

Academic Assessment Committee Handbook



UF | UNIVERSITY *of*
FLORIDA

Academic Assessment Committee Handbook

Timothy S. Brophy

Former Director of Institutional Assessment and Handbook Author

Institutional Assessment Staff:

Maria Cristina Leite, Director, Institutional Assessment

mleite1@ufl.edu

(352) 392-2478

Lissette Tolentino, Project Manager

ltolen@ufl.edu

(352) 273-4476

Table of Contents

The Academic Assessment Committee.....	4
2023-2024 Academic Assessment Committee - Roster.....	5
Standard Operating Procedures	6
SACSCOC Principle 8.2.a - Student Learning Outcomes – Educational Programs	9
Academic Assessment Committee - Committee Responsibilities	11
Appendices	12
Appendix 1. FLSUS Board of Governors 8.016 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment	12
Appendix 2. University of Florida Policy for Combination, Joint, And Dual Degrees	14

The Academic Assessment Committee

A Joint Committee established in 2010 by the UF Senate

Appointment

The President shall appoint six members to this committee, and the Senate shall elect six members from the faculty at large. Preference should be given to members with previous experience in assessment, curriculum development and evaluation and/or program accreditation. The student government shall select one non-voting student member. Term: 3 years, staggered; 1 year – student

Chair

The President or the President's designee appoints the chair. A co-chair will be elected from and by the six Senate-elected members. (This election will take place during the last meeting of the committee in each spring semester so that committee leadership will be in place at the beginning of the following academic year.)

Responsibilities

The Academic Assessment Committee shall review Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for all undergraduate programs, and all Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and program goals for each undergraduate, graduate, professional and certificate academic programs at the University. The committee reviews and recommends the Institutional Assessment Plans for General Education and Quality Enhancement Plan. The committee will provide an annual report of its work, findings, and recommendations to the Senate and the President.

Meetings

2nd Tuesday, at 3:00 PM, in Tigert Hall. (No meetings June, July, and August)

2023-2024 Academic Assessment Committee - Roster

Last Name	First Name	Title	Department	Term	Comm Title	Phone	Email
Adams	Carrie	Associate Professor	Environmental Horticulture, Restoration Ecology	2025	Member-S	904-244-3240	carrie.adams@ufl.edu
Ahlgren	Joslyn	Instructional Professor	Applied Physiology & Kinesiology	2025	Member-S	352-294-1728	jahlgren@ufl.edu
Teixeira	Leandro	Instr. Assist. Prof., Advisor	CALS/IFAS	2024	Member-S	352-392-8350	leandroteixeira@ufl.edu
Carytsas	Ferol	Lecturer, Acting Director	Center for Arts in Medicine	2024	Member-P	352-273-1488	fcarytsas@arts.ufl.edu
Tillander	Michelle	Associate Professor	College of the Arts	2025	Member-P	(352) 273-3079	mtillander@arts.ufl.edu
Giannadaki	Ifigeneia	Assistant Professor	Greek Studies	2025	Member-P	352-392-2075	giannadaki.if@ufl.edu
Dassa	Lori	Dir. Clin. Experiences and Partnerships	School of Teaching and Learning	2025	Member-P	352-273-2051	ldassa@coe.ufl.edu
Mellon	Melissa	Lecturer	University Writing Program	2024	Member-S	352-846-1138	mmellon@ufl.edu
Ryan	Matthew	Associate Professor	Emergency Medicine	2025	Member-S	317-441-9182	mfryan@ufl.edu
Schack-Dugre	Judi	Clinical Assistant Professor	Physical Therapy	2025	Member-P	352-294-8868	jschack@phhp.ufl.edu
Scholtz	Richard	Senior Lecturer	CALS	2026	Member-S	352-339-1751	rscholtz@ufl.edu
Rich	Morgan	Lecturer/Assist. Director	CLAS	2026	Member-P	352-294-7152	morganmrich@ufl.edu
Parker	Rossignol	Acad. Affairs Secretary (SG)	CLAS	2024	Student		jrossignol@ufl.edu
Chair and Liaisons							
Leite	Maria	Director, Institutional Assessment	Office of the Provost		Chair	352-392-2404	mleite1@ufl.edu
Gater	Cheryl	Associate Provost and Accreditation Liaison	Office of the Provost		Liaison	392-4208	cgater@aa.ufl.edu
Lebo	Cathy	Assistant Provost and Director	Institutional Planning and Research		Liaison	392-0456	clebo@aa.ufl.edu
Lindner	Angela	Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs	Undergraduate Affairs		Liaison	846-1761	alindner@aa.ufl.edu

