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Executive Summary

Activities & Findings in 2014-15

• In fall 2014, about 70% of UNC Charlotte’s first-time full time freshmen were enrolled in a PFS course (up from 44% a year before). Eighteen separate courses were offered across all 7 colleges.

• Each college participated in the Prospect Charrette on March 30, 2015, sharing its most successful PFS activities in a poster session and discussion with a university-wide audience.

• Faculty development offerings in 2014-15 comprised orientation sessions for new PFS instructors, two half-day trainings for all PFS instructors, 9 lunchtime discussions, and college-specific consultations on curriculum and assignment design.

• SLO assessment data, measured by direct scoring of student reflection essays or other artifacts, show about the same overall level of achievement as in AY13-14.

• PFS students perform better than non-PFS students on major student success indicators (retention, suspension and probation, GPA, and semester hours attempted and completed) though these results should be interpreted with care.

Changes for 2015-16

• Based on assessment data and other evaluations, each college has developed a plan to improve student learning in its PFS course(s). Working more intentionally with subject librarians and rearranging the timing of course assessments are common themes in these plans.

• The College of Arts + Architecture will offer a Prospect course in each of its departments in 2015-16, bringing the campus to full implementation.

• Attention will turn toward sustaining and institutionalizing Prospect across the university.
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Introduction  
The Prospect for Success (PFS or Prospect) program was created to fulfill UNC Charlotte’s Quality Enhancement Plan. Prospect’s goal is to increase the depth and the extent of students’ engagement with their education. All first-time, full-time freshmen have the opportunity to enroll in a Prospect course with a dedicated engagement curriculum, including academic work, integrated advising, and partnerships with campus organizations.

The university began a three-year implementation cycle in fall 2013, when almost half of all eligible freshmen were enrolled in Prospect courses. Last fall, the number of students in PFS courses increased by 26%. In fall 2015, PFS enrollment of First-Time In College (FTIC) students is projected to reach 90%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total FTIC enrollment</th>
<th>FTIC students in Prospect courses</th>
<th>% of FTIC in PFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 †</td>
<td>3087</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>3319</td>
<td>2335</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of First Year (AY 2013-14) Activities and Findings

- In fall 2013, almost half of UNC Charlotte’s first-time full-time freshmen were enrolled in a PFS course (1356 out of 3087). Sixteen separate courses were offered across all seven colleges.
- Faculty development offerings in 2013-14 comprised three, day-long meetings, three lunchtime discussions, one keynote address from a national expert, and college-specific consultations on curriculum and assignment design.
- SLO assessment data show that 61.7% of students demonstrated ‘inquiry’, 58.1% demonstrated ‘commitment to success,’ and 36.8% demonstrated ‘cultural awareness’ as measured by direct scoring of student reflection essays. These figures are short of the stated target of 75% mastery of each SLO.

1 We focus on the fall semester courses because most FTIC freshmen enter UNCC and are directed into Prospect courses at that time. However, there are PFS-related courses in the spring semester:

- The College of Engineering spreads its PFS curriculum over two semester-long courses: ENGR1201 covers two SLOs, and ENGR1202 covers the third. In any given spring semester, most COEN FTICs will be taking ENGR1202. Some will actually be taking their first Prospect course, ENGR1201, because they would not have met the math prerequisite in the fall.
- In addition, some colleges have spring courses aimed at transfer students that incorporate PFS curriculum and SLOs.
implementation teams took steps to adjust curricula to ensure continuous improvement with regard to student learning.

- With regard to student success performance indicators:
  - PFS students are more likely to intend to return to UNC Charlotte for their sophomore year than non-PFS students are.
  - PFS students attempted and completed more semester hours, on average, than non-PFS students

Second-year (AY 2014-15) Overview

This report presents and discusses the results from Prospect’s second implementation year in three categories: Student Learning Outcomes, Process Outcomes, and Program Outcomes. In each section, we will describe any changes planned for AY 2015-16 and explain how these are related to the findings from AY 2014-15.
I. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

Prospect for Success (PFS) courses are designed by the individual colleges at UNC Charlotte. These are the PFS courses that were taught in the program’s first two years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Course call number(s)</th>
<th>Fall 2013 Enrollment</th>
<th>Fall 2014 Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Computing &amp; Informatics</td>
<td>ITCS 1600</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health &amp; Human Services</td>
<td>HAHS 1000</td>
<td>88(^2)</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>LBST 2101(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LBST 2102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LBST 2211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LBST 2213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCOL 1200(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 2005(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSYC 1000(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOCY 1101(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WGST 2310(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts + Architecture</td>
<td>MUSC 1000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 1140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCH 1101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>BUSN 1101</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>EDUC 1100</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>ENGR 1201(^1)</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETCE 1222(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total enrollment in PFS courses(^4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>2945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each PFS course shares several elements in common, though other aspects vary based on the college implementation team’s determinations about how best to serve their own students. The most significant shared aspect of Prospect courses is the set of three common student learning outcomes (SLOs).

