



STATUS REPORT ON STRATEGIC PLANNING, ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM REVIEW

JULY 1, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LSSU Mission/Vision/Values	2
Development of CAFE Strategic Plan	3
LSSU Strategic Plan	8
Lake Superior State University - Assessment Vocabulary.....	10
LSSU Planning Units	13
Recommendation for Program-level ILO Implementation	15
Operational and Student Support Program Review – Template	17
College Program Review – Academic Template	19
Focused Visit on Program Review.....	22
Next Steps January 2018.....	23
Goal Setting Templates:.....	25
HLC Accreditation Update May 2, 2018.....	28

LSSU Mission/Vision/Values

LSSU MISSION STATEMENT

We equip our graduates with the knowledge, practical skills and inner strength to craft a life of meaningful employment, personal fulfillment, and generosity of self, all while enhancing the quality of life in the Upper Great Lakes region. *Approved by the Board of Trustees Nov. 3, 2017*

LSSU VISION STATEMENT

We capitalize on our unique location and mission as a regional state university to be a model for educational innovation and a preferred partner for U.S. and Canadian community and tribal colleges. *Approved by the Board of Trustees Nov. 3, 2017*

LSSU VALUES STATEMENT

Core Values

- **Excellence in Teaching and Learning.** Teaching is our first priority and focuses on providing student/faculty interaction, learning, and research in current, relevant programs.
- **Opportunity.** Students have a wide range of opportunities to grow academically, professionally, culturally and socially. Opportunities are provided via work-study assignments, student organizations, internships, community outreach and leadership.
- **Diversity.** Students experience a campus community environment which is inclusive and welcoming.
- **Ethics and Values.** The University promotes an environment which values honesty, openness, and courteous behavior where everyone is treated with respect.
- **Stewardship.** LSSU provides a framework in which to leave the university and region financially and environmentally sound for future generations of LSSU students, alumni, and friends.

Approved by the Board of Trustees, November 11, 2011

Development of CAFE Strategic Plan

Events during 2014

In November 2014 the Board of Trustees and Cabinet hosted a retreat which included the President, the faculty chair of shared governance oversight and others. Out of this dialog, a number of key outcomes were established, including Board committee structure, establishing goals for newly appointed President Pleger, examining the shared governance structure, and updating the strategic planning process. Furthermore, the University has established a set of four overarching goals, that are aligned with the mission, and that encapsulate the seven existing critical outcomes identified in the 2012 strategic plan. The goals have been widely incorporated into our campus dialogs, including discussions of an integrated service model and the President's presentation on the LSSU Transformational Plan. These goals are the basis of the acronym "CAFE". • Culture • Academics • Finance • Enrollment/Student Experience. The seven strategies of the previous strategic plan were consolidated or subsumed under the four overarching goals identified by the BOT.

Events during 2015

1. March 2015 Reporting on institutional activities related to the Four Goals (subsuming the former seven strategies) begins. A new integrated graphic shows the relationship of the four goals to the seven strategies.
2. Dec 8 – Campus Dialog on HLC Criterion 5: Resources Planning and Institutional Effectiveness – discussion including CAFE goals

Events during 2016

1. May 2 – The Laker CAFÉ graphic rolled out identifying how the four goals (A - Cultural Change, C – Educational Delivery Toward Excellence, D – Revenue Expansion and B Communication, Public Relations Visibility) subsumed the seven original strategies and were now renamed under the CAFÉ label: Culture Academics Finance and Enrollment
2. Nov 7 – HLC Peer Reviewers conduct reaffirmation review and campus site visit:
In discussions with the President, faculty and staff, they shared that the CAFE--Culture, Academics, Finance, and Enrollment--areas of focus were used as the guiding strategic plan for the campus. The strategic plan is a work in progress and was still being formalized during the visit.
3. Nov 28 – email to committee appointees to joint planning meeting
4. Dec 5 – CAFE committee meeting.
Q: do the committees make decisions. A: they make recommendations to the President.
5. Dec 16 – Campus Collegium – CAFE committee reports
6. Dec 17 – draft charges to committee
7. Dec 19 – Charges to Strategic Planning Committees – email from Dr. Pleger
8. December 2016 – HLC Peer Review Team issues final report:
LSSU's last strategic plan ended in 2015, and the campus has begun to form a new one. There is strong evidence of inclusivity in the process, as faculty, staff, and students could articulate the

Laker CAFÉ (Culture, Academics, Finance, Enrollment) priorities. These priorities have not yet resulted in specific goals, plans, timelines, and budgets. Articulating these clearly will be important, especially as the University seeks to build a culture of shared governance and as limited resources will force them to prioritize their planning.

9. April 2016 – Strategic Planning units Tracdat reports aggregate strategic activity reports by Goal
10. May 12 – President Pleger articulates the university top four goals at a University All-Campus Meeting. Includes discussion of academic restructuring.

Events during 2017

1. Feb 7 – Institutional Assessment (shared governance structure)
2. Feb 7 – Institutional implementation next steps – basic
3. Feb 8 – Implementation next-step checklist, including Charges to committee, semester timeline, draft format for goals
4. Feb 8 – CAFÉ Implementation Steps – with VENN diagram
5. Feb 9 – Leadership forum
6. Feb 10 – draft graphic for CAFE
7. Feb 14 – Campus Collegium – CAFE update
8. Feb 14 – CAFÉ Committee Functions – with draft schedule
9. Feb 17 – Deans and Chairs – CAFE schedule, committees serve as peer-reviewers
10. Feb 17 – CAFE graphic development – memo to Cabinet
11. Mar 10 – lighthouse graphic and Assessment Vocabulary – distributed to campus.