Standard Operating Procedures

Attendance

Meetings are held in person, at Tigert Hall. Specific location will be defined based on availability of meeting spaces. All members are expected to attend each meeting in person when on campus. Members who are off campus are provided a link to join the meetings virtually.

When a member has an unavoidable conflict, the member should, when possible, communicate recommendations on all scheduled actions to the Team Lead or the Chair.

Review Process

When faculty need to modify any component of their academic assessment plans, these changes are submitted through the approval system to the Academic Assessment Committee for review and approval. The committee reviews all new program academic assessment plans, and the following types of requests:

1. Mission updates
2. SLO modifications (see the [UF Guide for Developing Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes](#) for our expectations)
3. Assessment methodology changes. Note: SACSCOC [does not allow course grades](#) to be used as SLO measures.
4. Validity arguments for the use of 3rd party examinations as SLO measures.
5. Curriculum map or assessment timeline updates
6. Justifications for double-counted credits for combination programs (see Appendix 2, UF's Combination, Joint, and Dual Degree policy).

When these requests reach the Office of Institutional Assessment, they are screened initially for their readiness to be reviewed by the committee. Once these are determined to be review ready, they are saved and then assigned to a review team one week prior to the next scheduled meeting where they will be presented for discussion and voting.

Review Teams

The Academic Assessment Committee consists of 12 members, 6 appointed by the president, and 6 elected by the Senate. The committee is divided into four teams of three reviewers each. Each team has a lead, and two additional members.

We welcome a non-voting student representative to our committee each year. Our student member brings a valued student perspective to our decision-making processes.

Our liaisons provide additional perspectives and context to our decision making and attend our meetings as their schedules permit. For the current cycle, our liaisons are:

- Cheryl Gater, Associate Provost and Accreditation Liaison
- Cathy Lebo, Assistant Provost and Director of Institutional Planning and Research
- Angela Lindner, Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs

These are the Committee Team assignments for this cycle:

Team	Member 1 (Lead)	Member 2	Member 3
1	Ferol Carytsas (P, 2024)	Carrie Adams (S, 2025)	Ifigeneia Giannadaki (P, 2025)
2	Michelle Tillander (P, 2025)	Leandro Teixeira (S, 2024)	Melissa Mellon (S, 2024)
3	Judi Schack-Dugre (P, 2025)	Lori Dassa (P, 2025)	Mogan Rich (P, 2026)
4	Joslyn Ahlgren (S, 2025)	Matthew Ryan (S, 2025)	Richard Scholtz (S, 2026)

(P – Presidential appointee; S – Senate elected member; year term ends)