**Commitment to Success:** Students will identify specific and realistic goals for their collegiate experience, develop or exhibit strategies for achieving those goals, and recognize the need to make change in light of experience.

**Inquiry:** Students understand or experience inquiry as an open-ended process that explores evidence and/or approaches to generate ideas/conclusions.

---

\(^1\) Pilot sections, not directly assessed
\(^2\) These are freshman seminar/learning community courses; in AY 2013-14 PFS was piloted in this space but not directly assessed
\(^3\) Includes some transfer students, so numbers do not match FTIC figures reported above.
Cultural Awareness: Students will demonstrate an understanding of themselves, and of others, as individuals whose worldview and capacities are shaped by culture and experience and a willingness to take the worldview and capacities of others into consideration.

a. The direct assessment of Prospect for Success SLOs is conducted separately in each college, though the effectiveness measure and methodology are meant to be standard across all colleges. Direct assessment data is generated by scoring samples of student reflection essays against common rubrics. In all colleges/courses, the desired outcome is that 75% of students will score a “2” or better (on a zero-to-3 point scale) on each dimension of each of the three SLOs.

In summer 2014, acting on suggestions based on experiences in AY 2013-14, the PFS administrative team revised rubrics for each of the three SLOs. After Steering approved, the revised rubrics were distributed to all fall 2014 PFS instructors, along with an expanded list of assessment suggestions, explications, and examples. (See Appendix A for these materials.)

The charts and tables below present the university-wide data from fall 2013 and fall 2014, separating average scores into the three dimensions evaluated by the rubrics. In each case, the number refers to the percentage of scores above “2”, and the dotted line represents the 75% target.

For the most part, across all three SLOs, student achievement from year one to year two was about the same. On the “commitment to success” outcome, however, student achievement dropped significantly on the third dimension in the second year. The revision to assessment materials between years one and two, as described above, raised the expectations around “commitment to success” to include the student’s ability to describe his/her experiences over time and reflect on what s/he had learned and would do differently. While this higher bar is an appropriate expectation for Prospect students, not all instructors had time to prepare for the change in their fall 2014 courses. Course assessments will be adjusted in fall 2015—in particular, making sure that the assessment is scheduled late enough in the semester that students have the opportunity to experience the full semester’s work before reflecting on it.

---

The common rubrics used to assess student work included three dimensions for each SLO. The names of the dimensions were modified in year 2, as were some of the specifics of the scoring criteria for each level of achievement. In 2014-15, then, “Commitment to Success” essays were meant to show evidence of goal setting, strategies, and experience leading to change; “Inquiry” essays were evaluated on exploratory process, evidence/approaches, and originality; “Cultural Awareness” essays were scored for awareness of self, awareness of others, and openness.
**Commitment to Success**

![Bar chart showing commitment to success in Goal Setting, Strategies, and Experience → change for 2013 (N=713) and 2014 (N=805).]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Goal Setting</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014 (n=805)</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 (n=713)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inquiry**

![Bar chart showing inquiry in Exploratory Process, Evidence/App, and Originality for 2013 (N=541) and 2014 (N=722).]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expl Process</th>
<th>Evidence/App</th>
<th>Originality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014 (n=722)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 (n=541)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the charts and tables above present aggregated, university-wide data, the charts in Appendix B present detailed information for each of the colleges. These charts demonstrate the range within a college, and in most cases between years, with regard to the scoring criteria specified. Examining the data in this way is useful for college implementation teams as they think about curricular adjustments.

Using the direct SLO assessment data, as well as other information from the team’s experience with Prospect, colleges were asked to describe the changes or improvements they would implement during the next academic year to improve student learning. They reported these plans in SLO Assessment Reports submitted to the administrative team in March 2015. Excerpts from these Reports are as follows:

- The Belk College of Business is moving its Prospect course, BUSN 1101, from the Student Center for Professional Development (SPCD) to an academic department with greater faculty involvement. SCPD personnel may still provide guest lectures to explain their services to the students, while allowing the class itself to take on more of an academic nature and better address some of the PFS dimensions in greater detail.