CAFE Implementation Steps distributed

12. Mar 13 – draft rationale and goal statements
13. Mar 14 – Academic Senate - distribution of goals and vocabulary – campus feedback by email
14. Mar 17 – Deans and Chair leadership group – review of goals
15. Mar 20 – Campus Collegium – CAFÉ updates, review of Mar 13 session to draft 6-10 then condense down to 2-3
16. Mar 21 – campus survey using Survey Monkey to gather feedback on strategies, rationale and goals
17. Mar 27 – CAFE committee goal writing workshop – ‘each committee will submit recommendations for the summary statements and rationale’ – campus survey feedback distributed and reviewed prior to consolidation of draft goals – 14 survey respondents
18. Mar 30 – Campus Collegium – CAFE update
19. Apr 6 – email to faculty and staff with goal survey and draft (Apr 10) master goal summary
20. Apr 7 – Staff Senate to review CAFE goals
21. Apr 10 – Distributed draft goals (sent by email date Apr 10) each committee reported – committees will be “bringing a recommendation to campus soon”
22. April 18 – update at President’s Cabinet meeting
23. April 21 – Deans and Chair Leadership Group reviews draft goals, input and feedback solicited – goals still need standardization in format and structure
24. May 4 – CAFE draft goals reviewed with Board in closed session

25. May 5 – Board charges administration to move forward with implementation of CAFE draft goals and to review/revise the University Mission/Vision statements with final recommendations for the January Board of Trustee meeting
26. May 7 – first cut at revision to standardize language. For example, consistent use of phrasing such as “LSSU will develop ...” and “We seek ...”
27. June 26 – VP Review and edits including streamlining some phrasing, and adapting each set of master goals to include some element related to continuous improvement
28. June 27 – Cabinet final review and edits – largely grammar and style. Distribution to Strategic Committees for final review
29. September 27 – President’s Cabinet begins discussion and refinement of new mission and vision statements
30. October 5 – President’s email to campus outlines the rationale and justification for a revised mission/vision.
31. November 3, 2017 – Board of Trustees approves Mission and Vision Statements, and establishes Institutional Learning Outcomes

Mission Statement

We equip our graduates with the knowledge, practical skills and inner strength to craft a life of meaningful employment, personal fulfillment, and generosity of self, all while enhancing the quality of life of the Upper Great Lakes region.

Vision Statement

We capitalize on our unique location and mission as a regional state university to be a model for educational innovation and a preferred partner for U.S. and Canadian community and tribal colleges.

Institutional Learning Outcomes

- **Formal Communication** Students will develop and clearly express complex ideas in written and oral presentations.
 - **Use of Evidence** Students will identify the need for, gather, and accurately process the appropriate type, quality, and quantity of evidence to answer a complex question or solve a complex problem.
 - **Analysis and Synthesis** Students will organize and synthesize evidence, ideas, or works of imagination to answer an open-ended question, draw a conclusion, achieve a goal, or create a substantial work of art.
 - **Professional Responsibility** Students will demonstrate the ability to apply professional ethics and intercultural competence when answering a question, solving a problem, or achieving a goal.
32. December 1, 2017 – Senior Management Team affirms the 2018-2023 CAFE Strategic Plan and LSSU Assessment Vocabulary.
 33. December 15, 2017 – Board of Trustees approves the LSSU Strategic Direction plan which aligns academics into five colleges

Events during 2018

34. January 5, 2018 – Senior Management Team reviews the current version of this report noting the need to next affirm the LSSU planning units
35. January 11, 2018 – LSSU Planning Units are defined. Refined in June 2018 following reorganization that placed Mathematics/Computer Science within the College of Innovation and Solutions; moved all Information Technology and Enterprise Services to VPEM, and added Center for Freshwater Research and Education as a discrete unit of Academic Affairs
36. January 30, 2018 – Planning Unit Program Goal Setting template reviewed with Cabinet, a tool for development of goals and strategies to address the CAFE and ILO goals. Reviewed with Provost Council on Jan. 31.
37. January 31, 2018 – Joint Curriculum and General Education Committee approve plan for First-year experience integrated into program-required course of 1 or more credits.
38. February 12, 2018 – Senior Management Team completes final review of Operational and Student Support templates.
39. February 13, 2018 – adopted Program Review templates for Colleges (intention to adapt language at school level) and Operational Units, as defined in Step 34.
40. February 14, 2018 - Final review of Program Review templates for Colleges completed with Provost Council
41. February 16, 2018 – College Program Review template complete final review with the Deans and Chairs Leadership Group
42. February 19, 2018 – President finalizes and distributes the College and Operational/Student Support program review templates to university community. Deadline for completion set at April 6 (we were afraid a deadline of April 1 wouldn't be taken seriously).
43. April 18, 2018 – Memo on Academic Program Assessment (a precursor to program review) requesting that for each degree program course-level outcomes be reviewed by June 1, that a faculty contact be identified for each degree program by May 8, that every degree program have at documented assessment of at least one goal by June 1, and at least two goals (including one Institutional Learning Outcome) by December 1, 2018.
44. May 3, 2018 HLC Accreditation Update prepared for incoming President Hanley and Provost Gillette, distributed to Board of Trustees and to the university community May 15, 2018. Update provides status and timelines leading to March 2019 Focused Visit.
45. May 14, 2018 Deans and Chairs Leadership Group provided comprehensive list of all course learning goal statements, guidance on the review process, and a target of June 1 to review and update course-level student learning outcomes to reflect student-focus.
46. May 14, 2018 Deans provided program outcome reports for their areas with list of program outcome statements. Sample memo to the schools giving directions for the review and editing of those outcomes. June 1 target to ensure that every program had assessment on at least one program-level student learning outcome.

