- **UF Athletic Association Articles of Incorporation** – creates the UAA as a DSO for support of intercollegiate athletics at UF
- **UAA Bylaws revised 12 13 2012** – designates the president of the university as the chairman of the board of directors of the UAA and states that the president shall appoint the other members of the board
- **Job Description - Athletics Director** – indicates that the university’s athletics director reports directly to the president
- **NCAA certification 2005-06** – documentation of NCAA certification
- **NCAA reporting 2012** – self-study done in 2012 for NCAA membership certification

3.2.12 The institution demonstrates that its chief executive officer controls the institution’s fund-raising activities. *(Fund-raising activities).*

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001 states that each public university should have a Board of Trustees. The board of trustees is to appoint a university president who will be responsible for all operations of the university and report directly to the chair of the board of trustees. Among the president’s duties is oversight of university fund-raising activities. The president of the university has the authority to appoint other senior administrators to oversee specific areas of the university’s operations. The UF president has appointed a vice-president for development and alumni affairs to whom he has delegated responsibility for the university’s fund-raising activities. That vice-president is also the executive vice-president of the University of Florida Foundation, an incorporated 501(c) entity, which is the primary fund-raising entity of the university. The mission of the UFF is to “exclusively support and enhance the University of Florida’s mission of teaching, research, and service as determined by the University of Florida Board of Trustees.”

The vice-president for development and alumni affairs has, in turn, identified a number of senior administrators and staff who are delegated responsibility for areas of university fund-raising and who report to him. The Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs reports directly to the President of the institution.

Evidence:

- **Florida Board of Governors Regulation 1.001** – states that each public university must have a board of trustees which is responsible for
appointing the university president; further states that the president is to be given the power and duties to oversee all operations of the university.

- **Position description – President** – states that the UF president will be responsible for all university fund-raising activities.
- **UFF Articles of Incorporation** – designates the University of Florida Foundation as a 501(c) corporation.
- **UFF Bylaws** – states the exclusive mission of the foundation in support of and relation to the University of Florida.
- **VP Development and Alumni Affairs Organizational chart** – describes reporting structure of the office of the VP of development and alumni affairs.
- **UF Org chart from Comprehensive Standard 3.2.7** – shows that VP for development and alumni affairs reports directly to the president of the university.

### 3.2.13 For any entity organized separately from the institution and formed primarily for the purpose of supporting the institution or its programs:

1. the legal authority and operating control of the institution is clearly defined with respect to that entity;
2. the relationship of that entity to the institution and the extent of any liability arising out of that relationship is clearly described in a formal, written manner; and
3. the institution demonstrates that (a) the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity or (b) the fund-raising activities of that entity are defined in a formal, written manner which assures that those activities further the mission of the institution. *(Institution-related entities)*

Per state statutes, Direct Support Organizations, Health Services Support Organizations, and other affiliated corporate boards must exclusively receive, hold, invest, and administer property and make expenditures to or for the benefit of a state university or for a research and development park. Per statutes, these separately organized entities must have independent annual financial audits and the audit reports shall be submitted to the State Auditor General and the Board of Governors for review.

The institution has more than 30 such organizations and in accordance with UF Board of Trustees Internal Operating Memorandum 01-1, either the Board of Trustees or the President appoints at least one member of the board of each organization. The applicable state statutes, Board of Governors regulations, University of Florida Regulations, and the UF Board of Trustees Internal Operating Memoranda clearly define the legal authority and operating control over each type of these separately organized entities. In addition, approval of such an organization by the UF Board of Trustees requires submission of the Bylaws; policies on conflicts of interest and records; audit committee charter; names and qualifications of proposed initial members; and a business plan that includes a statement of the specific purpose for which the corporation is organized and how it will benefit the university, a detailed statement of proposed fund raising activities, balance sheet, etc. However, a formal, written document that describes the relationship with the institution (such as Bylaws) was provided for only six of the 32 organizations including the University of Florida Foundation, Inc., Gator Boosters, Inc., University Athletic Association, Inc., the institution of Florida Research Foundation, the University of Florida Alumni Association, and the Citrus Research and Education Center.
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined additional documentation and interviewed the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, the vice president and chief financial officer, and the associate vice president and deputy general counsel. In the Focused Report and accompanying documentation, the University of Florida provided the bylaws for 26 organizations which were not included in the original review. One of the organizations (Shands Healthcare, Inc.) had not been approved as of the Compliance Review, as it has not been incorporated, and therefore has no by-laws. During the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee's visit further documentation was provided by the University General Counsel's Office that satisfactorily updated the status of the affiliated organizational by-laws.

3.2.14 The institution's policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of all intellectual property. These policies apply to students, faculty, and staff. (Intellectual property rights)

The institution has an intellectual property policy that clearly states that it covers faculty, staff, and students and defines the ownership rights and the distribution of any income as a result of use of the intellectual property. The policy is published by the university in various locations including the Faculty Handbook, the web site of the Office of Research, the web site of the Office of Technology Licensing, and the web site of the Provost.

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas (Institutional Effectiveness):

*3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

The institution has identified educational program and student learning outcomes, the assessment measures employed to monitor achievement of those outcomes, and has exemplified how results from assessment measures have been used to prompt improvement initiatives.

Four sources of evidence and documentation were provided to substantiate the systemic effectiveness process at the college and program levels: (a) a review of state regulations regarding the assessment of student learning outcomes was provided, (b) an overview of the development of academic assessment at the university since the last reaffirmation was described, (c) a description and set of examples of the academic program review process was included, and (d) a description and representative sample of student learning outcomes assessment from the colleges and academic programs were presented.

From 2003-04 through 2010-11, educational goals, measures and use of results to improve programs was submitted annually to the Office of Institutional Planning and Research. In 2011-12, this process transitioned to the Office of Institutional Assessment, and coincided with the establishment of centralized academic assessment planning and assessment reporting process and procedure using the Compliance Assist
software application. The development and implementation of the new institutional assessment processes initiated in 2011 were described in the compliance narrative with particular attention to the rigorous and thorough review and approval process for academic assessment plans.

In documenting the effectiveness of academic programs a sample of 54 (17%) academic program reviews from the 2007-2012 timeframe were presented, representing each degree level and college. Six examples were presented illustrating the various methods and approaches adopted in the colleges for monitor program effectiveness (sample represented 38% of the colleges). A sample of 74 of the academic programs’ outcomes, assessments, results and use of results from the 2008-09 through 2011-12 academic years was provided representing 18% of the university's 405 undergraduate, graduate and professional degree programs.

The timetable for submitting compliance documentation prevented the institution from sharing outcomes assessment results and improvement actions following the new, more systematic process enhancements in place for the 2012-13 academic year and for including a sample of evidence for certificate programs since certificates were not official university credentials until the 2012-13 academic year. The documentation provided, however, demonstrated that the institution has identified outcomes, assessed student success, and made program-level improvements based on analysis of assessment data in its educational programs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification materials provided by the institution and conducted interviews with the director of institutional assessment, the chair of the academic assessment committee, a college assessment designee and several faculty members who participate in departmental assessment at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Based on that review it is clear that academic programs at the institution identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which they achieve those outcomes, and make improvements based on analysis of assessment data.

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

Administrative support services at the University of Florida are the primary responsibility of the vice president of business affairs and the vice president and chief financial officer. They operationalize the monitoring, assessment and improvement of administrative support services at the institutional level. The leadership of the 16 colleges and the remaining non-academic units develop administrative support services goals, action items, and resource allocations to meet these goals.

The institutional effectiveness process for administrative support services begins with planning – setting goals, planned actions and measures, setting a timeframe for the actions, identifying responsible individuals, and allocating resources. Then data is gathered, reviewed and used to modify and improve university services. Through 2011, the documentation of services and effectiveness processes was housed in
the units, but beginning in 2012-13, the university centralized the planning and reporting processes, and the units began submitting effectiveness documentation plans and reporting their results to the Office of Institutional Assessment.

As supporting evidence and documentation, examples of the effectiveness processes were provided by the offices of the vice president and chief financial officer, the vice president for business affairs, the vice president for information technology and chief information officer, and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

3.3.1.3 academic and student support services

While it was clear how academic and student support services fit into the organizational structure of the institution, and how those services are consistent with and aligned to the university mission, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find sufficient evidence and documentation to confirm determine that the institution's academic and student support services identify outcomes, assess those outcomes, and make improvements based on analysis of assessment data. A broader and more complete cross-section of the student affairs units, as enumerated in CR 2.10, is needed and a more direct expression of expected outcomes, measures, results and use of findings presented to demonstrate that student support services effectively meet the needs of students of all types and promotes student learning and development.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee was able to review the additional materials provided in the Focused Report and conduct interviews with the vice president of student affairs, the director of institutional assessment and chair of the Division of Student Affairs assessment team. The Division of Student Affairs' strategic plan includes five Key Strategic Areas (KSA) that are broad categories for activities in pursuit of the mission of the Division. The Division has adopted a central set of student learning outcomes (SLO) which are based on the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) and connect back to these five KSA's. Student Affairs departments now map programs and services back to these SLO using a learning outcomes grid, and established measurement methods for the specific learning outcomes identified for a particular year. All future annual assessment reports will now identify, measure, and report on a specific learning outcome. The Division improved the internal process for assessment and data collection.

3.3.1.4 research within its mission, if appropriate

The institution enables, supports, and disseminates research to ensure efficient and effective fulfillment of its institutional mission. Each unit engaged in research establishes goals, plans actions to meet research goals, systematically assesses the extent to which they are attained, and uses the results of those assessments to improve and strengthen the research enterprise.
Within the organizational structure of the university, the responsibility for the oversight of research lies with the four senior vice presidents: the vice president and chief operating officer, the senior vice president for health affairs, the senior vice president for agricultural and natural resources, and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost. The vice president for research reports directly to the vice president and chief operating officer. The vice president for research operationalizes the monitoring, assessment and improvement of research policies and practices and the advancement of the research enterprise. Each of the senior vice presidents sets research goals that advance the University Strategic Work Plan goals and the mission, and the vice president for research provides the services and structures to meet those goals. The institutional effectiveness process for research begins with planning – setting goals, planned actions and measures, setting a timeline for the actions, identifying responsible individuals, and allocating resources. Data is then gathered, reviewed and used to modify and improve the services.

The effectiveness of the research enterprise at the institution was documented by detailing research goals, accomplishments and improvements in three major research areas: the Institute for Food and Agricultural Science, the Office of the Vice President for Research, and Centers and Institutes. A new integrated research support tool, UFIRST, was described in the institution's narrative; it is expected to improve research administration processes throughout the proposal and award lifecycle.

3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

Community/public service at the institution constitutes a significant commitment of time and effort, with as many as 348 public service and outreach programs in place. Community service takes on many forms, including but not limited to service to the public schools, health care for medically underserved populations, outreach via public media, agricultural extension services, and civic engagement at all levels.

The vice president for university relations operationalizes the monitoring, assessment and modification of community service activities at the institutional level. A representative sample of the significant community and public service activities led by faculty, staff and administration were presented and their effectiveness processes described. Three service initiatives were described that were advanced by the Office of University Relations including the lead role they served in local United Way campaign. The Institute for Food and Agricultural Sciences Extension offices offer extensive public service initiatives and monitor their effectiveness on an annual basis. Media Properties in the College of Journalism and Communications, such as local TV and Radio stations (including NPR), offer public service broadcasting significantly impacting their local and state markets. University Health programs by the six UF medical colleges meet many of the needs of the medically underserved within the state. Many of the 177 active centers and institutes engage in service activities as well as research efforts.
The depth and breadth of public service offerings was effectively communicated in a table provided in the compliance narrative where each of the 300+ public service programs were identified and described, as well as how the program impacted a particular targeted audience.