- The College of Computing & Informatics has several specific ideas to improve student learning on the “cultural awareness” outcome, including more team building activities and low-stake team assignments. These will afford students greater opportunity for interactions with classmates that do not greatly affect grades.
- Though students in the College of Health & Human Services met the goal for "inquiry," the team will make changes based on student and faculty feedback to improve this aspect of the course. In fall 2015, the college will include its subject librarian as part of the instructional process, in order to help students with research techniques and synthesizing of sources.

b. In 2014-15, the plan was to conduct *indirect assessment* of student learning outcomes through two means, the National Survey of Student Engagement survey and student focus groups. The first was successfully completed while the second has been delayed until the next academic year.

- The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was administered in spring 2014, to graduating seniors and to students finishing their first year at UNC Charlotte. Responses were compared between freshmen who had taken Prospect courses and those who had not. No *substantively* significant differences were found between those two groups on any of the indicators of student engagement that NSSE measures. (See Appendix C for these analyses.)

- The qualitative research plan described in last year’s annual report (conducting focus groups at the beginning of the fall semester and again in the middle of the spring semester) was not carried out. The goal was that questions about the Prospect SLOs would be incorporated into student focus groups conducted by the SSWG Communications Working Group. In practice, though, this was not workable. A different approach will be developed for AY 2015-16.
II. Process Outcomes

This section reports on activities related to the effective implementation of Prospect, and to the practices of continuous improvement based on assessment data and experience. This includes faculty professional development and activities of the administrative team and Steering Committee.

A. PFS Administrative Team

The PFS administrative team met approximately biweekly throughout AY 2014-15. Ongoing responsibilities included planning faculty development activities and monitoring college assessment and evaluation activities. Developing and monitoring a communications plan for PFS that will be integrated with those of other New Student Induction initiatives was another key project.

The most significant development this academic year with regard to PFS implementation was the Prospect Charrette on March 30, 2015. (See Appendix D for flyer explaining the event.) The administrative team devoted most of its attention in spring 2015 to this project’s planning and follow up activities.

The Provost has indicated that Prospect for Success is a signature program of UNC Charlotte, a priority in our efforts to ensure student success at the university. In the course of discussions around this, we identified the theme of integration as an organizing principle for Prospect, going forward. Integration refers to both “vertical” (across the academic experiences that first year students have at UNCC) and “horizontal” (throughout each department degree program) processes. Discussions at the Charrette and at the Provost’s Assessment Retreat, the following day, have formed the basis for AY2015-16’s course implementation and faculty development agendas.

B. PFS Steering Committee

The Steering committee met in-person four times during AY 2014-15. Major actions included final approval of the 2014-15 SLO assessment rubrics, Charrette planning, and information sharing across colleges and campus partner units.

C. Faculty Development

2014-15 events

- In August 2014, GAs and undergraduate preceptors working in fall 2014 PFS courses were trained at a half-day workshop.
- In November 2014, all instructors and implementation team members were invited to an “All-Prospect” workshop. Results from PFS’s first year were presented, and instructors
shared assignments and discussed their end-of-semester assessment plans with one another.

- Nine Brown Bag Lunch workshops were held during the year, at which PFS instructors were invited to share information about their instructional experiences (assignment development, working with campus organizations, etc.) with peers.
- The May 2015 faculty development sessions addressed the fact that, in their SLO Assessment Reports, members of several college teams expressed a desire to help students better develop in the area of “inquiry.” Subject-area librarians met with college teams to discuss resources and developing assignments that would work well within each college’s curriculum area.
- The consultation model—working intensively with individual colleges, rather than attempting to address all instructors through one-size-fits-all faculty development—was fully implemented during AY 2014-15. A representative from the PFS administrative team attended at least one meeting of each college implementation team during 2014, with most colleges being visited during the implementation period in the fall term, as well as after the distribution of direct SLO assessment results analyses. During these meetings, team members were able to discuss and resolve college-specific issues (about instruction, resources, or other concerns) without distraction.
- Two new faculty orientation sessions were held at the end of the spring 2015 semester for instructors who were teaching PFS courses for the first time in fall 2015.

D. Changes Planned for 2015-16

1. Professional development plans
   - Attendance at Brown Bag sessions this year was very low. In 2015-16, they will be discontinued and members of the Administrative Team will try a different format/method/schedule to meet the same goal of information sharing and social support for instructors. Two roundtable discussions will be conducted in the fall semester on the two SLOs that evaluations indicate are the most challenging for instructors (inquiry and cultural awareness).
   - See Appendix E for the working calendar of PFS events in 2015-16, including faculty development sessions.