47. May 22, 2018 Memo to President's Cabinet reinforcing the Accreditation Update memo, and a second packet with the list of planning units, template for building goals, list of CAFE goals, and a training sample on goal writing.
48. June 6, 2018 Provost Council agenda reviews expectations and status for degree program outcomes, course-outcomes, program assessment and school-level assessment. Program champion list reviewed
49. June 27, 2018 Assessment reports distributed to Deans and Chairs Leadership Group: 1) Course Student Learning Outcomes – a table for each course listing learning goals; 2) Program Outcome Review – a table for each degree program listing the student learning goals; 3) Assessment Reporting Unit – a four-column assessment report for each program – used to scan each degree program for recent activity in evaluating program-level goals.
50. June 27, 2018, update to May memo to Cabinet regarding the establishment of planning units in January, and templates for the development of planning unit goals.

2018-2023 LSSU Strategic Plan

Approved December 1, 2017



Culture

LSSU will develop a culture of open communication and engagement fostering an enriching academic experience focused on a sense of community across campus, and connection to the Eastern Upper Peninsula. We seek to maximize individual voices in within our campus and community. With a commitment to our core values and teamwork across all departments, we can harness our unique talents and enrich our students' educational experiences. We strive to foster a culture of lifelong learning, integrity, and service by engaging students both in and outside of the university.

CAFE Master Goals for Culture:

1. We cultivate an environment of inclusion where all members treat others with dignity and respect.
2. We cultivate open communication, engagement, and behaviors that strengthen community, across campus and in the wider region.
3. We cultivate continuous self-improvement through service, assessment, and accountability.

Academics

LSSU will develop and embrace an educational environment that is at once informing and informed; respecting and cultivating knowledge, resources, and talent contributing to the local and global community. We seek to maximize our institutional potential by promoting collaborative and transformational learning. We provide learning environments which are responsive and inclusive. We embrace an intentional, high quality, and consistent educational experience.

CAFE Master Goals for Academics:

1. We will cultivate continuous academic and co-curricular improvement to provide relevant programs and support services.

2. We will cultivate student educational experiences that add value and allow students to reach their full potential.
3. We will cultivate programs that support individual growth within the curricular, co-curricular, and non-curricular realms culminating in degree completion and endorsement of lifelong learning.

Finance

LSSU will develop operational methodologies that are open and transparent to cultivate trust both internally and externally, and enable informed decision-making regarding stewardship and use of available resources. We seek to ensure the institution's resources are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of educational offerings, and plan for the future. We seek flexibility through resource allocation to address changing needs and opportunities. We seek sustainability through plans which are evaluated in order to accommodate both short and long term needs, and ensure that consequences of the decisions are considered.

CAFE Master Goals for Finance:

1. We will cultivate a culture of continuous improvement through accountability and sustainability practices, regular financial reviews, and periodic reporting.
2. We will cultivate data-informed budgetary processes that are open, transparent, and in alignment with institutional priorities.
3. We will cultivate viable entrepreneurial efforts to efficiently support evolving institutional needs, and to support new financially-viable, mission-driven opportunities.

Enrollment

LSSU will develop and implement systematic and integrated approaches to meet student enrollment goals. We seek to make enrollment decisions that reflect the mission of the institution and serve a broadly defined student population through goals which are developed, communicated, assessed, and updated annually. We seek to promote open communication and planning to establish institutional targets that are reflective of demographics and aligned with ongoing strategic decision-making for the campus.

1. We will cultivate, maintain, and support an enrollment management strategic plan that will center on programs and activities that reach enrollment goals.
2. We will cultivate collaborations with external and internal groups to promote student development and success.
3. We will cultivate continuous improvement of the student experience through data-informed decision making and student input.

Lake Superior State University - Assessment Vocabulary

Approved December 1, 2017.

This document establishes an institutional standard for the common terminology used in assessment of student learning outcomes, strategic planning goals, institutional effectiveness, and excellence.

Assessment: a process of establishing clearly stated goals and effective processes for evaluating the achievement of student learning, and institutional goals. Information gained from the process of assessment is used to guide improvement; and must be based on processes and methodologies which reflect good practice, and which incorporate the substantial participation of faculty and staff.

Benchmark: A criteria of measurement or standard of performance which uses peer performance data in the evaluation of institutional progress made in achieving a particular goal or strategy (Suskie, 2004).

Goal: First-level action item in Planning Units' individual strategic plans which operationalizes the University's Master Goals or the Planning Unit's mission. Writing SMART Goals (an acronym based upon: specific-measurable-agreed upon-realistic-time based) helps focus on developing goals that are clear, specific, and reachable. (Master Goal > **Goal** > Strategy/Measure > Finding > Action)

Institutional Effectiveness: An overarching and ongoing process of evaluation of the quality and efficiency in which an organization attains its mission, supporting planning, budgeting, and resource allocation. Institutional Effectiveness, the topic of HLC Criterion 5 (Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness) when fully permeating the life of the University,

- incorporates an ongoing process of quality improvement;
- provides measurable goals and outcomes for all areas;
- collects and evaluates data at regular intervals to measure the achievement of goals;
- engages a process of continuous review of data in support of data-informed decision-making.