3.3.2 The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (Quality Enhancement Plan)

The institution satisfactorily addressed all components of this standard. See Part III for additional information.

3.4.1 The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. (Academic program approval)

The institution has clear, well established processes for the approval of courses and programs that ensures faculty and administrative approval at multiple points within the university’s governance system. All academic programs and courses, regardless of their mode or location of delivery, are initiated by the faculty, reviewed and approved by the faculty in the units, the curriculum committee in the college, the college dean, the University Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs and the UF Board of Trustees. Undergraduate programs also require approval by the Office of Undergraduate Affairs, and graduate programs also require approval by the Graduate Council. Graduate (PhD) and professional (doctorate) programs also require the approval of the Florida Board of Governors. The approval process is managed through an online Academic Approval Tracking system.

3.4.2 The institution’s continuing education, outreach, and service programs are consistent with the institution’s mission. (Continuing education/service programs)

The institution’s continuing education, outreach and service programs are consistent with the institution’s mission which is, according to the UF Faculty Handbook, “to lead and serve the state of Florida, the nation and the world by pursuing and disseminating new knowledge while building upon the experiences of the past. The institution aspires to advance by strengthening the human condition and improving the quality of life.” The Division of Continuing Education (DCE) Center is the academic outreach entity at UF that is primarily responsible for coordinating continuing education, outreach, and service programs. According to the institution’s narrative, the DCE “is responsible for assisting academic units with developing non-credit courses and programs that are offered to working professionals for career advancement and ongoing continuing education.”

The institution provided numerous illustrations of the ways that its campus constituents as well as specific academic departments and colleges provide outreach and public service consistent with the institution’s mission. For example
at the university-level, UF participates in The Campaign for Charities which provides an opportunity for UF employees to make charitable contributions to their area charity of choice through payroll deduction, check, cash, or stock contribution. More specifically, considering academic departments the College of Health and Human Performance (HHP) has applied the vast teaching, research and educational service within the college to address key issues for the region and state specifically focused on the tourism industry's reaction to extreme weather, substance abuse and prevention, and other health issues such as the obesity epidemic, Parkinson's disease, and stroke prevention. The Levin College of Law coordinates two programs - the Pro Bono Project and the Community Service Project focused on providing service focused on meeting the legal needs of traditionally underserved populations and awareness of grassroots issues that bond the students to the community in ways that meaningfully relate to their future careers.

The institution's University Relations website provides an impressive illustration of the numerous community outreach activities that are taking place across UF's 16 colleges. The document titled 3.4.2-1: University of Florida Continuing Education, Outreach, and Public Service Programs provides a fairly comprehensive illustration of several of their outreach programs categorized by college or unit, program title, audience served, and a description of how the program relates to the university mission.

*3.4.3 The institution publishes admissions policies that are consistent with its mission. (Admissions policies)

The institution has clear and appropriate admissions policies for the various colleges that are aligned with the university’s mission and values. Undergraduate and Graduate admissions processes are clearly outlined and provided via web and hard copy. Documentation includes graduate and undergraduate catalogs, resources and standards for transfer students, and various important documents that would be relevant for incoming students.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed relevant documents such as student catalogs and websites addressing admissions policies, and interviewed the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, the vice president for enrollment management and associate provost, and the university registrar and assistant vice president for enrollment management. The findings of the Off-Site Review Committee were confirmed. The institution’s admissions policies appear appropriate, clearly stated, and easily accessed.

3.4.4 The institution publishes policies that include criteria for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer, experiential learning, credit by examination, advanced placement, and professional certificates that is consistent with its mission and ensures that course work and learning outcomes are at the collegiate level and comparable to the institution’s own degree programs. The institution assumes responsibility for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution's transcript. (See Commission policy "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.") (Acceptance of academic credit)
The institution publishes policies that include criteria for accepting credit for transfer, experiential learning, credit by examination, advanced placement and professional certifications in the form of the UF Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs. Lower level transfer courses are evaluated by the Office of Admissions in accordance with state policies. The Statewide Course Numbering System (SCNS) ensures that students from other institutions in the state are receiving credit for comparable college-level courses. Upper level or graduate level courses are evaluated by faculty from the student's chosen major department to determine degree applicability for major/minor requirements, then forwarded to the Graduate School for approval. Credit by examination is also administered by the Office of Admissions with guidance from state guidelines and the University Curriculum Committee.

3.4.5 The institution publishes academic policies that adhere to principles of good educational practice. These policies are disseminated to students, faculty, and other interested parties through publications that accurately represent the programs and services of the institution. (Academic policies)

Through the shared governance system, the University of Florida (UF) faculty participates in setting academic policies for the institution. The institution's academic policies may be initiated at the department, college, Faculty Senate, or Faculty Senate Council level. Proposals to these groups may be transmitted from academic support units, but the decision to put forward education policy must come from the faculty members themselves or their elected bodies. Faculty members comprise the membership at each level approving academic policies. Academic policies are published and widely distributed through a variety of means, including the Undergraduate Catalog, the Graduate Catalog, the various student handbooks such as the Graduate Student Handbook, Vet Med Student Handbook, Nursing Student Handbooks, College of Law Student Handbook, and the Student Conduct and Honor Code. The institution has established and implements academic policies that support the university mission and are widely disseminated.

3.4.6 The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. (Practices for awarding credit)

The institution has a robust process for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses. This occurs through faculty-based review of current and proposed courses, both within the originating department and in the undergraduate or graduate curriculum committee. The referenced document, "Florida Statewide Course Numbering System," specifies both the definition of a credit hour and the number of credits awarded for course equivalencies.

3.4.7 The institution ensures the quality of educational programs and courses offered through consortia relationships or contractual agreements, ensures ongoing compliance with the Principles and periodically evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the mission of the institution. (See the Commission policy "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.") (Consortia relationships/contractual agreements)
The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee's review of the supporting documents indicates that the institution is engaged in three dual degree programs and one joint degree program. The institution has no contractual agreements for third parties to deliver course credits. Copies of signed contracts and consortial agreements are presented for all of these programs that clearly delineate the responsibilities and role of all parties. However, the Committee was unable to determine that these agreements undergo regular evaluation and review. The three dual degree programs are relatively new (2009-2011), and the narrative indicates that they are "typically valid for five years" after which time they would presumably undergo some kind of review against SACSCOC Principles and the university mission. The joint degree program in Entomology with Florida A&M University has supporting documents from 1996 and earlier, with no information in either the supporting documents or the narrative suggesting any kind of review since that time.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed the associate provost for academic and faculty affairs and the vice president for enrollment management and associate provost to determine how consortial agreements are managed. Further discussion with the interim dean for the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences revealed that the program is currently undergoing review and a decision will be made on the future of the joint PhD program in Entomology and Nematology with Florida A & M University. Based on the interview, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee finds that the institution ensures the quality of educational programs and courses offered through consortia relationships or contractual agreements, ensures ongoing compliance with the Principles and periodically evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the mission of the institution.

3.4.8 The institution awards academic credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis only when there is documentation that the noncredit course work is equivalent to a designated credit experience. (Noncredit to credit)

The institution does not award academic credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis.

3.4.9 The institution provides appropriate academic support services. (Academic support services)

The institution submitted examples of a number of resources that provide a high level of academic support services to undergraduate and graduate students. Students who are enrolled through distance education courses or graduate students can access information and support services by visiting teach.ufl.edu. An entire list of academic support services were described and provided as documentation for the type of services offered to students and faculty.

The institution conducts the SERU (Student Experience in the Research University) survey to garner feedback on their services. Examples were provided that demonstrate how the results of the surveys are used to enact change.

3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of its curriculum with its faculty. (Responsibility for curriculum)
There is evidence provided that demonstrates that the institution places responsibility for the curriculum with the faculty. The evidence includes the institution’s constitution, copies of the policies of the university curriculum committee, a Faculty Senate document which summarizes Faculty Governance, listing of Graduate Council membership, and examples of the curriculum change process.

*3.4.11* For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration. *(Academic program coordination)*

The institution provides appropriate documentation that program coordination, development, and review is assigned to persons who are academically qualified in the field. The institution entrusts responsibility for coordinating each of its programs to faculty with terminal degrees or equivalent experience in the field assigned for coordination. A list of these individuals is presented on the "Academic Program Coordinators" document. According to UF’s attached narrative, academic coordinators “work with the department chair on activities such as class scheduling, faculty assignments, curriculum change and approval, monitoring enrollments, reviewing student evaluations of teaching, coordinating program assessment, and serving as a contact on accreditation and other related activities.” The "Graduate AAP page expanded" and "Undergraduate AAP page expanded" outline the role of the academic coordinator facilitating the review, their assigned area, and delivery of the curriculum in an educationally sound manner. The primary areas addressed in these reviews include an assessment of mission alignment, assessment timeline, assessment cycle, measurement tools and general assessment oversight. The institutional Assessment page provides a comprehensive break down of the assessment process for each major and the actual measurement tools utilized in the assessment to ensure sound educational practice.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the list of program coordinators and concurred with the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee that these individuals were academically qualified in their respective programs. Reviewers also met with the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, the associate provost for undergraduate affairs, the interim dean of the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, and an associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences to discuss the role of program coordinators at the institution. Information gathered during these interviews confirmed that program coordinators are responsible for assessing the quality of the program and its curriculum and for ensuring the curriculum, as well as its delivery, are educationally sound.

3.4.12 The institution’s use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have access to and training in the use of technology. *(Technology use)*

The institution provides a wide range of technological services that are designed support teaching and learning. Two recent surveys indicate that faculty is generally satisfied with training opportunities and with technology support in the
classroom. A third survey indicates the help desk users are satisfied with support services.

Based on the information provided, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to assess the extent to which the students have training in the use of technology.

Additional information pertaining to this standard was supplied to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee as part of the Focused Report and during discussion with vice president and chief information officer. The institution provides students with a variety of avenues for both technological training and support. New students, including online students, have orientations and training options to help prepare for technological requirements. Both the University of Florida Information Technology and the Computing Help Desk Application Support Center units provides numerous training opportunities and environments specific to the institution’s technological systems. Finally, faculty and staff have 24/7 access to online training courses through Lynda.com (over 2,000 online training courses).

3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them. (General education competencies)

The institution has established college-level general education competencies for its students, and the faculty assesses these competencies both directly and indirectly to determine the degree to which these are met. Assessment of general education is designed by the General Education Committee in collaboration with the Offices of Institutional Assessment and Undergraduate Affairs, and conducted by the faculty who teach the general education courses. The processes for development of the competencies and the assurance of their quality and appropriateness are rigorous and fulfill the academic mission of the university. The faculty analyzes general education assessment data and uses the results to evaluate the effectiveness of the program and to modify the curriculum based on these analyses.

3.5.2 At least 25 percent of the credit hours required for the degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. (See the Commission policy “Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.”) (Institutional credits for a degree).

The institution clearly states that at least 25 percent of the semester credits needed to satisfy its graduation requirements must be taken at the institution. This is stated on page 5 of the 2012-2013 university undergraduate catalog. Also included in the institution’s undergraduate catalog is a description of the institution’s Universal Tracking system that tracks a student’s progress toward a degree. Students can assess that progress through the Integrated Student Information System.

3.5.3 The institution publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education components. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. (See the Commission
policy "The Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees." (Undergraduate program requirements)

The institution publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education components online and in its catalog. The institution demonstrates compliance with this standard by providing clear and concise web and printed requirements for undergraduate program degree completion including general education components. Information about specific school/college degree requirements are published on the individual school websites as well.