2. PFS Administrative Team and Steering Committee Emphases
   - Attention will turn toward sustaining and institutionalizing Prospect across the university through the
     o implementation of vertical and horizontal integration ideas from the Charrette and follow up and
     o solidification of buy in for Prospect across all colleges (ensuring resources and attention)
III. Program Outcomes

The overarching goal of Prospect for Success program is to increase students' engagement with their own education. It is anticipated that higher levels of engagement will lead to greater student success in terms of progress through, and achievement in, their educational programs. Performance indicators such as average GPA, one-year retention rate, and earned-to-attempted-hours ratio may gauge the impact that PFS is having on the campus as a whole.

In fall 2014, 70% of all FTIC students were enrolled in a Prospect for Success course. The pattern of Prospect implementation was such that the only FTIC students who were NOT in a Prospect course fell into one of these categories:

- COEN students who did not have the math prerequisite for ENGR1201
- COA+A students who are in departments that have not yet implemented PFS (art/art history and architecture)
- CLAS and UCOL students who slipped through the advising cracks (and a very few such students in other colleges)

In other words, the “non-Prospect” category in the tables below does not include any students with a declared major in CCI, CHHS, COED, or BCOB.

In each of the indicator areas, Prospect students performed better than non-Prospect students. However, caution must be taken in drawing simple comparisons between the two groups, as this was not a true “experimental” setup where the only difference between the control group and the experimental group is that one group is exposed to Prospect and the other was not.

For the fall 2014 FTIC\(^5\) cohort in AY 2014-15\(^6\)

**Earned hours:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-Prospect</th>
<th>Prospect students</th>
<th>overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15 mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Semester Hrs</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>27.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15 mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned/Attempted Hrs Ratio</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) First-time-in-college, full-time freshmen  
\(^6\) This table includes only students who were enrolled for the full 2014-15 AY
Earned hours (cont'd):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-Prospect</th>
<th>Prospect students</th>
<th>overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014 6+ 'W' hours</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014 ALL 'W' hours</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015 6+ 'W' hours</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015 ALL 'W' hours</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probation & suspensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-Prospect</th>
<th>Prospect students</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Fall 2014 semester</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Spring 2015 semester</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Spring 2015 semester</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-Prospect</th>
<th>Prospect students</th>
<th>overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014 mean GPA</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014 median GPA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015 mean GPA²</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015 median GPA</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15 mean CumGPA²</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY 2014-15 median CumGPA</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>non-Prospect</th>
<th>Prospect students</th>
<th>overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Returned for spring 2015</td>
<td>93.29</td>
<td>95.12</td>
<td>94.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-registered for fall 2015</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

² Does not include students who appealed suspension and were reinstated
² Includes only students who were enrolled for the full 2014-15 AY
Data analysis involving the fall 2013 and fall 2014 FTIC cohorts will be ongoing. Questions to be explored include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the difference in preregistration rate translate into a higher official retention rate?</td>
<td>Yes, this was true for the fall 2013 cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within colleges where PFS was not fully implemented, what are the differences in success between Prospect and non-Prospect students over time? In colleges with full implementation, what are the differences in success between the fall 2012 (non-PFS) and fall 2013 (PFS) freshmen cohorts?</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do positive effects of PFS continue throughout the students’ college career? For example, does the increased first-to-second year retention yield higher rates of 4- and 6-year graduation for Prospect students?</td>
<td>In process—cannot be answered until spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the effects of the PFS experience the same for students regardless of race, gender, and socioeconomic status?</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any association between a student’s performance on Prospect SLO assessments and his academic performance in later semesters?</td>
<td>Not possible to address (data not sufficiently detailed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a difference in 4- and 6-year graduation rates between PFS and non-PFS students?</td>
<td>In process—cannot be answered until spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do PFS students choose majors earlier and/or change majors less often than non-PFS students?</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix A

Revised rubrics and assessment suggestions
Commitment to Success

Learning Outcome

Students will identify specific and realistic goals for their collegiate experience, develop or exhibit strategies for achieving those goals, and recognize the need to make change in light of experience.

Students who are active partners in the learning experience have the ability to identify who they want to become and the skills, knowledge, and motivation needed to get there. Commitment to success is obviously important on a small scale (for example as it relates to academic performance in a single course) but for the purpose of Prospect for Success the focus is on a commitment to success as evident on a more holistic scale of the student’s collegiate experience and beyond.

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Goals are stated but they are not specific or realistic</td>
<td>Goals are somewhat specific and realistic</td>
<td>Goals are specific and realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Articulates only vague strategies for achieving goals</td>
<td>Articulates a few specific strategies for achieving goals</td>
<td>Articulates several specific strategies for achieving goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience → change</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Shows limited recognition of the need to make changes in light of experience</td>
<td>Recognizes the need to make changes in light of experience</td>
<td>Recognizes and specifically describes the need to make changes in light of experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Suggestions

1. Reflection on semester’s work: Students complete an assignment early in the semester in which they have to articulate goals and strategies. During the semester, students engage in activities and/or complete assignments that require them to refer back to their original statement and incorporate modifications. Towards the end of the semester students refine and revise their goals / strategies statements and reflect on the changes they have made. This last assignment is the artifact used for assessment.