Key Performance Indicator (KPI): A measure of an essential performance outcome of a particular organizational performance activity or an important indicator of a precise health condition of an organization. Commonly based on an aggregate of related objectives, used to generate a single reporting value used for dashboards or performance scorecards. KPIs are used to evaluate progress in achieving Master Goals, and Planning Units may also develop specific KPIs to track their performance in key areas.

Learning Goal: A type of Goal focused on student learning; "the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and habits of mind that students take with them from a learning experience" (Suskie, 2004, p. 75). Learning Goals developed for courses and programs may sometimes be referred to as learning outcomes or specifically, student learning outcomes (SLOs).

Master Goals: Fundamental constructs necessary for a university to achieve its definition of excellence. Key Performance Indicators are the primary indices of achievement. Depending on the context, for example a Master Goal may be referred to as a CAFÉ Master Goal or College Master Goal. Master Goals do not have strategies-measures for their direct assessment but aggregate assessment findings from Planning Units can be the basis of a finding and KPI metric related to the Master Goal. CAFÉ Goals are Master Goals. (**Master Goal** > Goal > Strategy/Measure > Finding > Action)

Measures: Specific, measurable actions, and target performance criteria, taken to illustrate achievement of the components of a goal through a specific strategy.

(Master Goal > Goal > Strategy/**Measures** > Finding > Action)

Metrics: Standards of measurement; i.e., a macro-term for benchmarks and key performance indicators.

Mission: A broad statement explaining an organization's overall emphases, providing a definition of why it exists and a general direction for its activities. Mission statements are generally interchangeable with other institutions of similar nature.

Planning Units: Operational entities of the university, assigned specific functionalities and supported by institutional budgets, which develop their own strategic plans in support of institutional goals. Examples of Planning Units include Schools, Departments, or other organizational units.

Strategic Directions: Broad focus areas identified by the university that translate the mission statement and vision statement into categories that lend themselves to measuring the level of success attained. Strategic Directions usually encompass one or more Master Goals and often have a two-to-three-year focus period. The CAFÉ themes represent Strategic Directions.

Strategic Planning: "A formal process designed to help an organization identify and maintain an optimal alignment with the most important elements of its environment (Rowley and Sherman, 2001, p. 328).

Strategy: "An agreed-upon course of action and direction that changes the relationship, or maintains an alignment that helps to assure a more optimal relationship, between the institution and its environment" (Rowley and Sherman, 2001, p. 328). A strategy is operationalized as a "second-level" definition of a goal, providing direction for, and constraints on, administrative and operational activities to achieve the unit's goal. (Master Goal > Goal > **Strategy**/Measures > Finding > Action)


Value Statements: Those components of the university that will remain inviolate, regardless of environmental changes, programmatic shifts, etc.

Vision: What the university aspires to be.

References:

- Rowley, D., and Sherman, H. (2001). *From strategy to change: Implementing the plan in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Suskie, L. (2004). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*. Bolton, MA: Anker Books.

Rev. date: December 1, 2017



Based on <http://www.angelo.edu/services/strategy/vocabulary.php>

3/19/2017

LSSU Planning Units

Approved January 2017*

The LSSU Assessment Vocabulary document establishes a common terminology for assessment of student learning outcomes, strategic planning goals, institutional effectiveness, and excellence. Planning Units are defined as “Operational entities of the university, assigned specific functionalities and supported by institutional budgets, which develop their own strategic plans in support of institutional goals.

Academic Affairs

1. Academic Operations (includes: Academic Success, Career Services, Center for Freshwater Research and Education (CFRE), Grants & Contracts, Library, Records, Regional Centers)
2. Charter Schools
3. College of Criminal Justice and Emergency Responders
 - a. School of Criminal Justice, Fire Science and Emergency Services
4. College of Education and Liberal Arts
 - a. School of Arts and Letters
 - b. School of Education
 - c. School of General Studies
5. College of Health and Behavior
 - a. School of Kinesiology and Behavior Sciences
 - b. School of Nursing
6. College of Innovation and Solutions
 - a. Lukenda School of Business
 - b. School of Engineering and Technology
 - c. School of Mathematics and Computer Science
7. College of Science and the Environment
 - a. School of Natural Resources and Environment
 - b. School of Science and Medicine

Athletics

Enrollment Management, Marketing and IT

1. Admissions
2. Financial Aid
3. Integrated Marketing
4. IT – Enterprise Applications and Institutional Research
5. Technology Services

Finance and Operations

1. Business Office and Purchasing
2. Facilities Management

Human Relations

1. Public Safety
2. Human Resources

Institutional Advancement

Student Life and Retention

1. Campus Life
2. Health and Counseling Services
3. Housing

* June 2018 update to add Center for Freshwater Research and Education and Academic Schools to Academic Affairs, moving Enterprise and Technology Services to VPEMIT

Recommendation for Program-level ILO Implementation

Memo from the General Education Committee with draft timeline for the implementation of Institutional Learning Outcome Assessment at the Program level:

September 27, 2017

David R. Finley, Ph.D., P.E.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (interim)
Lake Superior State University

Dear Dr. Finley:

The General Education Committee affirms the importance of a broad, liberal education for all students who pursue post-secondary credentials. The University's General Education Program has historically used a distributional, inputs model, approving courses within specific disciplinary fields as those which impart broad-based foundational skills. The University has not previously defined Institutional Learning Outcomes, which would reflect the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that all LSSU graduates would demonstrate, and their alignment to academic program, general education outcomes, and outcomes related to student support and co-curricular programs."