According to the General Education Requirement page of the UF Undergraduate catalog, general education requirements are organized around seven major content areas: composition, diversity studies, humanities, international studies, mathematics, physical and biological sciences, and social and behavioral sciences. General education requirements for each program fall under the oversight of the General Education Committee. Additionally, three university-wide faculty committees monitor undergraduate general curriculum policy in the following manner: Major program requirements are defined by the faculty in the discipline. Proposals to add, delete, or make change in programs of instruction leading to undergraduate degrees are reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee which submits their decision to the Faculty Senate for final action. The process for a course to gain approval as part of the general education requirement consists of a comprehensive 5 step process that is initiated by the professor submitting the proposed course to the Academic Approval Tracking system.

The process for determining the inclusion of major course work and conformity to commonly accepted standards and practices is facilitated through a multi-step system starting with the faculty in the actual academic department cycling through the college dean, the University Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the University of Florida Board of Trustees. The combination of assessment and oversight across each of these committees ensures that the appropriate course work is included in each major and ultimately that the appropriate level of rigor is achieved, there is a coherent course of study, and the degree program conforms to commonly accepted standards and practices.

In addition to the institution’s institutional oversight, the state of Florida through the chair of the State Board of Education and the chair of the Board of Governors provides an added level of curricular oversight. This oversight occurs primarily through the State’s active participation in the standardization of general education requirements among public postsecondary institutions within the state. Documentation and a detailed description of this policy can be found within the Florida Laws Ch. 2012-195.

3.5.4 At least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding an appropriate terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate or the equivalent of the terminal degree. (Terminal degrees of faculty)

The institution’s evidence of meeting the requirement is illustrated through the "Terminal Degree of Undergraduate Table" that is provided. The institution
reports that each of the 112 sections of undergraduate departmental/program area courses across the university are taught in sections where the number of faculty with terminal degrees exceeds the 25 percent threshold. An 81.2 percent average and a median 69 percent of courses are taught by terminally degreed faculty at the institution.

3.6.1 The institution's post-baccalaureate professional degree programs, and its master's and doctoral degree programs, are progressively more advanced in academic content than its undergraduate programs. (Post-baccalaureate program rigor)

Documentation for post-baccalaureate degree programs provides evidence that the programs are progressively more advanced in academic content than undergraduate programs, and that there are faculty-based processes in place to define content and rigor of these programs. One example provided illustrates how the requirements for undergraduates and graduates in co-listed courses are clearly delineated. Co-listed courses must be approved by both the University Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Curriculum Committee. Upper-level graduate and professional courses are approved by either the Graduate Curriculum Committee or the college's curriculum committee. There are clear guidelines for creating course syllabi and outlining academic rigor, as established by the University Curriculum Committee. Assessment plans exist for the degree programs sampled.

3.6.2 The institution structures its graduate curricula (1) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences. (Graduate curriculum)

The institution structures its graduate curriculum to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and teaching experience. The institution points to its membership as one of only 62 North American universities in the highly selective Association of American Universities as proof of that their graduate programs support an environment that would afford students opportunities for appropriate training and experiences. Membership requires approval by three-fourths of the existing membership and as stated on the AAU website "is based on the high quality of programs of academic research and scholarship and undergraduate, graduate, and professional education in a number of fields, as well as general recognition that a university is outstanding by reason of the excellence of its research and education programs."

Disciplinary literature is incorporated into the curriculum by each school/program area having a prescribed set of introductory courses informed by relevant literature in its area of study in combination with practical experiences. Implementation and refinement of the literature presented through the course work is afforded through practicum/clinical experiences appropriate to the area of study.

The Master's, Specialist, and PhD degrees typically require students to attain content knowledge in the discipline through a suite of core and elective courses. Master's thesis and PhD level students are introduced to research methodologies
through research-related courses followed by preparation of a prospectus, conduct of research, and completion of the thesis, treatise, or dissertation. The Institutional Assessment webpage illustrates an additional level of assessment across all graduate programs through what UF referrers to as Academic Assessment Plans. These plans address three domains established by the Graduate Council – Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Behavior. Members of the program faculty develop Student Learning Outcomes for each graduate and professional program.

Several accompanying documents provide illustrations of students engaging in ongoing research. For example:

- The Genetics Institute webpage provides a listing of 2008 – 2013 doctoral students complete with their research interests and where possible current research projects.
- The University of Florida Health Cancer Center provides a list of over 12 symposiums through its Grand Round Seminar Series covering such topics as "Cell Therapy for Tissue Regeneration" and "The gut micro biota and colorectal cancer." Students have the opportunity to attend and participate in these cutting edge seminars about the latest findings about cancer.
- The Dental School sponsors a Summer Research Program in which incoming dental students are paired with a faculty member for a 10 week intensive research opportunity. According to the school website the included student discussion groups provide opportunities for participants to discuss their ongoing projects and to interact in a less structure environment. At the end of the program, student participants present the results of their research projects.

Additional evidence of inclusion of literature and research expectations/opportunities was provided within Table 3.6.2-1 “Sample Courses Exemplifying Knowledge of Disciplinary Literature, Engagement in Research, Practice, and/or Training Experiences.”

3.6.3 At least one-third of credits toward a graduate or a post-baccalaureate professional degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. (See the Commission policy "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.") (Institutional credits for a degree)

The institution has transfer credit limits in place to ensure that at least a third of the credits for a graduate degree are earned at the institution. The limit of transfer credit for a Master’s degree is 9 hours and for a PhD is 30 hours. This applies for professional degrees as well. The institution requires that two thirds of the credit must be earned at the institution. This requirement was shown as policy in the Graduate Catalog which was presented as evidence.

3.6.4 The institution defines and publishes requirements for its graduate and post-graduate professional programs. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. (Post-baccalaureate program requirements)
Supporting documents provided indicate that the institution defines requirements for its graduate and post-baccalaureate degree programs and makes these requirements readily available to students through publication of the Graduate Catalog. In addition, the Handbook for Graduate Students provides an invaluable resource for assisting graduate students with maintaining appropriate academic standing. The degree requirements as outlined in the narrative conform to commonly accepted standards and practices across institutions of higher education.

3.7.1 The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See Commission guidelines “Faculty Credentials.”) (Faculty competence)

The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the central tenets (teaching, research and service) of its mission. The institution has multiple, clear and consistent policies and practices to ensure that faculty competence is regularly reviewed and evaluated. However, the enclosed “Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications” of faculty includes course instructors of record for whom the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find sufficient evidence to determine that they were qualified to teach the course(s) identified.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report provided by the institution. Based on the information, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee agrees that the institution has provided adequate information of the faculty listed on the Off-Site Review Committee’s “Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications.” Specifically, the Focused Report provided details about either education and/or professional experience details associated for each requested name.

3.7.2 The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

The Office of Human Resources and Services supports a webpage titled “My UFL Toolkits” that provides comprehensive information about UF’s faculty evaluation processes. Specifically, this page has detailed information categorized for candidates (i.e., Downloading & Completing Packet Template and Candidate Response to College Review); information for department administrators (i.e., Viewing Chair or Director Endorsement); and information for College Review Committee (i.e., Reviewing Candidate Packet). In addition, the office also holds periodic workshops such as their "PRO324 Supporting Tenure and Promotion Activities in your Department," seminar which is intended “to increase administrative staff members' understanding of the tenure/permanent..."
status and promotion processes for faculty so that they may support those efforts more effectively."

According to the UF Regulation 7.010 each faculty member shall be evaluated in writing at least once annually on the basis of an assessment of the individual's total performance in fulfilling his or her assigned duties and responsibilities to the university. Several activities, including a mandatory three-year review and mentor system, are set in place for non-tenured tenure track faculty to support the evaluation process. Further, even after faculty have achieved tenure, a mandatory seven-year post tenure review is in place, in addition to the annual reviews. According to the "Policies & Practices - Office of the Associate Provost for Information Technology" page,

Each academic unit develops the criteria and procedures for annual evaluations of all regular faculty that are administered according to position description and assignment within the unit. These criteria and procedures are created by faculty using unit-appropriate governance structures at the departmental and college levels.

This evaluation must also be in compliance with the Article 18.8 of the United Faculty of Florida Contract to include a performance improvement plan should a faculty member's evaluation show consistently below satisfactory performance in one or more areas of assigned duties. The fact that the performance plan is developed through a collaborative consultation between the evaluator and the faculty member suggests that the feedback that has been provided is potentially useful for improving practice and establishing more effective teaching/student learning outcomes.

However, despite institution's adherence to regulations and the dissemination of information related to faculty evaluation, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to determine that the institution periodically evaluates part-time faculty and non-tenure track faculty.

The institution's Focused Report reiterated the requirement that all faculty be reviewed annually and included copies of annual reviews for a part-time (0.5 FTE) faculty member in the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences and a full-time non-tenure track faculty member in the School of Accounting. To verify the breadth of faculty evaluation, reviewers met with the associate provost for academic and faculty affairs, the interim dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, an associate dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, and the director of SACSCOC accreditation, and reviewed evaluations for tenure-track, non-tenure track full-time, and part-time faculty. These meetings demonstrated that the University of Florida has an ongoing process of regular evaluation of faculty.

3.7.3 The institution provides evidence of ongoing professional development of faculty as teachers, scholars, and practitioners. (Faculty development)

The institution provides ongoing opportunities for faculty development through the Faculty Enhancement Opportunity Grant program, sabbatical leaves, and professional development leaves. The institution's Office of the Provost oversees these institutional programs, which are fully funded by the university and the units. Cross-referenced documentation in Standard 3.4.12 indicates that
faculty has a wide range of technological services that are designed to support teaching and learning. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to find sufficient evidence to demonstrate ongoing professional development of the institution's faculty as scholars and practitioners.

As outlined in the Focused Report, individual colleges at the institution provide most of the continuing professional development opportunities for faculty to grow as scholars and practitioners. The most typical opportunities supported scholarly activities like Humanities Scholarship Enhancement Award in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as well as annual funding in the Warrington College of Business Administration. Some colleges emphasized support of continued growth as a professional like IFAS Extension in the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences and Institute for Food and Agricultural Sciences as well as continuing education courses in the College of Public Health and Health Professions. Many colleges have general support opportunities (supporting research activity, conference attendance, etc.) for faculty at a variety of levels like the Professional Development Account in the Levin College of Law. Some colleges had very specific opportunities like the Grant Writing Seminar for College of Agricultural and Life Sciences and Institute for Food and Agricultural Sciences and The Gatorade Travel funds in the College of Fine Arts.

3.7.4 The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom. (Academic freedom)

Academic Freedom at the institution is a central doctrine by which the faculty operates and it is embedded in the culture of the institution. The UF Regulation and Constitution, Collective Bargaining Agreement with the United Faculty of Florida, and the Grievance Process ensure adequate principles and practices to safeguard and protect academic freedom.

3.7.5 The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters. (Faculty role in governance)

The institution has published statements and policies that address faculty governance. The institution’s constitution in Article I clearly states that faculty will participate with the administration in the decision and policy making process. The Faculty Senate is the representative body within the institution that advises the university administration. Responsibility for academic policy matters related to such things as curriculum and tenure and promotion policy rests with the faculty. The Faculty Senate Bylaws establishes faculty representation on various university committees, and a copy of the Faculty Senate Bylaws is provided as evidence. Additionally, evidence is provided from each of the 16 academic colleges to show that there are provisions for shared governance at the college level.

