

Provost and VP of Academic Affairs Scorecard 2014-2015

1 - Alert		2 - Area of concern		3 - Goal met		4 - Met stretch goal		5 - Met super stretch goal	
Imperative	Goal	Weight	Scale	Outcome	Score	Weighted Score	Status		
Student Success	Graduation: Confer 2,300 degrees	10.0%		2256					
	Progression: Sustain 6-year graduation rate of 42%			41.00%	3.66	3.66			
	Retention: Increase 30, 60, 90, SCH retention rate from 70.8% to 73%			74.16					
Operational Success	Create a Workplace of Choice: Employee Satisfaction and Employee Engagement	10.0%	5 = 4.0+	The average score for all questions for this unit is 3.86 and the average score for all UWG is 3.82. (N = 16 approx), Crafton as IM					
			4 = 3.81-3.99	The average score for all questions for this unit is 3.78 and the average score for all UWG is 3.82. (N = 570 approx), Crafton as SL					
			3 = 3.8		3	3			
			2 = 3.6-3.79						
			1 = 3.59 and below						

Academic Success	Program Quality – SACS and assessment issues; QEP; meeting the LEAP challenge: Program	20.0%	5 = created best practice				
			4 = met and improved	SACS: In process, but a great deal of work has been expended and structures put in place to meet the report.	4	8	
			3 = met goals	QEP: Reform to the basic QEP to make the project compliant with Board Policy. Reformed budget, created incentives and program to support writing in the Core.			
			2 = no improvement	LEAP: System work advanced farther than local work, but moving toward structures of incorporation.			
			1 = Lost ground				
Academic Success	Faculty – diversity efforts Faculty development opportunities	10.0%	5 = Higher by 15%				
			4 = Higher by 10%	CTL activities increased, as did ORSP activities.			
			3 = Higher by 5%		3	3	
			2 = Kept to baseline				
			1 = Fewer number than baseline				
Academic Success	Scholarly and Creative Activities for students Schedules Block Core seats CCG Issues	10.0%	5 = Higher by 15%	UG SRAP projects increased from 41 to 50			

			4 = Higher by 10%	Core Projections Refined and Renewed Effort to Meet Core Seats: Still not satisfied with the process. After Fall is finished, we will analyze the results			
			3 = Higher by 5%		3	3	
			2 = Kept to baseline				
			1 = Fewer number than baseline				
Academic Success	Quality of Teaching	10.0%	5 = Higher by 15%	SEI – As an overall measure it is just too broad. Everything averages to 4.6. We will created a new metric that takes a granular view of deviations from norms and reports that upward. CTL – CTL activities indicate indirectly attempts to improve teaching quality Peer Ratings – captured variously by departments, but no uniform measure exists			
			4 = Higher by 10%				
			3 = Higher by 5%				
			2 = Kept to baseline		2	2	
			1 = Fewer number than baseline				

Academic Success	Quality of Research	10.0%	5 = Higher by 15%	Grant Data:			
			4 = Higher by 10%	Year # Sub # Funded Amt Requested Amt Funded			
			3 = Higher by 5%	2013 85 48 8,923,279 3,731,569			
			2 = Kept to baseline	2014 66 31 \$8,375,571 \$2,334,800	2	2	
			1 = Fewer number than baseline	Total Publication Data: Accurate data for the entire University does not exist			
Student Success	Post Graduation Success	10.0%	5 = created best practice				
			4 = met and improved				
			3 = met goals	Here we are in the earliest stages of development.			
			2 = no improvement	I would not say that there was no improvement, but I cannot say that we met the goals either.	2	2	
			1 = Lost ground				
Partnership Success	Create and Cultivate New Partnerships to Support Strategic Initiatives Articulations	10.0%	5 = created best practice	CCEC			
			4 = met and improved	LEAP Schools	4	4	
			3 = met goals	TCSG – Articulation Agreements			
			2 = no improvement	Newnan			
			1 = Lost ground	Each college boasts new partnerships			
Total Score						3.066	