Review Team Procedures

1. Review Teams are assigned approval request reviews on a rotating basis starting with Team 1.
2. Approval system links are made available to all team members in a List of Actions, along with electronic documents for each approval request, one week prior to the meeting where the request is scheduled for discussion.
3. Team members review their assigned requests and determine the degree to which the request meets the appropriate UF policy or expectations and communicate with the Team Lead to discuss their recommendations.
4. Team members are expected to come to consensus on a decision and make one of the following recommendations to the entire committee.
 - a. APPROVE. This status decision advances the request to the next approval process step for undergraduate certificate and degree programs and ends the process for graduate and professional programs. When the *final* status is listed as Approved, the request has gone through the entire approval process and has been approved for implementation.
 - b. COMMENT. This status decision maintains the request at the same approval process step but allows text to be entered into the comment field by the AAC.
 - c. CONDITIONALLY APPROVE. This status decision returns the request to the approval group at the preceding process step. This decision by the AAC typically indicates that if the recommended changes are made the request will be approved by AAC staff without requiring another review by the full committee.
 - d. DENY. This status decision ends the approval tracking process for that request. Note that all data and documents associated with the request up to the denial decision are retained in the system and remain searchable.
 - e. RECYCLE. This status decision returns the request to the approval group in the preceding approval process step. This decision usually indicates that the requestor must modify the request by uploading revised documents and/or forms, after which the request can again be considered by the approval group to which the request was recycled.
 - f. TABLE. This status decision maintains the request at the current approval process step, typically for later review by the AAC.
5. *Additional Information.* If you need any additional information from the faculty regarding the request, send these to the Office of Institutional Assessment (assessment@aa.ufl.edu) by **12 noon on the Friday before the meeting where the request is on the agenda.**

6. *Recommendations.* Each team Lead enters the recommendations and comments in a shared spreadsheet (List of Actions) by **12 noon on the Monday before the meeting where the request is on the agenda.** At the meeting, each Team Lead presents recommendations to the full committee for discussion and voting.
7. *Final decisions.* The Committee Chair enters the committee's final decisions into the approval system.

Voting

The full committee votes on all recommendations.

1. *Quorum.* A quorum is established when 6 members, or 50%, are present for voting. Members can be present in person or virtually.
2. *Voting.* After discussion of the team's recommendation, the committee reaches consensus on the status of the request. The vote takes place after consensus is reached.
3. *Decision.* The committee's decision is considered final with a majority vote.
4. *Ties.* In the event of a tie, if no consensus can be reached, the request will be recycled for additional information to address the committee's concerns.

Electronic Meetings

When there are less than three items for discussion and voting, there will be no formal meeting. The committee is notified via e-mail when the meeting is conducted electronically, and they receive the shared documents (i.e., Google doc), as well as a link to an AAC electronic meeting Qualtrics form to collect their votes.

Process

1. All requests are sent to the entire committee via email with a link to an AAC electronic meeting Qualtrics form.
2. After reviewing the requests, committee members enter their comments/recommendations and votes into Qualtrics.
3. Once all committee members have entered their decisions, these are tallied, and the Chair takes the appropriate action.

SACSCOC Principle 8.2.a - Student Learning Outcomes – Educational Programs

Principle 8.2.a. The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results for student learning outcomes for each of its educational programs. (SACSCOC 2018, p. 68)

How SACSCOC defines an academic program

For purposes of this standard, an academic program is a credential as defined by the institution. A degree with a defined major is clearly a program. Programs in the same field but taught at different levels (e.g., a BBA and an MBA) are typically viewed as distinct programs.

What SACSCOC expects:

1. The expectation is that the institution will engage in ongoing planning and assessment to ensure that for each academic program, the institution develops and assesses expected student learning outcomes.
2. Expected student learning outcomes specify the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes students are expected to attain in courses or in a program.
3. Methods for assessing the extent to which students achieve these outcomes are appropriate to the nature of the discipline and consistent over time to enable the institution to evaluate cohorts of students who complete courses or a program.
4. Shared widely within and across programs, the results of this assessment can affirm the institution's success at achieving its mission and can be used to inform decisions about curricular and programmatic revisions.
5. Program and learning outcomes and assessment methods are evaluated and revised at appropriate intervals. (SACSCOC 2018, pp. 68-69)

Source:

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges [SACSCOC] (2018). *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement (3rd ed., first printing)*. Decatur, GA: Author.