3.8.1 The institution provides facilities and learning/information resources that are appropriate to support its teaching, research, and service mission. (Learning/information resources)

The institution’s libraries support the institution by creating learning environments for students, and providing teaching and research support for faculty. There are
seven libraries on the institution's campus to serve the broad range of disciplines and research. Liaison librarians are assigned to specific libraries and to specific disciplines to support teaching and research in that area. In addition to the physical libraries, electronic resources are available to students and faculty 24 hours a day both on campus and off. As books and journals become available electronically, space is reconfigured to serve learning through information commons with high-end computing and production software, as well as for group and individual study spaces.

3.8.2 The institution ensures that users have access to regular and timely instruction in the use of the library and other learning/information resources. (Instruction of library use)

The institution provides regular instruction in the use of the library and other learning/information resources. A library instruction committee oversees the instruction program. The library combines in person and online instruction to target incoming freshman and transfer students with general library orientations. Online instruction modules are available for heavily used databases and tools including finding books, QuickTime™ videos of searching the catalog, and finding dissertations. Faculty are encouraged to arrange in-class or in-library instruction on specific topics of their choice, or for general library orientation. Liaison librarians work closely with these faculty to target the instruction to the work of the course, often compiling online course guides for student use.

3.8.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experiences in library and/or other learning/information resources—to accomplish the mission of the institution. (Qualified staff)

The staff of the institution's libraries consists of 86 library faculty; 170 professional, technical, and clerical staff; 26 other personal services (OPS) staff; and over 200 student assistants. Librarians are tenure-accruing faculty, and all have terminal degrees in Library Science or Information Studies, and/or a graduate degree in a relevant subject area. The institution provides appropriate professional development opportunities.

3.9.1 The institution publishes a clear and appropriate statement of student rights and responsibilities and disseminates the statement to the campus community. (Student rights)

The institution publishes and disseminates the students' rights in numerous online and printed resources. Undergraduate students are made aware of the handbook and honor code during summer orientation and can access the information online at the Dean of Students website. Additionally, the student’s rights and responsibilities are shared with the student body via the campus newsletter, Gator Times. Student financial aid rights, residence hall rights and the FERPA policy are communicated with students when they receive information to register for those programs or services.
Graduate students are provided information on their rights during orientation and through their academic departments. The Graduate Student handbook serves as the primary resource for graduate students.

Examples include student financial aid rights, residence halls rights, and the FERPA policy.

3.9.2 The institution protects the security, confidentiality, and integrity of its student records and maintains security measures to protect and back up data. (Student records).

The institution adheres to all federal guidelines relative to the maintenance, security, and access to student records. There are safeguards in place to ensure records and files are maintained and that all required forms are signed to release records to third parties. The University Registrar's office serves as the primary repository for records and ensures that all staff has been trained on FERPA. There is an extensive use of technology support systems to provide layers of security of all records. Notification of FERPA rights are published in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs and email notification is also sent to students at the beginning of each academic year.

While there is an extensive use of technology support systems to provide layers of security for all records, the 2011-2012 audit issued June 2013, raised concerns with the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee that the controls in place to protect student records (FERPA) may not be adequate.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and all accompanying documentation. The institution engaged in the following actions to secure student records:

- Reorganized the Office of Information Technology to create an enterprise-wide organization, including hiring an experienced vice president and chief information officer plus an experienced chief information security officer who has responsibility across the entire organization.
- Created an Information Security and Compliance Governance Committee whose charge is to develop and assess security related policies, standards, and practices. New policies have been implemented, and existing policies are reviewed and updated.
- Developed a Strategic Plan for IT which includes security measures.
- Established identity and access management procedures such as requiring training for individuals who access student records. Training is offered to all faculty and staff members.
- Established data management procedures using data encryption and network security measures including firewalls.
- Initiated measures such as proactively addressing security needs, identifying a vulnerability management program, scheduling regular scanning of websites for personal identifiable information, conducting security and privacy assessment, implementing patch management, penetration testing, whole disk laptop encryption, laptop theft recovery software, and providing improved secure infrastructure.
3.9.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experience in the student affairs area—to accomplish the mission of the institution. (Qualified staff)

The Division of Student Affairs consists of departments that support the overall student experiences. Documentation of the vice president’s council and staff credentials include vitas and resumes that outline the staff’s academic degrees and qualifications for their respective positions. Additionally, the student affairs organizational chart provides an overview of how the division is structured to best meet the needs of students. The Student Affairs organization provides professional development workshops and trainings to support staff. Staff also participate and attend local, regional and national conferences to remain abreast of best practices in the field.

3.10.1 The institution’s recent financial history demonstrates financial stability. (Financial stability)

The Florida legislature recently approved budget increases for public post-secondary education institutions, perhaps ending the state’s string of seven years of cuts. State appropriations at the University of Florida declined $93 million, or 15 percent, from FY 2008-09 to FY 2011-12. During the same period, net student tuition and fees increased $91.5 million, or 40 percent. Overall, the University’s unrestricted net assets (excluding gains and losses on investments) have increased from $108.6 million as of June 30, 2009 to $159.9 million as of June 30, 2012, or 46 percent. Thus, the institution has been able to maintain financial stability during the recent fiscal crisis by increasing tuition rates and controlling expenses.

*3.10.2 The institution audits financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations. (Financial aid audits)

Pursuant to the U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, the Auditor General of the state of Florida conducts an annual audit of federal award programs including financial aid programs. The Auditor General issues a single report for all state agencies with findings separately identified by state agency including each state university and college.

The Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program was established by the Florida Legislature to provide lottery-funded scholarships to Florida high school graduates based on merit and that enroll in an eligible Florida public or private postsecondary educational institution within three years of high school graduation. The State of Florida audits the Bright Futures Program on an annual basis. Similar to many institutions, the University of Florida received some findings in the audits. The findings have subsequently been appropriately addressed. A federal Department of Education program review was also conducted in February 2013, and UF is awaiting the final report.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification and accompanying documents, and conducted interviews with the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and the director of student financial affairs. The Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.
Financial aid programs are routinely audited, and all findings of the latest audit have been addressed.

3.10.3 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its financial resources. *(Control of finances)*

The institution appropriately delineates responsibility for control of financial resources. Departmental fiscal responsibilities are documented as part of the University's "Directives and Procedures" which is maintained by the Office of the Controller. The Office of Internal Audit provides objective assurance of compliance with university policies and procedures. The administrative system has been established such that security roles are only granted after an employee completes the required training.

The Office of the Controller is responsible for administrative functions such as payroll, cash management, general accounting and asset management. The University's standard processes and procedures for business transactions are well documented and easily found as part of the Office of the Controller's website. The Purchasing Department manages the University's purchasing card (PCard). A minimum of two employees must be involved in all transactions. The University's Budget Office monitors current funds activities compared to the approved budgets.

In addition to the financial audit report and the state-wide audit of federal awards, the State Auditor General issues the results of operational audits. Such a report was issued in October 2012 for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2012. The operational audit disclosed eight findings, four of which were previously reported.

3.10.4 The institution maintains financial control over externally funded or sponsored research and programs. *(Control of sponsored research/external funds)*

The institution has adopted polices, processes, and procedures governing the expenditure of external funds. These documents, such as the 'Costing Guidelines and Policies', are readily available as part of the Contracts and Grants Services as well as the Office of the Controller websites. The Division of Sponsored Research in the Office of Research oversees the pre-award administrative functions while Contracts and Grants Accounting Services in Finance and Administration oversee the post-award functions. Mandatory training is required for all individuals listed as an investigator on any sponsored project as well as all individuals associated with fiscal activities for sponsored funds. Based on the results of the external audits and the institution's internal control system, it appears that the institution does maintain sufficient control over externally funded or sponsored research and programs.

3.11.1 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its physical resources. *(Control of physical resources)*

The objectives of the institution's policies and practices regarding property are to ensure the accountability and safeguarding of the institution's assets. In accordance with the Board of Governors' (BOG) regulations, the institution requires departments to conduct an annual inventory of tangible personal
property and reconcile the results of the inventory to property acquisition records. The BOG regulations also establish the criteria and capitalization thresholds and the process for the identification and disposal of surplus property.

The BOG regulations are more fully defined by the University as part of its 'Directives and Procedures for Asset Management' (DPAM). The DPAM stipulates that all university employees are expected to comply with these directives and procedures.

The DPAM addresses most transactions. For example, the DPAM describes departmental responsibilities regarding the purchase, receipt of donated assets, transfer, fabrication, exchange, removal and disposition of University property. The DPAM also addresses the unaccounted loss of property including lost, stolen or maliciously destroyed items, cannibalization of parts, scrapped, and accidentally destroyed.

To safeguard its assets further, the institution appropriately insures its buildings and contents. The Physical Plant Division maintains lists of deferred maintenance projects and attempts to address the needs as funding permits.

3.11.2 The institution takes reasonable steps to provide a healthy, safe, and secure environment for all members of the campus community. (Institutional environment)

The administrative responsibility for a healthy, safe and secure environment at the institution lies with the vice president for business affairs, who reports directly to the president. The primary departments responsible for the health, safe and secure environment include campus police, environmental health and safety (EHS), and emergency management operations.

The University of Florida Police Department (UFPD) has 89 sworn law enforcement officers. In 2011, UFPD officers completed 487 environmental health and safety reports regarding potentially unsafe conditions on campus. The agency is responsible for ensuring compliance with the Federal Clery Act standards and all Uniformed Crime Reporting. All crime statistics are posted on the UFPD’s website.

The institution maintains a crisis communications plan that includes UF Alert, which disperses information via the University home page, text messaging, email, IP telephones, speakers, and social media. Other safety precautions include regular audits of laboratories for compliance with environmental and occupational regulations. All campus-building fire alarms are connected to a central monitoring system that alerts the police dispatch and EHS.

Florida Board of Governors Regulation 3.001 requires the development and maintenance of an emergency management program. Emergency Management (EM) is tasked with handling the complete cycle of an emergency – from prevention to recovery. The department provides many resources on its website including reminders for students to get flu shots to information for building emergency coordinators to templates for departments and colleges to use to draft an internal emergency plan. Overall, the institution has taken reasonable actions to provide a healthy, safe, and secure environment.
*3.11.3 The institution operates and maintains physical facilities, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities. (Physical facilities)

State statutes require the preparation of a ten-year campus master plan with an update every five years. The institution complies with these requirements and completed the most recent update to the campus master plan in June 2013. Florida statutes also require the institution to conduct an Educational Plant Survey every five years that identifies the educational programmatic space needs for the main campus and off-site facilities.

The narrative provided to document compliance with the standard focuses primarily on technology resources and facilities for Direct Support Organizations such as the University of Florida Athletic Association, auxiliaries, and deferred maintenance. The Educational Plant Survey results were issued in May 2009 and reflected substantial space deficiencies in many categories such as research labs, study, student academic support, and campus support services. An evaluation of the adequacy of the educational programs and other mission-related activities such as research has not been provided as part of the narrative.

The Focused Report confirms a systematic study of educational and ancillary plants occurs every five years, with the next survey to be completed in June 2014. To respond to the Off-Site Report, the institution provided a current satisfactory space review. Although the current space inventory notes increases in classroom, teaching laboratory, research laboratory, office/computer, auditorium/exhibition, student academic support, and campus support services since the 2008-2009 inventory (with similar trends at the Health Sciences Center), when comparing these figures in square feet to the plant survey need (form B), the university appears to have some space deficits in most categories as they prepare to advance the university toward their goal of preeminence. The biggest deficits, based on these documents, were in teaching laboratory space, research laboratory space, office/computer space, student academic support, and campus support services.

At the same time, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed the senior vice president and chief operating officer and the vice president for business affairs. The institution's master and strategic plans identify key construction projects and the institution is moving forward with these projects as was confirmed by members of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee during a tour of campus. In addition, a space audit is progressing in which some existing space will be reassigned and reconfigured to help meet future institutional needs. The combination of these physical resource enhancements meets the strategic planning objectives as the university moves forward with its preeminence plan.