In order to enhance student learning and to bring LSSU into compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation highlighted in the Final Report of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) (copied below the signature line of this letter), the General Education Committee, in May 2017, voted to adopt the following Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) (complete ILO recommendation included with this letter):

- **Formal Communication**
Students will develop and clearly express complex ideas in written and oral presentations.
- **Use of Evidence**
Students will identify the need for, gather, and accurately process the appropriate type, quality, and quantity of evidence to answer a complex question or solve a complex problem.
- **Analysis and Synthesis**
Students will organize and synthesize evidence, ideas, or works of imagination to answer an open-ended question, draw a conclusion, achieve a goal, or create a substantial work of art.
- **Professional Responsibility**
Students will demonstrate the ability to apply professional ethics and intercultural competence when answering a question, solving a problem, or achieving a goal.

To make these outcomes true Institutional Learning Outcomes, the General Education Committee makes the following recommendations for their implementation:

- By December 15, 2017, each Program must identify methods and artifacts (e.g. student work which is evidence of achievement) with which to assess achievement of each of these four outcomes at the Program-level, using the rubric provided with the ILOs (see attached document), and report these methods. Schools are encouraged to develop and submit a curriculum map that shows the alignment of program outcomes to the Institutional Learning Outcomes.
- By April 25, 2018, each Program must execute assessment of student achievement relative to each of these four outcomes at the Program-level and report its findings, incorporating the rubric provided.
- By April 25, 2018, each Program must devise an action plan, based on its assessment findings, to sustain and increase student achievement of the ILOs.
- By January 23, 2019, each Program must evaluate the effectiveness of the action taken to increase student achievement relative to the ILOs and report Program-level findings.
- Programs will implement their assessment plan, and maintain documentation of the goals, measures, findings and actions, in the University's resource for institutional assessment: Nuventive Improve™
- The ILO assessment cycle must be repeated no less frequently than once every two (2) years for any given ILO, with at least one ILO assessed each year.
- The General Education Committee will review and provide feedback to programs on the Institutional Learning outcomes annually.

Definitions and clarifications:

- "Program" means an entire School, or smaller unit (e.g., departments, disciplines, or majors) as deemed reasonable by the School, which share common ILO assessments; or a University Planning Unit responsible for Program Review (e.g., student support and co-curricular areas).
- Programs are encouraged to relate existing Program-level outcomes and existing assessment tools with which these ILOs already align.

Sincerely,

The General Education Committee

HLC requirements pertaining to the general education component of Component 4.B, as quoted from pp.35-36 of the HLC Final Report

- *The general education program must engage in the assessment of student learning beyond the identification of course outcomes*
- *The University must identify institutional learning outcomes, measures of learning, findings, and actions to improve learning*
- *The University must identify mechanisms to demonstrate that students are meeting those outcomes; if an external instrument is not used, alternate methods or instruments to measure those outcomes must be identified (e.g., rubrics)*

Operational and Student Support Program Review – Template

February 13, 2018

The HLC Criteria for Accreditation, specifically Core Component 4.A, require institutions to maintain a “practice of regular program review¹” as one component of our ensuring the quality of our educational programs and the evaluating our effectiveness in achieving our stated student learning outcomes. For **non-academic units, “Program” means a University Planning Unit.** This review will include sections which address HLC Core Components related to institutional accreditation, and these are identified in the text where appropriate (e.g. CC 4.A.1), or which address elements of the HLC’s Assumed Practices² (e.g. AP B.1.a).

Operations and Student Support Program Review Reports are due by April 1 of the review year. Brief responses (1-2 pp) should be in the form of narrative, indexed to the prompt, and supported by evidence relative to the activities of the Planning Unit.

1. Operations and Student Support Program Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Provide an introduction to the Planning Unit being reviewed.b) Present the Planning Unit mission statement and evaluate how this is consistent with the LSSU Mission and strategic plan (CC 1.A.2).c) Evaluate the extent to which the Planning Unit mission, and other relevant documents, identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the Program (CC 1.B.3)d) Evaluate the role of the Planning Unit to address the institution’s role in a multicultural society, and the processes and activities which reflect attention to human diversity (CC 1.C.1-2).e) Present evidence of the extent to which the Planning Unit engages with external constituencies and communities of interest within the scope of the program mission and capacity (CC 1.D.3).	
2. Operations and Student Support Program Quality, Resources and Support <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Within the Planning Unit, review evidence that staff members providing student support services, and those providing co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and are supported in their professional development (CC 3.C.6).b) Student Support only, answer where applicable:<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Present evidence that the Planning Unit provides student support services suited to the needs of the student population (CC 3.D.1)ii. Present evidence of effective processes to support the academic needs of all students and for directing students to courses and degree programs for which students are adequately prepared (CC 3.D.2).iii. Present evidence of academic advising support services suited to the University programs and the needs of students (CC 3.D.4)	

¹ <http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/criteria-for-accreditation.html>