How the Academic Assessment Committee Ensures that UF Meets Principle 8.2.a

What SACSCOC Expects	How UF Meets the Expectations	Academic Assessment Committee Review
1. The expectation is that the institution will engage in ongoing planning and assessment to ensure that for each academic program, the institution develops and assesses expected student learning outcomes.	Each academic program - undergraduate, graduate, professional, and certificate is required to establish student learning outcomes and assess them.	The Academic Assessment Committee reviews all outcomes and approves them or requests modifications/additional information as needed.
2. Expected student learning outcomes specify the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes students are expected to attain in courses or in a program.	UF Undergraduate outcomes fall into three broad categories: knowledge, critical thinking, and communication. UF Graduate and Professional outcomes fall into three broad categories: knowledge, professional behavior, and skills.	The Academic Assessment Committee ensures that the outcome categories are represented in the programs. <u>Exception</u> : Certificates, which are required to have only one outcome from one category.
3. Methods for assessing the extent to which students achieve these outcomes are appropriate to the nature of the discipline and consistent over time to enable the institution to evaluate cohorts of students who complete courses or a program.	Academic assessment plans and data reports provide the methodologies that faculty use to assess the outcomes.	The Academic Assessment Committee evaluates the methodologies and approves them or requests modification/additional information as needed.
4. Shared widely within and across programs, the results of this assessment can affirm the institution's success at achieving its mission and can be used to inform decisions about curricular and programmatic revisions.	UF publicly presents student performance on the outcomes in each program through its SLO Dashboard .	The Academic Assessment Committee does not review the dashboard.
5. Program and learning outcomes and assessment methods are evaluated and revised at appropriate intervals.	Academic assessment plans and data reports provide Curriculum Maps for undergraduate programs and Assessment timelines for graduate and professional programs. Undergraduate curriculum maps are published for each program in the Undergraduate catalog . Graduate SLOs are in the Graduate Catalog .	The Academic Assessment Committee reviews all Curriculum Maps for undergraduate programs and Assessment timelines for graduate and professional programs and approves them or requests modifications/additional information as needed.

Academic Assessment Committee - Committee Responsibilities

Responsibility	Anticipated Tasks
The Academic Assessment Committee shall review Academic Learning Compacts (ALC) and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) developed by each unit in order to assess their feasibility and consistency with UF Institutional Assessment processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review SLO proposals for new programs; review revisions of existing SLOs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take action on all new and revised SLOs. Review and approve new academic assessment plans for 2022-23. Review and approve all justifications for double-counted credits in combination, joint, and dual degrees
The Committee will review and advise the General Education Committee regarding the institutional assessment plan for General Education and <i>UF Quest</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make recommendations for modification to the General Education/UF Quest assessment process as needed. Take approval action on modifications.
The committee will review all Academic Assessment Plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review representative samples for approval. Review and approve program goals.
The committee will advise Institutional Assessment on all matters related to assessment of academic programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Academic Assessment processes and modify as needed. Review faculty resources and provide recommendations for improvements. Discuss and recommend new content for faculty assessment supporting materials. Guide the development of online modules for faculty on assessment processes. Discuss/develop a faculty and/or program recognition process.
The Committee will discuss approaches to the development of institutional student learning outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop standards and processes for validity and reliability for student learning assessments.
Contribute to the success of the assessment conference, <i>Assessment in Higher Education: Enhancing Institutional Excellence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in the development and implementation of the 2023 assessment conference.
Contribute to the continuation of the UF journal, <i>The Journal of Assessment in Higher Education</i> .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider Serving as special reviewers when appropriate, recommend potential author contributors
Other duties as needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined.

About the AAC: <http://fora.aa.ufl.edu/University/JointCommittees/Academic-Assessment-Committee>

Appendices

Appendix 1. FLSUS Board of Governors 8.016 Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