3.12.1 The institution notifies the Commission of changes in accordance with the Commission's substantive change policy and, when required, seeks approval prior to the initiation of changes. (See the Commission policy “Substantive Changes for Accredited Institutions.”) (Substantive change)

The institution has a policy and documents its use in notifying the SACS Commission on Colleges of changes in accordance with the Commission's substantive change policy. The policy likewise ensures that the institution, when
required, seeks approval from the Commission prior to initiation of those changes.

The institution's Compliance Certification describes the administrative procedure by which it ensures compliance with the substantive change policy. All substantive changes are coordinated through either the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs or the Associate Provost for IT, E-learning and Distance Education. One either of those officers is notified of the changes, he or she notifies the Director of SACSCOC accreditation. The Director has the responsibility (1) of coordinating with the Provost and President notification of SACSCOC of substantive changes and of requesting, when required, approval of those changes and also has responsibility (2) of monitoring the institution's Curriculum Committee and Graduate Council agenda prior to each meeting in order to identify potential substantive changes and report them to the institution's SACSCOC liaison in order to facilitate appropriate notification.

Documentation provided by the institution in its Compliance Certification includes (1) its internal policy on substantive change [which includes specification of staff responsibility, a procedural calendar, relevant definitions, and a table depicting notifications and approvals and time frames expected by the policy] and (2) a dated historical reports of all substantive changes, descriptions of such, and dates representing notice, approval, or current status.

3.13.1 The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges. (Policy compliance)

*3.13.1. "Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies"

Applicable Policy Statement. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting body must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and constituencies, and must keep each institutional accrediting body apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

Documentation: The institution should (1) list federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution or any of its programs, (2) provide the date of the most recent review by each agency and indicate if negative action was taken by the agency and the reason for such action, (3) provide copies of statements used to describe itself for each of the accrediting bodies, (4) indicate any agency that has terminated accreditation, the date, and the reason for termination, and (5) indicate the date and reason for the institution voluntarily withdrawing accreditation with any of the agencies.

The institution provides documentation in its Compliance Certification that identifies all U. S. Department of Education recognized accrediting bodies of which the University is a member. The institution provides a comprehensive table/database that describes types of accreditation, agency name of the accreditor, program name for accredited program, accreditation status, the period of time in which the accreditation has been held, and relevant noting of action. For each accrediting body that requires a university-level description of the relevant program, the table provides a link to text in which the description appears. The information provided to multiple agencies is consistent in message and description conveyed. In all instances the information relies on a standard source such as the undergraduate or graduate catalogs, the institution homepage, etc.
Documentation provided also indicates that the institution notifies SACSCOC of any changes concerning the accreditation decisions of federally recognized accrediting bodies.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed available documents and met with the university ombudsperson and an assistant vice president of Student Affairs and confirmed the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee. The institution is consistent in describing itself to all accrediting bodies, and notifies SACSCOC of any changes in accreditation status with other U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting bodies.

3.13.2 "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures"

Applicable Policy Statement. Member institutions are responsible for notifying and providing SACSCOC with signed final copies of agreements governing their collaborative academic arrangements (as defined in this policy). These arrangements must address the requirements set forth in the collaborative academic arrangements policy and procedures. For all such arrangements, SACSCOC-accredited institutions assume responsibility for (1) the integrity of the collaborative academic arrangements, (2) the quality of credits recorded on their transcripts, and (3) compliance with accreditation requirements.

Documentation: The institution should provide evidence that it has reported to the Commission all collaborative academic arrangements (as defined in this policy) that included signed final copies of the agreements. In addition, the institution should integrate into the Compliance Certification a discussion and determination of compliance with all standards applicable to the provisions of the agreements.

Florida has three dual academic award programs and one joint program. As part of its "Substantive Change Policy" document, the institution demonstrates that it notified SACSCOC and has signed letters of acknowledgement from SACSCOC.

*3.13.3 "Complaint Procedures Against the Commission or Its Accredited Institutions"

Applicable Policy Statement. Each institution is required to have in place student complaint policies and procedures that are reasonable, fairly administered, and well-publicized. (See FR 4.5). The Commission also requires, in accord with federal regulations, that each institution maintains a record of complaints received by the institution. This record is made available to the Commission upon request. This record will be reviewed and evaluated by the Commission as part of the institution's decennial evaluation.

Documentation: When addressing this policy statement, the institution should provide information to the Commission describing how the institution maintains its record and also include the following: (1) individuals/offices responsible for the maintenance of the record(s), (2) elements of a complaint review that are included in the record, and (3) where the record(s) is located (centralized or decentralized). The record itself will be reviewed during the on-site evaluation of the institution.

The dean of students' office and university ombudsperson serves as the primary repository for student complaints. Students can access information about filing a complaint via the student handbook located both online and print (examples
provided). There is also a UF Compliance Hotline that individuals can call and report anonymously.

The institution’s narrative describes the institution’s complaint policies and procedures and details the elements contained in the complaint record.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification and supporting documentation, interviewed the university ombudsperson, and inspected the record of complaints received by the institution. The institution has published policies concerning student complaints, and maintains a record of complaints in the Office of the Dean of Students.

3.13.4 “Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports”

*3.13.4.a. Applicable Policy Statement. An institution includes a review of its distance learning programs in the Compliance Certification.

Documentation: In order to be in compliance with this policy, the institution must have incorporated an assessment of its compliance with standards that apply to its distance and correspondence education programs and courses.

Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1 (Institutional Effectiveness) document presents evidence that student learning outcomes assessment expectations are identical for all programs regardless of instructional delivery mode. The distance education offerings align with aspects institution’s mission that speak to creating “the broadly diverse environment necessary to foster multi-cultural skills and perspectives in its teaching and research for its students to contribute and succeed in the world of the 21st century”; by affording a medium for several of the academic programs at the institution to be available to a broader and more diverse constituency across the state, nation, and world. Programs delivered through distance education are housed within and coordinated by existing academic departments and programs. Distance education courses may have a separate academic program coordinator who specializes in distance education. The criteria for faculty teaching evaluation is clear and the learning outcomes for distance education are assessed by the individual schools that assess distance education in a manner that mirrors the assessment of learning outcomes for classroom based courses.

Oversight for the curriculum and instruction of the distance education programs falls under the same division as the entirely class-room based degree programs composed of faculty within the schools and colleges with oversight by chairs, deans, and ultimately the provost, president and the state. Instructors that facilitate online courses are the same that facilitate the class-room based courses.

According to standard 3.4.12 and the UF Accreditation webpage the Academic Technology Service Areas provide “services and facilities for teaching and learning resources for the university. Each unit within AT interacts with each other to ensure timely and high quality resources are available to faculty, students, and staff.” The AT’s organizational chart illustrates five offices consisting of Instructional Computing Services, Instructional Technology & Training, Learning Support Services, and UF Computing Help Desk. This comprehensive offering of services suggests that UF has ample
technological infrastructure to support both faculty and student technological distance education needs.

All information concerning degree completion standards for distance students is listed in the Undergraduate/Graduate degree catalogs. Additionally this information is published online and is widely available to all students no matter the student's location. It is promptly updated when appropriately approved changes to program policies and procedures are made.

In addition to virtual access through the VPN accounts that all students are granted, UF also has a specific set of library services offered through the "LibGuide" which affords distance education students access to a subject liaison librarian for specific questions associated with accessing UF's libraries. A complete listing of services available to distance education students is available online through the Distance Learners LibGuide.

The institution refers to the written protection of all students enrolled in distance and correspondence courses by having all matriculated students assigned a University of Florida Identification Number (UFID). According to the institution's Accreditation webpage "UFIDs are generated using name, birthdate, and social security number information, and at least two of these pieces of information are required to create the UFID. After being assigned a UFID, the student must create a GatorLink account which requires the creation of a username and password. The GatorLink account information is used for authentication for accessing the university course management system."

The On Site Reaffirmation Committee had the opportunity to observe some online courses and the UF Online Orientation as well as interview the provost, members of his staff, and the associate provost for teaching and technology. Based upon the review of the compliance report, the observations, and the interviews, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the University of Florida holds both distance learning programs and courses offered via distance learning technologies to the same high standards in course offerings and assessment, student technology and academic services support, as well as protection of student privacy.

3.13.4.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If an institution is part of a system or corporate structure, a description of the system operation (or corporate structure) is submitted as part of the Compliance Certification for the decennial review. The description should be designed to help members of the peer review committees understand the mission, governance, and operating procedures of the system and the individual institution's role within that system.

Documentation: The institution should provide a description of the system operation and structure or the corporate structure if this applies.

The institution provided a succinct description of the mission, governance, and operating procedures of the system with appropriate evidence. The University of Florida is one of eleven public universities in the State University System of Florida (SUS). A statewide board of governors is responsible for the management of the system. Pursuant to the Board of Governors regulations, each university has a separate board of trustees, which is responsible for the administration of its university in a manner consistent with the university's mission and the purposes of the SUS as defined by the Board of Governors.
3.13.5 “Separate Accreditation for Units of a Member Institution”

*3.13.5.a. Applicable Policy Statement. All branch campuses related to the parent campus through corporate or administrative control (1) include the name of the parent campus and make it clear that its accreditation is dependent on the continued accreditation of the parent campus and (2) are evaluated during reviews for institutions seeking candidacy, initial membership, or reaffirmation of accreditation. All other extended units under the accreditation of the parent campus are also evaluated during such reviews.

Documentation: For institutions with branch campuses: (1) The name of each branch campus must include the name of the parent campus—the SACSCOC accredited entity. The institution should provide evidence of this for each of its branch campuses. (2) The institution should incorporate the review of its branch campuses, as well as other extended units under the parent campus, into its comprehensive self-assessment and its determination of compliance with the standards, and indicate the procedure for doing so.

In reviewing documentation and in talks with the president and provost, it was determined that the institution does not have any branch campuses; therefore, this policy is not applicable to the institution.

3.13.5.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If the Commission on Colleges determines that an extended unit is autonomous to the extent that the control over that unit by the parent or its board is significantly impaired, the Commission may direct that the extended unit seek to become a separately accredited institution. A unit which seeks separate accreditation should bear a different name from that of the parent. A unit which is located in a state or country outside the geographic jurisdiction of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and which the Commission determines should be separately accredited or the institution requests to be separately accredited, applies for separate accreditation from the regional accrediting association that accredits colleges in that state or country.

Implementation: If, during its review of the institution, the Commission determines that an extended unit is sufficiently autonomous to the extent that the parent campus has little or no control, the Commission will use this policy to recommend separate accreditation of the extended unit. No response required by the institution.

In reviewing documentation and in talks with the president and provost, it was determined that the institution does not have any branch campuses; therefore, this policy is not applicable to the institution.

3.14.1 A member or candidate institution represents its accredited status accurately and publishes the name, address, and telephone number of the Commission in accordance with Commission requirements and federal policy. (Publication of accreditation status)

The institution represents its accredited status by employing language consistent with the requirements of the standards. Further, documentation provided indicates that internal processes and procedures are in place to ensure ongoing compliance with the standards.
D. Assessment of Compliance with Section 4: Federal Requirements

*4.1 The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations, student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals. (Student achievement)

The institution evaluates student achievement on a variety of student success indicators including retention rates, persistence and graduation rates through their Office of Institutional Planning and Research. The institution also evaluates its effectiveness in promoting student achievement on outcome measures such as placement rates and licensure examinations. Multi-year summary tables were presented documenting performance levels across these metrics. The institution monitors its students' success using nationally accepted benchmarks and measures, and through a rigorous internal system of student learning outcomes assessment.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification materials provided by the institution and interviewed the assistant provost and director of institutional planning and research, and the director of institutional assessment. Based on the document review and on-site interviews it was confirmed that the institution maintains accurate records of success relevant to student achievement consistent with its mission. Further, the institution monitors the success of its students using nationally accepted benchmarks and measures. And finally, the university posts retention, persistence, and graduation rate data online via UFFacts.