² <http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/assumed-practices.html>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Present evidence of student guidance in the effective use of research and information resources (3.D.5). c) Co-Curricular only, answer where applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Present evidence that co-curricular programs are suited to the mission and contribute to the education experience of students (CC 3.E.1) ii. Present evidence that co-curricular programs help the University fulfill claims related to providing an enriched educational environment and student educational experience (CC 3.E.2) 	
<p>3. Operations and Student Support Program Evaluation and Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Present evidence of the Planning Unit's goals for student learning and the processes in place to assess student learning and achievement of these goals (4.B.1). b) Summarize actions taken to engage in continued improvement of student learning which is based on the established learning goals and measures (CC 4.B.2-3). c) Using appropriate Nuventive Improve™ reports where available for the Planning Unit, document clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of the learning goals (CC 4.B.2), and evidence of the use of assessment information to improve student learning (CC 4.B.3). Review evidence of how the processes and methodologies used to assess student learning reflect good practice, including evidence of the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff (CC 4.B.4). d) Summarize the ongoing activities related to improving retention, persistence and degree completion rates for students through the efforts of this program to implement clearly defined goals. For the collection and analysis of information, and for the use of information to make improvements as appropriate (CC 4.C.1-3). 	
<p>4. Operations and Student Support Program Resources, Planning and Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) Evaluate the sufficiency of the fiscal and human resources, and the physical and technological infrastructure to support the Program (CC 5.A.1) f) Summarize one or more examples of how the Planning Unit has linked processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning and budgeting (CC 5.C.2). g) Identify examples of the Planning Unit's consideration of internal and external constituent groups in planning, and how programmatic planning reflects an understanding of the current capacity, challenges and emerging factors (CC 5.C 4-5) 	
<p>5. Other - Present other issues relevant to the Planning Unit review not addressed above (optional)</p>	

College Program Review – Academic Template

Adopted February 13, 2018

The HLC Criteria for Accreditation, specifically Core Component 4.A, require institutions to maintain a “practice of regular program review³” as one component of our ensuring the quality of our educational programs and the evaluating our effectiveness in achieving our stated student learning outcomes. For academic units, “Program” means an entire College. The elements of an Academic Program Review include sections which address HLC Core Components related to institutional accreditation, and these are identified in the text where appropriate (e.g. CC 4.A.1), or which address elements of the HLC’s Assumed Practices⁴ (e.g. AP B.1.a).

Colleges submit an Academic Program Review Report by April 1 of the review year. Responses to each prompt (1-2 pp) should be in the form of narrative, indexed to the prompt numbers, and supported by evidence relevant to the academic degree programs and activities of the College.

1. College Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Provide an introduction to the College, its programs, key initiatives, and history.b) Evaluate the relationship of the College goals to the LSSU Mission and strategic plan. (CC 1.A.2).	
2. College Program Quality, Resources and Support <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Summarize the academic degrees of the College, present evidence that they adhere to commonly accepted program standards, and delineate the College and academic degree learning goals. Verify compliance with institutional policies related to degree requirements (AP B.1).b) Within the College, present evidence that courses and degree programs are current, and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the course and program level (CC 3.A.1).c) Within the College, present evidence that student-learning goals, at the course and degree program level, are student focused, are clearly articulated, and differentiated based on the course and program level (CC 3.A.2).d) Within the College, present evidence that degree program quality and student-learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (CC 3.A.3).e) Within the College, present evidence that students are engaged in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information, in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work, and in developing skills integral to the program (CC 3.B.3).	

³ <http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/criteria-for-accreditation.html>

⁴ <http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/assumed-practices.html>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) Present evidence that College faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to the Program and academic degrees (CC 3.B.5). g) Present evidence that the College has sufficient numbers and continuity of qualified faculty to carry out necessary functions, including oversight of curriculum, setting expectations for student learning, academic credentials for instructors, and involvement in assessment of student learning (CC 3.C.1). h) Present evidence that all instructors in the College are appropriately qualified and regularly evaluated in accordance with established policies and procedures (CC 3.C.2-3). i) Present evidence that all College instructors are current in their disciplines, adept in their teaching roles, engaging in ongoing professional development, and accessible for student inquiry (CC 3.C.4-5). j) Present evidence that faculty teaching in the College participate substantially in the analysis of data and development of action on the assessment of student learning and program completion (AP B.2.c) k) Present evidence of this College's incorporation of high-impact educational practices promoting student learning and engagement⁵. l) Present evidence of the College's use of specialized facilities or equipment. 	
<p>3. College Degree Program Evaluation and Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Present evidence of the process used by faculty in the College to evaluate credits accepted to meet degree program requirements, including credit for experiential learning and other forms of prior learning, and to assure the quality of credits accepted in transfer (CC 4.A.2-3). b) Within the College, present evidence of the faculty's role to exercise authority over course prerequisites, rigor of courses, faculty qualifications and equivalence of learning outcomes and achievement in all modes and locations where the program is delivered (CC 4.A.4). c) If relevant, present evidence of the status of any specialized accreditation related to degree programs, including findings and recommendations from previous reviews (CC 4.A.5) Summarize program pass rates on licensure exams since the last program review, or the previous 5 years (AP A.7). d) Present evidence of degree-program specific graduate success and preparedness for advanced study or employment through indicators appropriate to the College mission (CC 4.A.6). e) Summarize examples in the College of the faculty's commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning (CC 4.B). 	