(1) Policies and Procedures

- (a) Each board of trustees shall require its university to establish a process for certifying that each baccalaureate graduate has completed a program with clearly articulated expected core student learning outcomes.
- (b) Each university shall develop processes to ensure that:
 - 1. program faculty develop and publish an Academic Learning Compact for each baccalaureate program that, at a minimum,
 - a. outlines expected core student learning outcomes in the areas of content/discipline knowledge and skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills;
 - b. takes into consideration perspectives of appropriate constituencies (including but not limited to potential employers and graduate programs) regarding the knowledge and skills graduates need in the global marketplace and society; and
 - c. lists the types of assessments students may encounter in the program (e.g., capstone projects, juried performances, standardized exams, common embedded exam questions, portfolio requirements, etc.);
 - 2. program faculty develop methods for assessing student achievement of the expected core student learning outcomes within the context of the program;
 - 3. university personnel use program evaluation systems (which may include sampling) to evaluate the program and related assessment practices to analyze their efficacy in determining whether program graduates have achieved the expected core student learning outcomes; and
 - 4. university personnel use the evaluation results to improve student learning and program effectiveness.
- (c) As appropriate, this regulation shall support and be supported by regional and specialized accreditation efforts, as well as the program review procedures in Regulation 8.015.

(2) Products

- (a) A current hard copy or a URL (Web link) to an electronic version of the university-wide regulation or policy and related procedures regarding Academic Learning Compacts, related assessment mechanisms, program evaluation, and continuous improvement expectations shall be provided to the Board of Governors Office.
- (b) Each Academic Learning Compact shall be made available (using student-friendly, jargon-free language) on the university's Web site.

- (c) As requested by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee, university personnel shall submit to the Board of Governors Office periodic status reports on Academic Learning Compacts, related assessment mechanisms, program evaluation, and continuous improvement processes. The articulation and assessment of expected core student learning outcomes, as well as program evaluation and improvement, shall occur on a continuous basis.

Authority: Section 7(d), Art IX, Fla. Const.; History: New 3-29-07, Amended 01- 19-12.

Appendix 2. University of Florida Policy for Combination, Joint, And Dual Degrees

I. INTRODUCTION

Combination, joint, and dual degree programs are specialized pathways that provide academically qualified students the opportunity to enhance their educational experience and strengthen their career preparation or readiness for future academic pursuits.

II. POLICY

1. Definitions

- a. *Academically qualified student.* Academically qualified students are those who meet program-defined academic criteria and exhibit the potential for success in the combination, joint, or dual-degree program as determined by the faculty.
- b. *Approved student.* Approved students are academically qualified and have been approved by the faculty to enter a combination, joint, or dual-degree program. Approved students also have enough remaining credit hours in their program to accommodate double-counted credits in the combination, joint, or dual degree program.
- c. *Admitted student.* Admitted students are those who have been approved for a combination, joint, or dual-degree program and have been formally admitted to the associated baccalaureate, graduate or professional program at the University of Florida and/or the partner institution.
- d. *Combination Degree.* A combination degree program, sometimes referred to as a combined degree program, is one where the University of Florida awards more than one degree from an overlapping course of study. Combination degrees often allow a shorter time for completion due to the sharing of some coursework between the degree programs (these result in *double-counted credits*; see Item 3 in this policy). At the University of Florida, this type of program includes any combination of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs.
- e. *Dual Degree.* A dual degree program (also called a *dual academic award*) is one whereby student study at the University of Florida *and* at another institution, and each institution awards a separate program completion credential bearing its own name, seal, and signature.
- f. *Joint Degree.* A joint degree program (or joint academic award) is one whereby students study at the University of Florida and one or more participant institutions and are awarded a single program completion credential bearing the names, seals, and signatures of each of the participant institutions.

- g. *Double-counted credits.* Double-counted credits, sometimes referred to as overlapping or shared credits, are those that a student earns in a degree program that are also applied to (or counted toward) another degree program. The principle of double-counted credits allows the student to earn two degrees without any loss of integrity, quality, or coherence of the two degrees for fewer total credit hours than would normally be required if both academic degree programs were taken independently.
- h. *Justification for double-counted credits.* Academic programs must provide a clear academic justification for the use of double-counted credits that provides evidence that the integrity and quality of each program is not compromised. The justification should address (a) how the shared credits meet the requirements of both degrees, (b) how the combination, joint, or dual degree program present a coherent course of study, and (c) the process used to determine this.