*4.2 The institution's curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded. (Program curriculum)

The institution provided documentation that its curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, and degrees awarded. UF's mission statement states that "Together with its undergraduate and graduate students, UF faculty participate in an educational process that links...with the traditions and cultures of all societies, explores the physical and biological universes and nurtures generations of young people from diverse backgrounds to address the needs of the world's societies. The university welcomes the full exploration of its intellectual boundaries and supports its faculty and students in the creation of new knowledge and the pursuit of new ideas. Teaching is a fundamental purpose of this university at both the undergraduate and graduate levels."

Program consistency with university mission is ensured by a multi-step process that begins with the departmental faculty, who complete a proposal to be submitted to the college curriculum committee for review and approval. Once college approval is obtained, the proposal is submitted for review and approval by the University Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the UF Board of Trustees. As part of this process each department undergoes a septennial program review to ensure that its aims and actual mission is in alignment with and supports the collective University's mission. The institution includes illustrations of the
individual college missions and the academic assessment plans at each the Undergraduate, Graduate/Professional, and Certificate levels within the supporting materials.

Additionally, an illustration of the university attending to aspects of its mission associated with "addressing the needs of the world's societies" with a specific focus on the state of Florida is its integrated system of county cooperative extension offices and research/education centers known collectively as the IFAS Extension (Electronic Document Information Source). The IFAS extension is a system of county cooperative extension offices and research/education centers that extends to each of Florida's 67 counties, and its 19 research/education centers span the state. The IFAS Extension Electronic Document Information Source provides Floridians access to over 7,500 IFAS publications, which include curricula, handbooks and guides, and series.

The institution ensures that its curriculum is appropriate and consistent with good practices in higher education through various assessments to include internal and in most cases external measures across its 16 colleges. Each college has a curriculum committee and their courses and programs move through hierarchical levels of university assessment (i.e., University Curriculum Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the UF Board of Trustees). A clearly outlined illustration of the steps and procedures associated with each phase of this process is provided in the attached "University Constitutional Statue" document. Additionally, several of the programs are also externally reviewed by professional and discipline related accrediting bodies to ensure that their curriculum is appropriate and consistent with best practices in higher education. The institution included a table titled USDOE Accrediting Bodies as a listing of several of the fore-referenced accrediting bodies to include, but not limited to, the American Dental Association Commission on Dental Accreditation, the Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education, the American Psychological Association Commission on Accreditation, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee had the opportunity to interview the provost and members of his staff, and two deans regarding curriculum. Based upon the review of the compliance report and the interviews, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee agrees with the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee that the institution demonstrated that the institution's curriculum aligned with the mission and goals as well as the diplomas, certificates, and degrees awarded. The institution uses a combination of materials demonstrating thorough internal curriculum development and assessment processes with external approval of various accrediting bodies.

*4.3 The institution makes available to students and the public current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies. (Publication of policies)

The institution provides comprehensive calendars, handbooks, grading policies and refund policies via university websites. Academic calendars (current and past) are listed and allow for individuals to easily access information. The institution provided documentation of registration information, fee information, process for general academic appeals, and academic calendars.
The following professional colleges and independent study (Flexible Learning) with separate academic calendars publish their calendars online. Those colleges include the College of Dentistry, College of veterinary medicine, and Levin College of Law.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification materials provided by the institution and interviewed the associate provost for academic and faculty affairs and the vice president for enrollment management and associate provost. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee agrees with the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee in that the institution provides to students and public current academic calendars, grading and refund policies.

*4.4 Program length is appropriate for each of the institution's educational programs. (Program length)

The institution ensures that the length of its educational programs conforms to constitutional statutory requirements and widely accepted standards. The program approval process at the university includes multiple stages of institutional review to guarantee that program length is appropriate for the discipline. With the exception of one program, all other academic programs that yield associates, baccalaureate, graduate, doctoral and professional degrees are of appropriate program length. The Master of Laws (LLM) program requires a total of 26 credits (which is less than the norm of 30 credits hours). The institution has justified the LLM program's reduced credit hours through a list of peer or nationally ranked LLM programs ranging from 21 to 32 credits, with a majority of the programs consisting of 24 credits.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with the provost and the associate provost for undergraduate affairs and confirmed that the program length of online, accelerated, and off-campus programs also conformed to constitutional statutory requirements and accepted standards.

*4.5 The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints. (See the Commission policy "Complaint Procedures against the Commission or its Accredited Institutions.") (Student complaints)

The institution provides several mechanisms and direction for students to file formal academic and non-academic written complaints, the process by which complaints are resolved, and documentation of "closing the loop" of a complaint process.

The complaint process is decentralized among the Division of Student Affairs, the Division of Enrollment Management, and Human Resource Services. Student Affairs serves as the primary division handling written student complaints and maintains the university's complaint policy. The institution provided documentation of 1) policies and procedures for academic and non-academic written complaints and 2) examples of non-academic complaint logs and how the complaints were resolved.
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined documents pertaining to student complaints as well as examples of complaint logs and the resolution of sample complaints. In addition, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed the university ombudsperson and an assistant vice president of student affairs, and affirmed the finding of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

*4.6 Recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent the institution's practices and policies. (Recruitment materials)

The institution provides a wealth of recruitment materials to assist prospective parents and students in making a decision about their post-secondary experience. The publications include a general information bulleting, parent brochure, and international brochures. The institution provided documentation of presentations, brochures, view books, and an excerpt from the Factbook.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined recruitment materials and interviewed senior administrators, including the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, the vice president for enrollment management and associate provost, and the university registrar and assistant vice president for enrollment management, and determined that the institution's recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent its practices and policies.

*4.7 The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the most recent Higher Education Act as amended. (In reviewing the institution's compliance with these program responsibilities, the Commission relies on documentation forwarded to it by the U.S. Department of Education.) (Title IV program responsibilities)

The State of Florida Auditor General has audited the University of Florida as part of federal A-133 audits of the state through FY 2011-12. A federal Department of Education program review was also conducted in February 2013 but the report has not yet been issued. In addition, the FY 2012-13 audit by the Auditor General is currently underway. As the prior audits contained noncompliance findings that have not been cleared and given the outstanding issues described in the Department of Education's letter of June 20, 2013, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee cannot discern the institution's compliance with the standard.

Please refer to C.S. 3.9.2 above for the details of the compliance for a breach of the computing systems. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined additional documents and interviewed the provost, the vice president for enrollment management and associate provost, the vice president and chief information officer, and the associate provost for undergraduate affairs, and determined that the institution put into place security measures to avoid unauthorized access to student records. The US Department of Education did a final program review and determined that institution's responses have resolved all findings and considered the program review closed without further actions.

*4.8 An institution that offers distance or correspondence education documents each of the following: (Distance and correspondence education)
4.8.1 demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (a) a secure login and pass code, (b) proctored examinations, or (c) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification.

All matriculated students are assigned a University of Florida Identification Number (UFID). UFIDs are generated using at least two pieces of information such as name, birthdate and social security number. Then using the UFID, students create a GatorLink account which requires the creation of a username and password. The GatorLink account information is used for authentication for accessing the university course management system.

Online proctoring is conducted by either ProctorU or Kryterion Online Secured Testing. Each company authenticates student identification by photo ID and either questions specific to the student from a public information database or keystroke patterns of individuals. Kryterion’s patented biometric keystroke software differentiates individuals based on his or her keystroke patterns. By measuring the patterns of keystroke rhythms, the technology can recognize an individual with a high level of accuracy.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance report and interviewed the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and the associate provost for teaching and technology. Based on the information they shared and the review of the compliance report, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee agrees with the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee that the University of Florida demonstrated the institution’s commitment to verifying the identity of distance learning students. The institution provides students with unique identification numbers linked with secure computer identity access accounts (GatorLink). The institution also uses multiple online proctoring technologies to provide both test security as well as individual authentication.

4.8.2 has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs.

The institution has a policy related to the Family Educational Rights and Protection Act (FERPA) to protect the privacy of student records in accordance with federal law and Florida Statute 1002.225. Distance and correspondence student records are managed, maintained, and protected by the Office of the Registrar and are subject to the same privacy and confidentiality procedures as those used for on-campus students. The institution’s Regulation 1-4.007 serves as the university’s written policy for confidentiality. The institution’s Privacy Office also provides privacy guidelines and procedures.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance report and interviewed the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs
and the associate provost for teaching and technology. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution has a policy addressing FERPA and applies the policy to distance learners as well as to on-campus students.

4.8.3 has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity.

The institution informs students of all identity verification charges at the point of registration. These charges are clearly explained and itemized as part of a course's distance learning fees. Once students have registered for courses, they can view a detailed and itemized tuition statement showing all fees with descriptions prior to making their tuition and fee payment.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the compliance report and interviewed the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and the associate provost for teaching and technology, and confirmed the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee: students have appropriate and timely access to information pertaining to all required fees.

*4.9 The institution has policies and procedures for determining the credit hours awarded for courses and programs that conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education and to Commission policy. *(See the Commission policy "Credit Hours.")*(Definition of credit hours)*

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee's review of the supporting documents indicates that the institution has a robust process for determine the amount and level of credit awarded for courses through faculty-based review of current and proposed courses both within the originating department and in the undergraduate or graduate curriculum committee. The referenced document, "Florida Statewide Course Numbering System," specifies both the definition of a credit hour and the number of credits awarded for course equivalencies.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with representatives of the provost's and registrar's offices and concluded that online and non-traditional courses/programs also defined and awarded credit hours in a way that conforms to commonly accepted practices and to Commission policy.

E. Additional observations regarding strengths and weaknesses of the institution. (optional).
Part III. Assessment of the Quality Enhancement Plan

A. Brief description:

The institution's Quality Enhancement Plan, *Learning without Borders: Internationalizing the Gator Nation*, builds on the institution's sustained focus on internationalization. Beginning with the 2003 SACSCOC self-study and further developed in the President's 2007 strategic work plan, *From achievement to recognition: A strategic work plan for the University of Florida*, UF has identified internationalization as an area of strategic investment. As a follow up to that plan, the UF provost launched a campus-wide initiative for enhancing the quality of academic programs with internationalization as the central theme. An International Task Force (ITF) of faculty, administration, staff and students from across the university was appointed in January 2011, and was charged to develop a plan to improve student engagement in international learning experiences. The ITF established three goals: 1.) Identify the factors that impede student participation in international learning experiences. 2.) Design initiatives to mitigate these factors, the student learning outcomes subsequent to these initiatives, and the measures to be used to assess student learning and the university's progress toward successful implementation. 3.) Implement these initiatives, assess their effectiveness annually, analyze the results of these assessments, and revise the initiatives as needed based on this analysis. If successfully implemented, the institution believes the QEP will achieve goals 1 and 2. Goal 3 will be annually assessed during plan implementation and its achievement determined at the end of year 5.

The QEP for the institution focuses on five campus initiatives designed to provide optimal learning experiences for undergraduate students. These initiatives will enhance undergraduate student attainment in two competencies identified by the ITF, global awareness and intercultural competence. The ITF developed three student-learning outcomes (SLOs) to measure these competencies. The five initiatives are: Study Abroad, Curricular Enhancement, Campus Life (increasing interaction between international and domestic students), Internationalization Resources and Support (enhanced SLO-focused co-curricular activity), and the International Scholars Program. Each of the initiatives builds on existing programs at the institution and enhances the learning environment for the undergraduate population to enable students to achieve their learning outcomes.

