

## Example

**Note: Not a real organization. A composite created from assessment reports submitted in prior years.**

# 2014 Outcomes Assessment Report

*Please add rows or expand sections as needed.*

**Unit Name:** Carolina Research and Outreach Support Center  
**Reports To:** Vice Chancellor for Outreach

**Contact Person:** Dr. Jane E. Doe, Director  
**Email address:** janeedoe@unc.edu

**Mission** (*Link to University mission, VC/School mission, or other strategic plans*): Our mission is to support engaged scholarship that contributes to better lives for the citizens of North Carolina and the world. The Center promotes the University's research, teaching, and service mission by helping researchers broaden the impact of their work on society and contributing to the preparation of the next generation of leaders and researchers. We do this through providing: activities that engage our students and faculty with communities, training in research methodology and field work techniques, and opportunities for professional development and interdisciplinary collaboration.

Outcome #1: The Center's research and outreach activities in the local communities will help address challenges faced by those citizens.	
Assessment Methods Used	Results of Assessments Conducted
<p><b>Method 1:</b> Assessment of the effectiveness of the engagement of our students and faculty with communities associated with our network of field sites, through annual focus group interviews conducted by Center staff with partnering community agencies.</p> <p><b>Performance Target:</b> Positive feedback on the usefulness of faculty/student projects to the community and suggestions for enhancing our outreach.</p> <p><b>Method 2:</b> NA</p> <p><b>Performance Target:</b></p> <p><b>Method 3:</b> NA</p> <p><b>Performance Target:</b></p>	<p>Overall, the focus group results over the past two years suggest that the projects undertaken by our faculty and students have practical value for the community. A particular success has been the rural field site activities in eastern NC, where community partners described very high levels of satisfaction with both the quality and relevance of the student and faculty work performed for them. Feedback received on 2 projects in western NC indicated that community members might not have understood the role of the faculty and students and were somewhat reluctant to work with them.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p>
	<p><b>Use of Results for Improvement</b></p> <p>Based on these assessments, the Center worked with the community partners to improve the way in which the purpose and goals of the projects were communicated to local citizens. The successful model used in the eastern NC projects, which included mailings, an article in the local newspaper, and a faculty/student presentation to community leaders, was adopted in the most recently implemented projects. Feedback thus far has been very positive.</p> <p>NA</p> <p>NA</p>
Outcome #2: Faculty and graduate students are equipped with skills needed to conduct applied research and to compete for external funding.	
Assessment Methods Used	Results of Assessments Conducted
<p><b>Method 1:</b> Tracked enrollment in training courses overall and by department and school.</p> <p><b>Performance Target:</b> Enrollments in training courses will for each training offering will exceed 70% of the stated maximum capacity.</p> <p><b>Method 2:</b> Participant evaluation forms completed at the conclusion of each course.</p>	<p>Total annual enrollment in training courses has grown from 700 three years ago to over 1,000 this past year. Of 40 courses offered, 36 were completely filled. Enrollments by students and faculty in STEM departments have grown from 20% to nearly 40% of all participants.</p> <p>Results of the evaluations over the past two years revealed that 92% of the respondents rated their training experience as "Useful" or "Highly Useful". Specific enhancements</p>
	<p><b>Use of Results for Improvement</b></p> <p>To keep up with demands for seats in our courses, we added five additional courses, two of which focused on STEM-related topics. These filled up within a day of being posted, and a waiting list was maintained. We are now developing web-based training as a cost-effective approach to expanding our training services.</p> <p>In response to user requests, we made the following changes in our training courses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added a new training session related to IRB concerns and</li> </ul>