Justifications typically include program-defined admissions requirements, evidence that the student will be able to meet student learning outcomes for both programs successfully with no loss of fidelity, the relevance of the combination, joint, or dual-degree program to the student's desired outcomes, and any other evidence that the student will succeed in and benefit from the combination program.

- i. *Participant Institution.* These are institutions that partner with the University of Florida for joint and dual degree programs.
- j. *Coherent course of study.* At the University of Florida, all approved academic programs present a coherent course of study. This is evidenced by the logical, sequential, and consistent nature of the programs. Combination, joint, and dual degree programs preserve this coherence.

2. Responsibility

a. Faculty

The responsibility for developing combination, joint, and dual-degree programs resides with the faculty in each academic program. Proposals should be submitted when faculty identify student demand, employment demand, or a justified substantial pedagogical interest that best serves the student.

b. Administration and Proposal Routing

Requests for combination, dual, and joint degrees must follow the appropriate routing in the UF Approval Tracking System. All combination, joint, and dual degree programs must be reported to the Office of Institutional Assessment at least six months in advance of their implementation.

3. Justification of Double-counted Credit Hours

a. Combination degrees.

i. *Baccalaureate/Masters and Baccalaureate/Professional.*

1. All double-counted credits must be justified in the proposal as described in Item II(1)(h) in this policy. In this policy, double-counted credits *do not* include those that are transferred according to the [University of Florida Transfer Credit Policy](#) for undergraduate programs, and the [Masters, PhD, and nontraditional program](#) transfer of credit policies.
2. *Up to 12 credit hours of double-counted credit.* Upon review by each degree program's department and college curriculum committee, the Dean, the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, the University Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Council, the Director of Institutional Assessment and the Provost, **up to 12 credit hours** of graduate coursework may be double-counted toward an undergraduate degree and a graduate degree.
3. *Additional hours of double-counted credits beyond 12.* If the program faculty wish to double count **13 or more hours** of graduate credit toward the baccalaureate and master's degree, the proposal may include a request for the additional hours. A separate justification is required for the additional hours beyond 12 and should present a strong case for how the additional hours preserve the quality and coherence of the combined programs.
4. *Individual student exceptions.* A program may petition on behalf of an individual admitted student for an exception to item II(3)(a)(ii)(2) with justification that the additional hours beyond 12 credits preserve the quality and coherence of each program comprising the combination.
5. Undergraduate credit coursework **may not be** double counted toward the graduate degree.
6. At least 50% (at least one-half) of the credits required for completion of the graduate degree in the combination must be earned after the student has been formally admitted to the graduate degree program.
7. The resulting combination program will consist of at least 120 credit hours counted toward the undergraduate degree and at least 30 credit hours counted toward the graduate degree, with up to 12 credit hours of double-counted graduate coursework.

8. Graduate courses counted toward the undergraduate degree must be appropriate for that degree program, consistent with the SACSCOC requirement that degree programs embody a coherent course of study, as well as all other principles contained in the SACSCOC Policy on Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees. The integrity and coherence of the graduate program shall be maintained so that the graduate courses are progressively more rigorous than the undergraduate courses.
9. Program faculty will set appropriate admissions standards to ensure that students are academically qualified and prepared for graduate-level coursework.

ii. *Graduate/Professional.*

1. The combinations must have a minimum combination total of 60 unduplicated graduate or professional credit hours.
2. In combinations where one of the graduate or professional degrees has been approved by the University Curriculum Committee at fewer than 30 credit hours, or the program is approved by the area's professional disciplinary accreditor as appropriate at fewer than 30 credit hours, justification is required for the combination. Justification typically rests on the fact that one of the two associated graduate or professional degrees exceeds the 30-credit minimum so that the total credit hour combination meets or exceeds 60.
3. In combinations where the two programs double count credits, justification is required for the double-counted credits (see Item 1[h] in this policy).

b. Dual degrees.