2. Portfolio w/ summary analysis: Students do various assignments during the semester that require them to describe the impact of specific experiences, activities, interactions on their goals and strategies. Each of those assignments goes into the portfolio, and at the end of the semester students are given an assignment that requires them to reflect on how these assignments (or selected assignments) served to develop their thinking re goals and strategies. This final reflection is the artifact used for assessment.

3. Portfolio w/o summary analysis: As above except that students simply collect all of these assignments in a portfolio they submit at the end of the semester. Instructors will have designed the assignments so that it is possible to use the rubric to score the totality of students’ work vis a vis the outcomes.

Prospect SLOs and Rubrics Year 2 July 2014
EXPLANATION (and examples)

Goal Setting: Students need to be able to articulate their educational, career, and personal goals in order to commit to success. The goals students identify should be specific in the sense that they represent tangible outcomes. Goals should also be realistic, both in the sense that they are achievable and also in the sense that they are coordinated with each other. Finally goals should be informed by both honest self assessment and a realistic assessment of external factors.

- More specific/realistic/well informed:
  - "entry level position in engineering";
  - "1st year GPA >3.2";
  - "competitive for internship in junior year";

- Less specific:
  - "do well in school"
  - "become Fortune 500 CEO"
  - "get a good job"

Strategies: Students need to be able to identify the strategies they will need to pursue to achieve their goals. Strategies can be both internal (things the student will do him or her self) and external (support resources/networks the students will take advantage of).

- Clear strategies:
  - "I will join/form study group in all classes with 50 or more students";
  - "go to my professors’ / TAs’ office hours regularly";
  - "limit work hours to 12 per week,"
  - "started early with tutoring in Math because that subject is difficult for me;"
  - "joined student organization in chosen field of study."

- Weak strategies:
  - "study hard";
  - "get to know faculty"

Experience → Change: Students need to know themselves to be able to set realistic goals and identify the strategies they need to pursue to achieve those goals; self understanding includes students’ ability to assess their own strengths and weaknesses as well as the ability to be reflexive in that assessment.

- Strong self-understanding:
  - "I tend to get distracted so I need to carefully manage my time for studying;"
  - "I think that a Public Health major will suit me well because I really like working with and helping other people and also enjoy analyzing and presenting information."
  - "I thought that being good in math was enough to make me successful in Engineering but now realize that you need to have a passion as well."

- Minimal self-understanding:
  - "I’ll study harder next time”;
  - "I got unlucky with the essay question"
  - "subject isn’t really relevant to my major"
  - "I couldn’t understand the professor’s accent"
Inquiry

Learning Outcome

Students understand or experience inquiry as an open-ended process that explores evidence and/or approaches to generate ideas/conclusions

Students who are active partners in the educational experience are intrinsically curious. They understand that knowledge is made rather than simply received. They also are on their way to understanding the process of inquiry as the means by which knowledge is constructed.

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Process</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Discussion and/or results indicate that the focus of inquiry was static and narrowly focused</td>
<td>Discussion and/or results indicate that the focus of inquiry evolved to some degree</td>
<td>Discussion and/or results indicate that the focus of inquiry evolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence / Approaches</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Discussion and/or results indicate limited exploration of appropriate evidence or approaches</td>
<td>Discussion and/or results indicate some exploration of appropriate evidence or approaches</td>
<td>Discussion and/or results indicate substantial exploration of appropriate evidence or approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>No evidence (derivative)</td>
<td>Limited evidence of originality in discussion or results of inquiry</td>
<td>Some evidence of originality in discussion or results of inquiry</td>
<td>Strong evidence of originality in discussion or results of inquiry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Suggestions

1. Inquiry project w/ reflection: Students do an inquiry project—a structured, multi-step process of developing questions, exploring evidence, and presenting conclusions and further questions. This can be research, design, performance, whatever is appropriate for the field. Along with the inquiry project itself, students turn in a summation of their experience with the inquiry process that is designed to elicit their understanding of how inquiry works. (Note responses to this prompt are likely to be better if the incremental steps in the inquiry process include opportunities for students to reflect on what they are learning about how inquiry works.) The summation (not the inquiry project itself) is what is used as the artifact for assessment.