⁵ http://www.neasc.org/downloads/aacu_high_impact_2008_final.pdf

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) Present evidence of the College, and specific degree program, goals for student learning and the processes in place to assess student learning and achievement of these goals (4.B.1). g) Within the College, summarize actions taken to engage on continued improvement of student learning which are based on the learning goals and measures (CC 4.B.2-3). h) Use appropriate Nuventive Improve™ reports to document clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals (CC 4.B.2), and evidence of the use of assessment information to improve student learning (CC 4.B.3). i) Within the College, present evidence of how the processes and methodologies used to assess student learning reflect good practice, including evidence of the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff (CC 4.B.4). j) Within the College, summarize the ongoing activities related to improving retention, persistence and degree completion rates for students enrolled in this Program, and for academic degree programs, through clearly defined goals, evidence of the collection, analysis and use of information to make improvements as appropriate (CC 4.C.1-3). 	
<p>4. College Resources, Planning and Effectiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Evaluate the sufficiency of the fiscal and human resources, and the physical and technological infrastructure to support this College and its constituent academic degree programs (CC 5.A.1) b) Summarize examples of how the College has linked processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning and budgeting (CC 5.C.2). c) Identify examples of the College's consideration of internal and external constituent groups in planning, and how programmatic planning reflects an understanding of the current capacity, challenges and emerging factors (CC 5.C 4-5) 	
<p>5. Other Present other issues relevant to the Program review not addressed above (optional).</p>	

Focused Visit on Program Review

Due Date 3/1/2019

Visit Focus 4A and 4B

LSSU should provide: 1) a list of all completed program reviews in keeping with the approved-upon schedule; and 2) evidence that program review is being used to inform strategic planning and budgeting decisions.

The institution must develop assessment methodologies and practices that include the following:

1. All course outcomes must focus on student learning rather than on teaching or on programmatic goals.
2. All academic programs must state not only program-level student learning outcomes, but also measures of those outcomes findings, and actions taken to engage on continued improvement of student learning.
3. The general education program must engage in the assessment of student learning beyond the identification of course outcomes.
4. The University must identify institutional learning outcomes, measures of learning, findings, and actions to improve learning.
5. The University must identify mechanisms to demonstrate that students are meeting those outcomes; if an external instrument is not used, alternate methods or instruments to measure those outcomes must be identified (e.g., rubrics).
6. Student support services and co-curricular programs should develop student learning outcomes and assessment plans in their respective areas; this process is parallel to the setting and evaluation of goals that is being reported in TracDat.

<https://www.lssu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2017HLCFinalReport-LSSUAssurance.pdf>

Next Steps January 2018

(Please see the HLC Accreditation Update from May 2018)

The next 18 months are critical to the university on many fronts, including the presidential search, efforts to increase enrollment, and continuing a new era of trust and collaboration. However, it cannot be understated the importance of maintain institutional accreditation and the accompanying approval to offer credit bearing programs and to award federal financial aid.

To reach our targets in advance of the next accreditation visit the following steps are required:

- 1) Review, revision if necessary, and reaffirmation of our institutional mission, vision and values. ***Mission and Vision updated and adopted by BOT on November 3, 2017.***
- 2) Review, revision if necessary, and affirmation of an institutional strategic plan. The CAFE framework establishes broad high-level goals, and is not intended to establish measurable action plans which are the realized through the work at the planning unit level. ***Affirmed by the Senior Management Team on December 1, 2017.***
- 3) Review, revision if necessary, and reaffirmation of an institutional assessment vocabulary to build a common understanding of the language of continuous improvement for all planning units. ***Affirmed by the Senior Management Team on December 1, 2017.***
- 4) Revise and establish the institutional Planning Units – those areas from academics, student support, co-curricular and operational areas responsible to develop and implement continuous improvement processes aligned with the mission, strategic plan, and internal goals related to student outcomes. ***Board of Trustees approve the Strategic Directions plan which aligns academic units into 5 Colleges in preparation for defining the planning units for program review on December 15, 2017.***
- 5) Establish goals, strategies and measures for each Planning Unit in spring 2018, measures must include some components for which evidence can be developed in spring 2018, and where findings and actions implemented in fall 2018 can be evaluated in early spring 2019 prior to the HLC team visit. Some Planning Unit goals must be evaluated and reported on annually. Findings from goal assessment must be incorporated into annual budget and strategic planning
- 6) Review, revise if necessary, and implement templates for program review aligned with HLC Criteria for Accreditation. Program reviews must provide information useful for budgeting and ongoing implementation of the strategic plan.
- 7) Establish policy and procedure to systematically review and affirm that all courses and programs have outcomes that focus on student learning. Program outcomes may additionally include goals related to program support and infrastructure. This review could be conducted by schools, Curriculum Committee, or embedded in Program Review processes.
- 8) Establish policy and procedures to implement a General Education Program which assesses student learning beyond course outcomes, identifies and assesses institutional

learning outcomes for all graduates, and which uses appropriate measures to evaluate student achievement of goals.

- 9) Establish a timeline for completion of program reviews that includes establishment of goals, strategies and measures in early spring 2018. Evaluation of some findings, and actions to respond to the program review findings, must occur in spring 2018 prior to the development of the final FY19 budget.
- 10) Updates within Nuventive Improve™ (formerly Tracdat™) will be required to document and allow report generation for the strategic plan, the goals of Planning Units, the General Education, and to collect budget information related to goals for continuous improvement. The focus for Planning Units must be on establishing reasonable and measurable goals where evidence of continuous improvement can be documented. The Provost's Office can assist all units in collection and storage of documentation with Improve™. Reports derived from Improve™ will provide updates on progress in meeting goals, aggregate budgetary needs linked to assessment, and show progress in meeting the strategic plan goals across all Planning Units.