- i. Dual degree programs that share credits must academically justify the double-counted credits [see Item (II)(1)(h) in this policy].
- ii. Each institution may choose to transfer credits between or among the programs. If transfer credits are part of the agreement, these must be clearly explicated in the agreement.

4. Proposal

Faculty interested in creating a new combination, joint or dual degree program should complete the appropriate proposal form available in the Approval System. The proposal should include the following information.

a. Proposal Purpose

- i. Define the purpose for proposing the program and the benefits of establishing the program.
- ii. Justify the program in intellectual and pedagogical terms (see Items II(1)(h), II(3)(a)(i), II(3)(a)(ii), and II(3)(a)(iii) in this policy).
- iii. Identify the individual responsible for program.

b. Approval and Admission Requirements, Student Application Procedures, and Advising

- i. The proposal must explain the process for determining that a student is academically qualified for the combination, joint, or dual-degree program.
- ii. The proposal must explain the process for approving students to enter the combination, joint, or dual-degree program, including the eligibility period when a student can apply for the program.
- iii. The proposal must explain the admissions requirements to the associated graduate or professional program, including but not limited to the minimum GPA, GRE score (when appropriate), and the application procedures.

c. Curriculum

- i. The core requirements of each academic program and available electives (along with the associated hours).
- ii. Provide the curriculum for the proposed program.
- iii. Explicitly identify and justify, both intellectually and pedagogically, specific courses designated as “shared credits” and explain how integrity and quality are not compromised for either degree program.

5. Assessment

- a. Assessment of student learning and program outcomes shall be as follows.
 - i. **Combination degree programs.** Assessment shall be at the individual degree program level.
 - ii. **Joint degree programs.** Assessment shall be shared by the institutions contributing to the degree. Each institution shall follow their institutional processes for assessment planning and reporting.
 - iii. **Dual degree programs.** Assessment shall be completed by each individual institution according to their institutional processes for assessment planning and reporting.

6. Termination of a Combination, Joint, or Dual Degree program

- a. If the University of Florida or the participant institution discontinues the combination, joint, or dual degree program, it will be necessary for the student to complete the requirements for each academic program separately.
- b. If any of the individual programs that comprise the combination or dual degree is closed, the institution is responsible for following its regional accreditor's teachout policy.

7. Degree Conferral

1. A student enrolled in a combination program will earn the degrees as follows.
 - i. *Baccalaureate/Graduate and Baccalaureate/Professional degree combinations.* The degrees will be earned in one of two ways, at the discretion of the college:
 1. Baccalaureate degree(s) will be earned upon completion of the undergraduate program(s), and master's and/or professional degree upon completion of the graduate/professional degree program, or
 2. The degrees will be conferred upon the completion of the combination.
 - ii. *Graduate/Professional combinations.* The degrees will be conferred upon completion of the combination.
2. Upon completion of a joint degree program, the student will earn one degree from the participant institutions.

3. Upon completion of a dual degree program, a student will earn two separate degrees, one from each participant institution.

III. JUSTIFICATION AND REVIEW OF THIS POLICY

1. This policy is supported and justified by requirements stated in the following standards and policies from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges [Resource Manual](#) (2018).
 - a. Standard 9.2, Program Length; Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees.
 - b. Standard 9.1, Program content (Program Coherence).
 - c. Standard 9.6, Post-Baccalaureate Rigor and Curriculum.
 - d. Standard 10.7, Policies for Awarding Credit.
 - e. Standard 10.8, Evaluating and Awarding Academic Credit.
 - f. Standard 10.9, Cooperative Academic Arrangements.
 - g. SACSCOC [Policy](#), *The Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees*
2. Periodic Review
 - a. Combined, joint, and dual degree programs will be reviewed every seven (7) years by the appropriate committees, councils, and administrators.
 - b. This policy will be reviewed every five (5) years by the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Director of Institutional Assessment.
 - c. Ultimate review responsibility and authority is with the Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

History:
8/5/2019, original
12/20/19, revised
1/15/2020, final
Approved by APC 5.8.2020