2. Inquiry Project w/o reflection: Students do an inquiry project—a structured, multi-step process of developing questions, exploring evidence and presenting conclusions and further questions—this can be research, design, performance, whatever is appropriate for the field. Instructors will have designed the inquiry project so that the final product manifests the developmental inquiry processes called for in the rubric.

3. Portfolio w/ summary analysis: Students do various design/inquiry assignments during the semester. Each assignment is placed into the portfolio, and at the end of the semester students prepare a reflection in response to a prompt that asks them to select assignments and describe how those illustrate what the student now understands about the process of inquiry.
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EXPLANATION (and examples)

Exploratory Process: Students should see the process of inquiry as open-ended rather than rote. It begins with a problem or vision rather than a topic or subject, and the process of inquiry should be described in terms of the evolution of the problem or vision rather than as the regurgitation of information or the rote application of a rule or process. The evolution of the questions that drive an inquiry process comes in part from a substantive engagement with new ideas, approaches, information, and evidence. The evolving questions and engagement with new material means that while an inquiry process will come to an end (because the assignment has to be turned in) students should be cognizant of the new lines of inquiry or creative opportunities that have been opened up and new material that needs to be explored.

- Open ended:
  - "I am interested in ______ and particularly the question of why/how ______",
  - "I started out working on ______ but realized that the more interesting/feasible question was ______?;"
  - "I wanted to express ______ and realized that it worked best if I ______"

- Rote learning:
  - "my topic is ___;"
  - "In order to ______ the first step is to ______, then ..."

Evidence / Approaches: Students should conduct inquiry with an open mind. In some contexts that will mean that they are exploring for evidence that will help them accomplish their purpose or solve their problem; in other contexts ‘evidence’ is less important than the ability to explore a purpose or problem using different approaches or methodologies. (The latter perhaps more appropriate in the design fields.)

- Exploratory:
  - "When I found out that ______ I realized I needed more information on ______"
  - "My first design focused on balance and symmetry, but then I tried a version that deliberately created imbalance."

- Fixed:
  - "Once I got my three sources I tried to fit them together."

Generation of Ideas/Conclusions: Students should ‘discover’ rather than ‘report’ or in design terms they should ‘create’ rather than ‘replicate’

- Creative / new ideas:
  - "I discovered ______"
  - "I realized ______"

- Report:
  - "I found three reasons why ______"
Cultural Awareness

Learning Outcome

Students will demonstrate an understanding of themselves, and of others, as individuals whose worldview and capacities are shaped by culture and experience and a willingness to take the worldview and capacities of others into consideration.

Students who are active partners in the educational experience are aware. This awareness has two aspects. On one hand they are able to see themselves from “outside” in the sense of understanding how culture and experiences have shaped their own pre-dispositions, values, expectations, and capacities. On the other hand they are able to appreciate others from the “inside” in the same fashion. Being culturally aware allows a student to be open when interacting with others.

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of self</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Limited awareness of how culture and experience shape own perspectives and capacities</td>
<td>Some awareness of how culture and experience shape own perspectives and capacities</td>
<td>Strong awareness of how culture and experience shape own perspectives and capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of others</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Limited awareness of how culture and experience shape others' perspectives and capacities</td>
<td>Some awareness of how culture and experience shape others' perspectives and capacities</td>
<td>Strong awareness of how culture and experience shape others' perspectives and capacities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Limited consideration of multiple points of view</td>
<td>Some consideration of multiple points of view</td>
<td>Strong consideration of multiple points of view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Suggestions

1. Interaction Experience w/ reflection: Students do an assignment (set of assignments) that will, necessarily, require interaction with or consideration of individuals who are different from themselves. The particular nature of the assignment will vary depending upon the Prospect curriculum. Moreover, the interactions with ‘difference’ could come from the project per se, or from the fact that students are working in a diverse group, or both. As part of the assignment (or at the end of the semester) students must summarize what they have learned about themselves and others in the process of completing the assignment.

2. Interaction Experience w/o reflection: Students do an assignment (set of assignments) that will, necessarily, require interaction with or consideration of individuals who are different from themselves. The particular nature of the assignment will vary depending upon the Prospect curriculum. Moreover, the interactions with ‘difference’ could come from the project per se, or from the fact that students are working in a diverse group, or both. Instructors will have designed the interaction experience assignments so that the final product manifests the awareness and openness called for in the rubric.
3. Portfolio w/ summary analysis: Students do various cultural interaction assignments during the semester. Each assignment is placed into the portfolio and at the end of the semester students prepare a reflection in response to a prompt that asks them to select assignments and describe how those illustrate what they now understands about awareness and openness.

4. Portfolio w/o summary analysis: As above except that the specific assignments that comprise a student's portfolio will have been designed to enable instructors to use the rubric to assess the student's grasp of the awareness and openness.