<p><b>Performance Target:</b> 90% of participants rate the training course as useful</p>	<p>recommended by participants included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend coverage of issues in the collection and use of sensitive individual data from community members;</li> <li>Provide additional instruction on collecting data in the field</li> <li>Increase hands-on training with software</li> <li>Offer sessions at times that do not conflict with faculty and students working in clinics and other off-campus sites.</li> </ul>	<p>methods for management of sensitive data. This was so well attended that we will add more.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implemented a new course on collecting and analyzing administrative data from community agencies</li> <li>Instructors revised their syllabi to devote more time to hands-on practice in the computer lab as opposed to demonstration and lecture. Participant evaluations have reflected satisfaction with this change.</li> <li>Added evening sessions to accommodate users not available during the day. Attendance is building as students learn about the extended hours.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Method 3:</b> Annual faculty evaluation and needs assessment survey</p> <p><b>Performance Target:</b> Good alignment of Center offerings and faculty needs</p>	<p>Faculty perceptions of the impact of the Center's offerings on their skills and those of their students were generally positive as in the past. Results indicated that both junior faculty and graduate students could use more training on proposal writing.</p>	<p>A new workshop on proposal writing was offered this year. In response to the increasing interest of STEM researchers the course focused on the specific expectations of NSF and NIH proposal reviewers.</p>
<p><b>Outcome #3:</b> Interdisciplinary research initiatives that enable faculty and students across campus to work together collaboratively on funded research are supported.</p>		
<p><b>Assessment Methods Used</b></p>		
<p><b>Method 1:</b> Tracked the number of interdisciplinary initiatives offered each year and review trends over the most recent four-year period.</p> <p><b>Performance Target:</b> Add an average of one new initiative per year across the most recent 4years.</p>	<p>The Center added two new interdisciplinary initiatives this year: the Applied Research Consortium and the Ethical Uses of Data Training Program. This brings our total number of new initiatives to 5 over the most recent four-year period.</p>	<p><b>Use of Results for Improvement</b></p> <p>Since the Center has been meeting its annual goal for adding initiatives, we began considering other ways of supporting these opportunities. This past year we branched out with a new initiative that brings together faculty and students from other campuses as well as from different departments within UNC-Chapel Hill.</p>
<p><b>Method 2:</b> Tracked success in funding new interdisciplinary initiatives on campus.</p> <p><b>Performance Target:</b> To increase pool of funds available to support initiatives.</p>	<p>The Center requested and received \$30,000 in one-time funds from the Provost's Office to sponsor a multidisciplinary seed grant proposal process this past year that yielded 42 proposals from both Academic Affairs and Health Affairs. The seed grants were awarded to 6 projects in 4 schools. Each funded project involved research teams from multiple disciplines focusing on poverty in North Carolina.</p>	<p>The quantity and quality of the proposals received and the public impact of the funded projects was so encouraging that we requested and received additional seed grant funds from the Provost's Office again this year. In addition, we submitted a proposal to the US Department of Education for a five-year grant that would enable us to widen the scope of projects we support.</p>
<p><b>Method 3:</b> Evaluated the quality of interdisciplinary initiatives as part of the Center's five-year external peer review using stakeholder interviews and examination of program documentation.</p> <p><b>Performance Target:</b> Positive feedback from reviewers.</p>	<p>The reviewers reported that the Center's interdisciplinary support activities were providing productive opportunities for researchers from different disciplines to collaborate on topics related to the University's public service mission. Faculty interviews confirmed the professional development value of participation. The peer-reviewed publications and professional conference presentations resulting from Center-supported projects served as further evidence of the quality of the work produced. Reviewers encouraged the Center to revisit past projects to analyze the long-term impact on the communities that were served.</p>	<p>Based on the review team's recommendations, the Center offered additional funds to selected projects to support follow-up evaluations. In addition, we rewrote our proposal guidelines and selection criteria to encourage PIs seeking new funds from the Center to expand their evaluation plans to include impact analyses where feasible.</p>

## Other Improvements Made and Additional Evaluation Processes

1. **List any other improvements made in recent years in response to data or other evidence gathered, even if informally.**  
Our recent five-year external review yielded other assessment findings that we have since used to guide improvement. The reviewers observed that centers of comparable size at peer institutions and other areas of UNC-Chapel Hill tended to have a full-time faculty leader. We successfully sought funds to raise our

director's FTE from .50 to 1.00, which had an immediate impact on our ability to do fundraising and to develop new community partnerships. The reviewers also suggested that we collaborate with other centers on campus to expand access to research opportunities for underrepresented minority students with interests in STEM fields and public service. We developed 10 new summer field experiences that are co-sponsored with the STEM Diversity Office.

**2. List any existing processes used to evaluate the quality of your unit's work (e.g., annual reports, speciality accreditation).** We make reports and presentations to our Center's Advisory Board, made up of faculty, students, and community partners. The Board meets twice a year, which gives us an opportunity to present both our strategic plans as well as share the results of our evaluations. The feedback from the Board provides us with multiple perspectives on the value of our work and is extremely helpful in identifying our strengths, weaknesses, and areas of opportunity.

## Assessment Plan for 2014-15

Please indicate which outcomes you will measure during 2014-15 and the methods you plan to use to assess them. The next Outcomes Assessment Report covering 2014-15 will be due August 1, 2015. **NOTE: If you will repeat the same assessments for the same outcomes this year, just insert a note to that effect here instead of rekeying the information in the box below.**

<b>Outcome #1:</b> The Center's research and outreach activities in the local communities will help address challenges faced by those citizens.	
Method 1: Focus group interviews with community partners	Performance Target: Same as this year
Method 2:	Performance Target:
<b>Outcome #2:</b> Faculty and graduate students are equipped with skills needed to conduct applied research and to compete for external funding.	
Method 1: Track enrollment in training courses across departments.	Performance Target: Continued full capacity
Method 2: Participant evaluation forms with added questions to compare experiences of face-to-face and online versions of training courses.	Performance Target: 90% rating of usefulness
Method 3: Annual faculty evaluation survey	Performance Target: Alignment with faculty needs
<b>Outcome #3:</b> Interdisciplinary research initiatives that enable faculty and students across campus to work together collaboratively on funded research are supported.	
Method 1: Evaluate success of new inter-institutional collaboration initiative	Performance Target: Participation and participant evaluations
Method 2: Track new initiatives and funding expansion, including success in attracting external grant money through USDOE proposal submitted this year	Performance Target: Increase in funding sources

### Submitting the 2014 Outcomes Assessment Report

Please forward the assessment report and any attachments to your unit's division head or vice chancellor's office by **October 31, 2014.**

**For assistance with completing this report, contact:** Lynn Williford, Office of Institutional Research & Assessment, lynn\_williford@unc.edu, 919-962-1339.