B. Analysis of the Acceptability of the QEP

1. Institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment (CR 2.12).

The process for identifying the QEP topic started with the examination of the President's 2007 strategic work plan, which included three goals addressing internationalization:

Goal 13: Provide a wide range of excellent co-curricular/extra-curricular activities and student services to maximize students' development as outstanding scholars, leaders, and citizens in Florida, the nation and the global community.

Goal 30: Enhance existing and develop new programs to promote international research, teaching and study abroad and exchange programs.
Goal 31: Support Title VI centers in making competitive grant applications to secure extramural funding.
In January, 2010, UF’s Task Force on Undergraduate Education provided a "report on the major assets and challenges of the university’s undergraduate programs." The report made the following recommendations to strengthen internationalization of the undergraduate programs:
- Offer an international certificate
- Promote more broadly the opportunity to study abroad
- Identify faculty and staff who are trained and willing to help freshmen and sophomores to plan for study abroad
- Support and encourage faculty to identify ways to internationalize their syllabi

Since 2009, UF has participated in a biennial survey of university climate called the Student Experience in the Research University (SERU). The institution was able to demonstrate that while internationalization was a priority for undergraduate education, there had been declining enrollment in foreign language courses, student participation in study abroad programs remained flat over the past five years, and while 46% of the freshmen expressed interest in participation in study abroad, only 3% actually participated. Among seniors 30% indicated a desire to participate with 14% actually participating. In campus discussions, the provost further observed that as approximately 95% of the undergraduate student population comes from the state of Florida, the institution must implement a substantive and coherent program to equip students for lives and careers in a global community.

The provost and the 16 college deans selected the topic of internationalization because 1) it directly relates to the institutional mission and 2) it is identified as part of the institution’s strategic Work Plan. Faculty and others were engaged in developing the student learner outcomes, campus initiatives, and assessment methods. A leadership team with representation from academic affairs, student affairs, institutional assessment, and the international center, is proposed along with a promotion working group (which includes faculty and students) and an international scholars course approval committee (representatives from each of the undergraduate colleges and others). These groups will be responsible for implementation and engaging faculty in the five initiatives.

Therefore, topic development was determined by some self-assessment and through the president’s strategic planning process.

2. Focus on learning outcomes and/or environment supporting student learning (CR 2.12)

The QEP identifies specific goals and associated student learning objectives that are central to the overall objective of Learning without Borders: Internationalizing the Gator Nation. The QEP is clearly focused on student learning and, as described above, relates closely to the mission and strategic plan of the institution. While there was some concern about the overall scope of the plan perhaps being too broad, interviews on campus clarified the process whereby the focus of the plan narrowed, e.g., by eliminating graduate programs from the plan. There was also discussion about future plans to focus the implementation of curricular and study abroad program development in specific areas for maximum
impact. The QEP and campus leadership believe that the plan requires breadth to accomplish the overall goal of infusing international perspectives throughout the institution. Through integration with existing initiatives, the institution felt the program would have an impact on 75 percent of the undergraduates by the end of the five-year period. Due to the heavily in-state composition of the UG population, as mentioned above, the overall impact will transform the students' perspectives on the world in which they live and work.

3. Institutional capability for the initiation and continuation of the QEP (CS 3.3.2)

Consistent with C.S. 3.3.2, the development and planned implementation of the QEP included broad involvement of institutional constituencies. The ITF comprises faculty, administrators, staff, and students from across the university. This group developed a plan to improve student engagement in international learning experiences as part of the overall undergraduate learning experience. In fall, 2012, the ITF held an outreach event with university stakeholders in order to solicit input on curriculum, co-curricular, and engagement initiatives. In early 2013, two faculty forums were held to invite dialogue and input related to aligning student-learning outcomes with international programs and courses and with co-curricular activities. The forums engaged faculty in dialog on how to promote faculty and student participation in the QEP. The plan was iterated on campus in student focus groups and with stakeholder groups at various college and departmental forums. Additionally, a public relations course has further engaged the campus in promoting this initiative.

The implementation plan is comprehensive and phased in over the five years of the QEP. Campus initiatives focused on study abroad, curriculum-courses, campus life, international calendar events, and an international scholars program have been identified along with appropriate resources to support these key initiatives. Planned personnel and program costs totaling $2,570,243 are committed over the five years of the budget plan. These resources are allocated to the specific areas identified above to advance the program objectives. The overall resource commitment is reasonable relative to the breadth of the program and in the context of helping to drive institutional transformation. The institution has committed a limited number of personnel directly toward managing the implementation of the various components of the plan. But clearly the key campus constituencies are engaged in the implementation including the faculty, students, staff, and administration. The institution’s assessment plan will clearly monitor progress and should lead to a sustained program around the theme of internationalization.

4. Broad-based involvement of the institutional constituencies in development and planned implementation (CS 3.3.2)

The institution has effectively described the methods used for the development of the QEP and the broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in this process. The process included the active participation and involvement of the Division of Academic Affairs, Division of Student Affairs and campus constituents, including the following: Division of Enrollment Management, Information Technology, Office of the Provost, University Registrar, Academic Ombuds, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and Student Financial Affairs.
Faculty participated in training about the general aspects of SLOs and developed the professional skills to link the curriculum with assessment and outcome measures. The communication strategy for faculty involved the weekly distribution of electronic newsletters for faculty, which complemented the monthly, 2-hour meetings of the ITF for multiple years. The follow-up strategy to ensure the continued engagement of faculty and tracking the progress is a key success step that will provide the appropriate level of feedback for proper assessment.

Members of the governing board are completely briefed, trained and supportive of the QEP to improve the Internationalization of the campus. This support is vital to the sustained success of the QEP both short and long term.

The student engagement involved the use of social media including: Instagram, Twitter, Blogs, Facebook, text and the lesser used email. These strategies created a groundswell of motivation, support, and enthusiasm. The development of the commencement medallion for the students who have demonstrated proficiency in the QEP objectives provides the aspirational vision for the sustainable success. As student interest grows for the honor to be displayed during the commencement exercises the global awareness and intercultural competencies will begin to permeate the campus culture.

The co-curricular activities primarily under the Division of Student Affairs appear to be primed to connect the academic units with the 143 culturally themed organizations through the varied study aboard opportunities. The campus life activities within the Division of Student Affairs have matched the modules where appropriate to further integrate the theme of Learning without Borders and Internationalizing where appropriate.

The broad-based involvement of the institutional constituencies in the development and planned implementation of the Quality Enhancement Plan, "Learning without Borders: Internationalizing the Gator Nation" is well positioned for a sustained and effective future.

5. Assessment/evaluation plan (CS 3.3.2)

As stated above, the QEP for UF focuses on five campus initiatives that promote global awareness and intercultural competency for undergraduate students. Each of the initiatives is measurable and includes a valid, reliable assessment.

The Internationalization Task Force (ITF) and the Assessment Committee at UF engaged in a thorough process to identify and develop assessment instruments. Their initial goal was to use commercially available instruments with strong psychometric properties, and to resort to developing their own instruments only if existing instruments could not be found or did not have strong psychometric properties. The assessment committee identified and evaluated seven commercially available instruments that were designed for use with undergraduate students to measure components of internationalization. After extensive review they determined that commercially available instruments did not assess their SLOs. In addition, some of the scales or subscales did not meet their standards for reliability and data was not available with any of the scales to show the practicality of the scales for use in a large-scale context. As a result
they concluded that none of the commercially available instruments were suitable to assess the impact of the proposed QEP. The ITF and the Assessment Committee proceeded to develop internal assessment protocols and instruments that appear to be appropriately aligned with their SLOs, meet their psychometric standards, and can be administered on a large scale.

Their assessment protocol includes three assessment types: 1) direct outcome assessments to measure student learning, 2) indirect outcome assessments to measure student attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, and 3) output measures that count student participation in the campus initiatives. The QEP document does a good job of providing details about the assessment procedures and the assessment plan that is being put into place. The Assessment Committee determined that all QEP direct assessments would be administered in association with specific learning activities related to their approved QEP courses and developed adaptations of the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics previously developed by faculty and assessment expert teams across the country (from http://www.aacu.org/value/index.cfm) to ensure that the direct assessments were aligned with their SLOs.

Their indirect assessments measure attitudes, beliefs and student behaviors. These assessments are planned as self-reports that do not directly measure student learning but capture changes in attitudes, beliefs and self-reported behaviors. They developed or modified three indirect assessments to be used as their assessment protocol: 1) international items were added onto their existing Student Experience in the Research University (SERU) which has been in odd years since 2009, 2) a measure of critical thinking focusing on internationalization (IntCRIT), and 3) a measure of communication focusing on internationalization (IntCOMM). The ITF and the Assessment Committee also identified three QEP outputs (participants at specific campus events with an international focus, courses that teach the internationalization SLOs and students enrolled in QEP approved international courses) that they intend to measure as counts of the numbers of participants in their QEP events and programs.

The QEP document presents a reasonably well thought out plan for the administration of the three assessment types over the five years of the QEP. Direct assessments will be completed each fall and spring semester during the QEP period. With regard to indirect outcome assessment, the SERU has been administered to all undergraduate students on a biennial basis in odd years since 2009 and will continue. Beginning in Fall 2014, the IntCRIT and IntCOMM will be administered electronically to random samples of students by cohort (500 students per cohort) annually. In the first year of the program, the assessment will be administered to first year students only. In the succeeding years, the assessments will be administered to the entering class and the previously measured cohorts until the final year when all cohorts are included. Output numbers will be collected annually. This plan is intended to allow UF to track the effect of the program initiatives between different cohorts and within the same cohorts over time. One concern relative to this assessment plan that should be addressed in more detail is the availability of baseline data to use as a point of comparison to determine the effect of the QEP.

With regard to Institutional structure and resources for assessment of the QEP, there is a full-time Associate Director for the QEP who (with support of a Graduate Assistant) is responsible for the management of the QEP.
implementation including “data collection, management and analysis as well as reporting the results of the QEP.” It is unclear if this structure represents enough institutional support to implement the QEP as well as the assessments designed (collecting, analyzing and reporting on the data). The institution has a Director of Institutional Assessment and an Office of Institutional Planning and Research. It is somewhat unclear what role they might play in assessment of the QEP.

The final step in assessment typically involves a “closing the loop exercise” where once the data is collected and analyzed, adjustments are made to the “program” or the “plan” as needed. The documentation provided does not include a discussion of processes in place for utilizing assessment outcomes to inform changes to the QEP or the assessment tools/plan. One could assume that the leadership team (Dean of the International Center (UFIC) as the chair, the associate director who is responsible for the operational management of the QEP, the director of institutional assessment, and representatives from the Office of Student Affairs and the Title VI Centers) would be charged with that role but the section on assessment would be enhanced with a direct discussion of how this step (if needed) will be accomplished to achieve the goals outlined above.