EXPLICATION (and examples)

Awareness: Students should be aware that their own values and perspectives, and those of other's, are shaped by culture and experience. Students lacking this awareness often assume that their worldview is normal or natural and are therefore critical of differences with others.

- Strongly aware: “I understand now how my attitudes towards people from the North have been shaped by the environment in which I grew up;” “It has been really interesting to learn about people from different backgrounds in my class see the world differently.”
- Not aware: “I can’t understand how the people we read about in Wine to Water couldn’t have invested in their own water supply, can’t they take responsibility for themselves?”

Openness: Students should be able to interpret the actions of others, and interact with others, in a fashion that takes into consideration the worldviews, experiences, and aptitudes of those individuals or groups. Students without this openness are likely to be judgmental or at best merely tolerant of others.

- Open: “We had an interesting discussion about our experiences,” “I realized that we would have understood what happened when [reference to some event] from one another.”
- Tolerant: “Everyone is different, I guess that’s ok;” “They are entitled to their beliefs”
- Judgmental: ”I can’t imagine how people could do/believe that”; “It is obvious that the right way to _______”; “I had to keep my mouth shut when she ______”
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SLO Assessment Data by college
College of Arts + Architecture  
Percentage of students scoring a “2” or better (out of 3) on rubric dimensions

**Commitment to Success**
- Goal Setting
- Strategies
- Experience \(\rightarrow\) change

**Inquiry**
- Exploratory Process
- Evidence/Approaches
- Originality

**Cultural Awareness**
- Awareness of Self
- Awareness of Others
- Openness

Blue: fall 2013  \(n=25\)
Red: fall 2014  \(n=45\)

(solid line represents 75% target)
Belk College of Business

Percentage of students scoring a “2” or better (out of 3) on rubric dimensions

**Commitment to Success**

- Goal Setting
- Strategies
- Experience → change

**Inquiry**

- Exploratory Process
- Evidence/Approaches
- Originality

**Cultural Awareness**

- Awareness of Self
- Awareness of Others
- Openness

Blue: fall 2013  n= 163
Red: fall 2014  n=104

(solid line represents 75% target)
College of Computing & Informatics  Percentage of students scoring a “2” or better (out of 3) on rubric dimensions

**Commitment to Success**

- Goal Setting
- Strategies
- Experience → change

**Inquiry**

- Exploratory Process
- Evidence/Approaches
- Originality

**Cultural Awareness**

- Awareness of Self
- Awareness of Others
- Openness

Blue: fall 2013  n= 83  
Red: fall 2014  n= 103

(solid line represents 75% target)
The College of Education, in accordance with the allowance written into the original QEP, chose not to directly assess student work on 'cultural awareness' in 2014-15 because their students had already demonstrated mastery in this SLO for two consecutive years.
College of Engineering  
Percentage of students scoring a “2” or better (out of 3) on rubric dimensions

**Commitment to Success**
- Goal Setting
- Strategies
- Experience --> change

**Inquiry**
- Exploratory Process
- Evidence/Approaches
- Originality

**Cultural Awareness**
- Awareness of Self
- Awareness of Others
- Openness

Blue: fall 2013  n= 219  (146 for Inquiry)  
Red: fall 2014  n= 145  (62 for Inquiry)  
(solid line represents 75% target)
College of Health & Human Services
Percentage of students scoring a “2” or better (out of 3) on rubric dimensions

**Commitment to Success**
- Goal Setting
- Strategies
- Experience -> change

**Inquiry**
- Exploratory Process
- Evidence/Approaches
- Originality

**Cultural Awareness**
- Awareness of Self
- Awareness of Others
- Openness

Red: fall 2014  n= 99
(solid line represents 75% target)
No assessment results for fall 2013 pilot year.
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences—LBST/Disciplinary  
Percentage of students scoring a “2” or better (out of 3) on rubric dimensions

**Commitment to Success**
- Goal Setting: [Graph]
- Strategies: [Graph]
- Experience → change: [Graph]

**Inquiry**
- Exploratory Process: [Graph]
- Evidence/Approaches: [Graph]
- Originality: [Graph]

**Cultural Awareness**
- Awareness of Self: [Graph]
- Awareness of Others: [Graph]
- Openness: [Graph]

*Blue: fall 2013  n= 146*  
*Red: fall 2014  n= 157*

(solid line represents 75% target)
College of Liberal Arts & Sciences—UCOL/Freshman Seminar  Percentage of students scoring a “2” or better (out of 3) on rubric dimensions

**Commitment to Success**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience -&gt; change</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inquiry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory Process</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence/Approaches</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Awareness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Self</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Others</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red: fall 2014  n= 70

(solid line represents 75% target)

No assessment results for fall 2013 pilot year.
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NSSE14 comparison charts
**Engagement Indicators: Overview**

Engagement Indicators are summary measures based on sets of NSSE questions examining key dimensions of student engagement. The ten indicators are organized within four themes: Academic Challenge, Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty, and Campus Environment. The tables below compare average scores for your students with those in your comparison groups.