C. Analysis and Comments for Strengthening the QEP

The committee has identified a list of strengths of the QEP as proposed by the institution.
- The QEP is well grounded in and appropriate to the institution’s mission and strategic plan; it appears to have strong support from faculty, staff, and students.
- Most of the QEP activities are developing out of current activities; the faculty and staff will not have to develop radically new strategies, initiatives, or materials. Based on discussions with key participants, it is obvious that they are aware of the key issues involved in developing a more robust and complex array of courses, study abroad opportunities, and assessments.
- The QEP greatly benefited from the systematic reworking of the competencies and SLOs.
- The institution listened to the students and developed the Undergraduate International Scholar Medal program as a result.
- The ITF Assessment Sub-Committee did a great job researching, developing, and testing quantitative and qualitative assessment materials. Continued assessment of the process will bring further benefit the program.
- Based on the initial reading of the QEP, some perceived that the topic selection was heavily influenced from higher levels of administration. However, discussions with key members of the planning and development group as well as faculty members it is clear that there were multiple methods for cross-constituent input.
- We were originally concerned about motivation and ability of faculty already teaching internationalized courses for integrating the SLOs and related assessment rubrics to their course curriculum. It is a great benefit that faculty will be able to smoothly implement both the SLOs and the assessment rubrics as a part of their required faculty, course, and program assessment processes in which they are already trained and continually supported.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee offers these comments, observations, and suggestions for strengthening the QEP.
- In implementation, it will be necessary to focus on specific programs, areas, and courses as curricular and study abroad options are developed for maximum impact.
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This strategy will benefit both the workload of the International Center as well as the time and energy of faculty and staff in the various colleges.

- While discussing the communication strategy, the chair of the College of Journalism and Communications said, "It is not a marketing campaign, it is a strategic public relations campaign. We want to engage." Matching the communication strategy to the goal of institutional culture change will help plan and design a complex communication strategy for variety of audiences with varied needs.

- The QEP presents the institution with a significant opportunity to more systematically organize and link student affairs programming with academic affairs and specific SLOs.

- Although many members in the discussion groups feel that numbers of students will positively respond to the Undergraduate International Scholar Medal program, this initiative will require students to make substantive changes in their degree curriculum structure. The marketing for the Undergraduate International Scholar Medal will be key to the success of the program. Students will not only need to be made aware of the program; but, they will also need to be convinced it is worth taking extra/different courses. Similarly, advisors will need to be both aware and adequately prepared to guide students in adding internationalized courses and/or study abroad options to their planned coursework.

- The institution will need to plan for the long-term sustainability of these programs and the associated budget once the five-year QEP time period is completed. Several concerns emerged initially relative to the assessment plan: (1) what is the availability of baseline data to use as a point of comparison to determine the effect of the QEP? (2) does the proposed administrative structure represents enough institutional support to implement the planned assessments as well as collect, analyze and report on the data? (3) how, once the data is collected and analyzed, will adjustments be made to the "program" or the "plan" as needed (i.e., closing the loop on assessment) to achieve the goals of the QEP? The on-campus meetings and interview with the QEP team clarified our thinking on all of these issues and assured the team of the institution's thorough attention and planning for all of these items.
Part IV. Third-Party Comments

To be completed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

If an institution receives Third-Party Comments, the institution has an opportunity to respond to those comments and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviews the response as part of its comprehensive evaluation of the institution.

The Committee should check one of the following:

____ No Third-Party Comments submitted.

___ Third-Party Comments submitted. *(Address the items below.)*

1. Describe the nature of the Comments and any allegations of non-compliance that may have been part of the formal Third-Party Comments;

2. Indicate whether the Committee found evidence in support of any allegations of non-compliance.

If found to be out of compliance, the Committee should write a recommendation and include it in Part II under the standard cited with a full narrative that describes why the institution was found to be out of compliance and the documentation that supports that determination. In this space, reference the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement and the recommendation number cited in Part II.

If determined to be in compliance, explain in this space the reasons and refer to the documentation in support of this finding.
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APPENDIX B

Off-Campus Sites or Distance Learning Programs Reviewed

Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center
3205 College Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314-7799

The Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center/Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences offers opportunities for students both undergraduate and graduate to complete course work towards the degrees listed below and some certificates for non-degree seekers. The Graduate Certificate in Plant Pest Risk Assessment and Management and the Baccalaureate level certification in Environmental Horticulture Management are offered on-line. In addition to the academic program offering the Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center is a leader in multiple research projects complete with outdoor and indoor labs, faculty publishing jointly with Graduate and Undergraduate students in peer reviewed journals. The service components are a prominent part of the operation as local farmers, governmental agencies and others seek guidance and agricultural knowledge through the varied out-reach activities in the community and on-site during the various events held on the grounds.

The collaborative relationship with a local university is paramount as the organization has labs occupying the 2nd floor of an adjacent faculty own and operated by Florida Atlantic University. The faculty hold tenure status, advising duties, along with their research and teaching which primarily occurs on-line using the Polycomm video media interface to allow synchronous (audio and visual) communication with Distance Education students at the other University of Florida campuses.

The students services provided are site are sufficient and appropriate including: academic advising, career counseling, registration, ADA compliance, psychological services through the local agencies, safety procedures and protocols for potential hazardous situations i.e. Category 4 hurricane, Occupational Safety and Health Administration and Pesticide licensure. The safety and security measures in place were effective through the use of cameras, patrols by the local police department and the Florida Atlantic University police officers. A sixteen unit housing complex is available for students, temporary faculty assigned through exchange programs. All of the Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act required training was in place for the management and security of student records. The student complaint processes are processed into the institution’s Gainesville campus and coordinated with the Academic home of the student based on the major of the student. All of the financial management of cash handling procedures was in place to adequately have checks and balances when collecting checks and cash for the external self-funded programs. There were no operations to receive credit card payments. The faculty, staff and students were knowledgeable and fully aware the Quality Enhancement Plan.

The evaluator visited all of the facilities and toured the 67 acres of the property on a guided tour provided by the Director and a full professor. Additionally, the evaluator observed and utilized the PolyComm system by sitting in on a Gainesville lecture being interfaced at the Fort Lauderdale Research and Education Center/Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences. The following were interviewed: 6-students including Graduate and Undergraduate, Professor of Environmental Horticulture, Professor and Associate Center Director, Geomatics Specialist and Program Assistant, Coordinator of Student Support Services, Associate Professor of Entomology and Nematology and an Assistant Professor of Geomatics.
New World School of Arts
300 NE 2nd Street
Miami, FL 33132-2103

The New World School of Arts is a unique collaboration with Miami Dade College and the Miami Dade Public School district, operating a fine arts high school and fine arts programs at the associate level with Miami Dade College and transfer program with the University of Florida. There are approximately 360 students, of which, approximately 120 to 140 are enrolled in the University of Florida fine arts programs offered on site, and an additional 40 students enrolled in both Miami Dade College and University of Florida. An On-Site Reaffirmation Committee member visited the facility; two members then video-conferenced with the provost, deans, student support staff, and students. Instruction is provided by full-time faculty and part-time adjunct faculty in studio and one-on-one instructional formats common to fine arts programs. Faculty development opportunities are provided with the use of privately donated funds. Miami Dade College provides technology support, health, library, and recreational services. Faculty are actively engaged with career counseling and graduate application for those who wish to further their education. Students have access to the institution's support services through on-site staff and via web-based technology. Administration, faculty and students were aware of the Quality Enhancement Plan and affirmed they can participate.

Health Sciences Center
653 W 8th St.
Jacksonville, Florida

Programs in Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, Public Health and Health Professions, Pharmacy, and Veterinary Medicine.

Members of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee interviewed administrators, faculty and students from the College of Medicine, College of Nursing, and College of Pharmacy and toured facilities including classrooms, the library and simulation laboratories at the Jacksonville Health Sciences Center of the University of Florida. The classroom and library facilities are very good and the simulation laboratories are excellent. Interviews with the administrators, faculty and students indicated the Center is providing coursework and support services to faculty, students, and staff comparable and complimentary to the main center in Gainesville. These same representatives confirmed they were receiving adequate financial resources and support for their programs. The students expressed that the quality of the educational experience at this site as comparable to the main campus in Gainesville.

Research and Engineering Education Facility
1350 Poquito Rd N.
Shalimar, Florida

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee conducted a video conference call review of University of Florida's Research and Engineering Education Facility (REEF) site in Shalimar, FL. The REEF offers courses that may lead to Masters and Doctorate degree programs in Mechanical Engineering, Aerospace Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Industrial and Systems Engineering. This review provided an opportunity to speak with the Chair of the Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Interim Director, an Assistant Professor, Industrial and Systems Engineering, a staff member and one doctoral student on-site and ask questions related to the facilities,
programs offered, and student support services available. We were also provided with a presentation reviewing the facilities.

The Research and Engineering Education Facility (REEF) is a 45,000 square-foot facility at Eglin Air Force Base, Shalimar Florida. The facilities includes fifteen research laboratories, two professionally equipped taping studios, auditorium seating for 110 people, a student computer laboratory and office space for the students and faculty. The REEF facility supports the graduate education and research needs of the greater Eglin Air Force Base (EAFB) community and very specifically the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL). REEF students are able to gain valuable experience while working with researchers from UF and the Air Force on a wide range of relevant and challenging research topics. Course work for both the master's and doctoral degree is delivered via the graduate distance program EDGE (Electronic Delivery of Graduate Engineering) which relies on live lecture capture and posting on-line the same day in streaming, downloadable and podcast formats. A limited number of courses are offered in a face-to-face format on site at REEF. Students from the Gainesville campus participate in those courses regularly.

There are currently two T/TT faculty located at REEF along with several adjunct faculty and two additional research faculty. As many as 6-10 T/TT faculty from the Gainesville campus regularly commute to the Shalimar site for research and teaching purposes.

Engineering students at the REEF site have access to the UF library and its digital library system as well as an on-site library. The services provided by the UF Library to the REEF students are identical to the library privileges provided to all DE students. The institution also has a specific set of library services offered through the "LibGuide" which affords distance education students access to a subject liaison librarian for specific questions associated with accessing the institution's libraries. A complete listing of services available to distance education students is available online through the Distance Learners LibGuide. Instructional technology support includes interactive videoconferencing in a large classroom and auditorium with IT support and network connectivity that is the same as that available to a main campus UF graduate student. The institution provides universal network and communications access to all faculty, staff and students including those at the REEF site. Facilities at the site are similar to those in the main Campus in Gainesville in terms of classrooms, faculty, staff and graduate student space and technology.

UF Online
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee members were able to visit the University of Florida Distance Learning website (http://www.distance.ufl.edu) as well as the UF Online website (http://ufonline.ufl.edu/). Just as with the main campus, students are able to identify which degree programs are associated with the online campus and are provided instructions how to register and enroll within these programs. Both the Distance Learning as well as the UF Online websites also include an "Is Distance Education Right for Me" survey for prospective students.

In every instance distance programs are identical to their on campus counterparts. In fact, no distinction between the two is made other than the fact that courses are offered by the same faculty online in the distance programs. The distance courses are subject to the same curriculum development and student evaluation processes as on-campus courses. There will be a committee that assess online course design and delivery every two years.

Reviewers were provided access to the "UF Online Orientation" space. This online orientation provided materials for successful student behaviors in an online environment as well as links to resources for online student support services. Reviewers were also given access to the following three courses:
• MAN3025, Principles of Management
• ENT3003, Principles of Entrepreneurship
• ISM3004, Computing in the Business Environment

The courses all provided a centrally located "student guides" link to various student academic and technological resources. The courses were all well organized and provided a variety of learning activities and assessments.

Both the website and the associate provost for teaching and technology discuss how student support services for distance programs seem to be very good and in most cases are at least identical to those provided for on campus students. In several cases programs offer additional administrative and technical support to distance students. Support services for faculty teaching distance courses are identical to those for faculty teaching on campus and in many cases it appears the culture of the distances programs encourages faculty to take greater advantage of the instructional design and technology support services in distances courses than is typical for faculty in on campus courses.

The technologies used to facilitate the distance learning program at large, as well as courses in particular, are technologically robust, providing a variety of teaching and learning opportunities. The institution also implements technologies and technology management processes that help with other logistics like identity management.
APPENDIX C

List of Recommendations
Cited in the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee propagated no recommendations.