Use the following key:

- ▲ Participants’ average was significantly higher (p<.05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.
- ▼ Participants’ average was significantly lower (p<.05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- No significant difference.

### New Freshmen Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Engagement Indicator</th>
<th>Prospect for Success</th>
<th>Learning Community</th>
<th>Honors College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants versus</td>
<td>Participants versus</td>
<td>Participants versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Challenge</strong></td>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning with Peers</strong></td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiences with Faculty</strong></td>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Environment</strong></td>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Engagement Indicator</th>
<th>Prospect for Success</th>
<th>Learning Community</th>
<th>Honors College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants versus</td>
<td>Participants versus</td>
<td>Participants versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Challenge</strong></td>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning with Peers</strong></td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiences with Faculty</strong></td>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Environment</strong></td>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>▲</td>
<td>▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Flyer from the Prospect Charrette on March 30, 2015
The Design Challenge: Curriculum Integration

How do we take full advantage of the potential of Prospect for Success by INTEGRATING...

1. ... across Prospect courses to ensure that it remains a coherent "University" program?
2. ... across introductory courses and activities that make up the 1st year experience?
3. ... across the four year degree, linking general education and the major

How to Charrette

Round 1:
1. CIRCULATE to the FOUR stations. Talk to faculty and students. Learn about what they are doing.
2. POST answers to the questions above: How would YOU integrate across Prospect, across the 1st year experience, across all four years?
3. GATHER at a station with ideas you would like to explore further. A facilitator will lead your small group in a discussion of these three questions.

Round 2:
Repeat at the other FOUR stations

College of Arts + Architecture
Cultural Awareness

College of Business
Commitment to Success

College of Computing and Informatics
Commitment to Success

College of Education
Inquiry

College of Engineering
Commitment to Success

College of Health and Human Services
Cultural Awareness

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences:
Liberal Studies
Inquiry

College of Liberal Arts & Sciences:
Freshmen Seminar
Inquiry
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Working calendar of PFS events in 2015-16
## Prospect for Success
### Faculty Development & Steering Committee Meetings
#### 2015-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>Meeting or Workshop</th>
<th>Date/Time/Location</th>
<th>Team Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>New Faculty Prospect Orientation</td>
<td>Week of Aug. 17-21 as needed Colvard 2203</td>
<td>Carla &amp; Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preceptor &amp; GA Training (Michael Abel)</td>
<td>Thursday, Aug. 20 from 8 a.m. to 2 p.m. Fretwell 121</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee Meeting - Resources &amp; Fall PFS enrollments - Updates on communications</td>
<td>Friday, Aug. 21 from 8:30-9:45 a.m. Colvard 2203</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Roundtable Discussion: Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>Thursday, Sept. 24 from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. Colvard 2006</td>
<td>Carla &amp; Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Roundtable Discussion (Inquiry)</td>
<td>Monday, Oct. 19 from 11:30 a.m. to 1 p.m. Colvard 2006</td>
<td>Carla &amp; Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library follow up on inquiry with college teams</td>
<td>Librarians will schedule these meetings with college implementation teams</td>
<td>Carla &amp; Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Steering Committee Meeting - Assessment planning</td>
<td>Friday, Nov. 20 from 8:30-9:45 a.m. Colvard 2203</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Faculty Prospect Orientation</td>
<td>Week of Nov. 19-23 as needed Colvard 2203</td>
<td>Carla &amp; Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>All Prospect Faculty/Staff Meeting - College team debriefing - SLO outcomes discussion - Big Questions discussion</td>
<td>Friday, Jan. 8 from 8:30 to noon TBD</td>
<td>Carla, Bruce, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Steering Committee Meeting - Review Fall assessment data</td>
<td>Friday, Feb. 19 from 8:30-9:45 a.m. Colvard 2203</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Prospect for Success Charette</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>New Faculty Prospect Orientation</td>
<td>Week of April as needed Colvard 2203</td>
<td>Carla, Bruce, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>All Prospect Faculty/Staff Meeting</td>
<td>Friday, May 6 from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. TBD</td>
<td>Carla, Bruce, John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Friday, May 13 from 8:30-9:45 a.m. Colvard 2203</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>