Goal Setting Templates:

COLLEGE/School – Goals Setting

Goal Level:	<input type="radio"/> College of Science and the Environment <input type="radio"/> School of Natural Resources and Environment <input type="radio"/> School of Science and Medicine
Unit Contact:	

College Goal: (name of goal)	
Statement or Description of Goal:	
Goal Status:	Active – Inactive
Goal Type: (select one)	Administrative and Staffing Infrastructure Resource Objectives Operational Goal not related to student learning Student Learning Other: <i>(specify)</i>

USE ADDITIONAL PAGES TO DOCUMENT ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES FOR THIS GOAL

Strategy Category: (select one)	Activity-Event Student Learning Other: <i>(specify)</i>	Report-Audit Survey-Focus Group
Statement or Description of Strategy:		
Benchmark: (success criteria)		
Schedule/Notes:		
Related Documents:		

Related Tasks (optional):	
Link Goal to: (e.g. CAFE or ILO) -circle selection-	Culture 1 – 2 – 3 Academics 1 – 2 – 3 Finance 1 – 2 – 3 Enrollment 1 – 2 – 3 ILO: Formal Communication ILO: Use of Evidence ILO: Analysis and Synthesis ILO: Professional Responsibility
Strategy Assignment: (who to contact and when)	

Operational Student Support Planning Unit – Program Goals Setting

Planning Unit Name:	
Planning Unit Contact:	

Planning Unit Goal: (name of goal)	
Statement or Description of Goal:	
Goal Status:	Active – Inactive
Goal Type: (select one)	Administrative and Staffing Infrastructure Resource Objectives Operational Goal not related to student learning Student Learning Other: <i>(specify)</i>

USE ADDITIONAL PAGES TO DOCUMENT ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES FOR THIS GOAL

Strategy Category: (select one)	Activity-Event Student Learning Other: <i>(specify)</i>	Report-Audit Survey-Focus Group
Statement or Description of Strategy:		
Benchmark: (success criteria)		
Schedule/Notes:		
Related Documents:		

Related Tasks (optional):	
Link Goal to: (e.g. CAFE or ILO)	Culture 1 – 2 – 3 Academics 1 – 2 – 3 Finance 1 – 2 – 3 Enrollment 1 – 2 – 3 ILO: Formal Communication ILO: Use of Evidence ILO: Analysis and Synthesis ILO: Professional Responsibility
Strategy Assignment: (who to contact and when)	

SAMPLE – use for training purposes only

Planning Unit Name:	Public Safety
Planning Unit Contact:	Wendy Beach

Planning Unit Goal: (name of goal)	Positive Public Interactions
Statement or Description of Goal:	To increase the frequency of Public Safety staff positive public interactions through oral and written communications.
Goal Status:	Active – Inactive
Goal Type: (select one)	Administrative and Staffing Infrastructure Resource Objectives Operational Goal not related to student learning Student Learning Other: (<i>specify</i>) - Communication

Strategy Category: (select one)	Activity-Event Student Learning Other: (<i>specify</i>)	Report-Audit Survey-Focus Group
Statement or Description of Strategy:	The Public Safety will introduce training to systematically increase the level of staff-community interactions, to promote positive interactions, improve public and community perception, and Public Safety visibility on campus in positive venues.	
Benchmark: (success criteria)	Establish baseline performance, train staff, set goals for improvement, monitor.	
Schedule/Notes:	Spring staff training, support for a culture of dignity and respect	
Related Documents:	Attach training materials	

Related Tasks (optional):	Measure baseline staff interactions Provide Staff training to increase community engagement
Link Goal to: (e.g. CAFE or ILO)	Culture 1 – 2 – 3 Academics 1 – 2 – 3 Finance 1 – 2 – 3 Enrollment 1 – 2 – 3 ILO: Formal Communication ILO: Use of Evidence ILO: Analysis and Synthesis ILO: Professional Responsibility
Strategy Assignment: (who to contact and when)	Wendy Beach, July 1, 2018

HLC Accreditation Update May 2, 2018

1. Can you send me the letter that HLC sent to LSSU related to its findings and what we need to do?

The HLC summarized all findings in their final report related to the HLC Comprehensive Visit of November 2016. This report is part of the full documentation posted to our institutional accreditation web page:

<https://www.lssu.edu/accreditation/2016-comprehensive/>

The HLC final report summarizes their findings, and the actions on which the institution must report in the upcoming monitoring reports and focused visit:

- Reaffirmation Review: Peer Review Team [2016 Final Report](#) 12/16/2016

2. Can you tell me the exact date that our report is due to their office?

There are a number of dates related to monitoring reports and the upcoming Focused Visit. These events and dates are documented on the accreditation page dedicated to the next full reaffirmation:

<https://www.lssu.edu/accreditation/2021-comprehensive/>

- Interim Report (due 3/1/2018) – focus on Federal credit hour expectations - this report was accepted by the HLC
 - [Lake Superior State \(1337\) Compiled Interim Report on Credit Hours 2017](#) (submitted 1/10/2018)
 - [Lake Superior State Univ. Acceptance of Interim Report 20180326 FCH policy](#)
- Interim Report (12/3/2018) – focus on enrollment and budget
- Focused Visit (3/25/2019) – focus on program review, strategic planning and budget
- 4th year Comprehensive Evaluation (2020-2021) date TBD
- Interim Report (12/4/2020) – focus on enrollment and budget
- Comprehensive Evaluation (2026-2027) date TBD

3. Can you give me a brutally honest assessment of where we are on the report and our compliance with the relevant standard(s) at this point in time? Please also send me the exact wording of all relevant standards.

Current status:

- Not all our academic degree programs are engaged in assessment of student learning at the program-level. The HLC team noted that our *"audit showed that 100% of programs had submitted such outcomes. A review of academic programs shows that while programs have identified goals or learning objectives for students, not all those outcomes are stated in measurable terms."* We need to move beyond stating goals to actually measuring and using that data. This situation is a partial consequence of having a very wide number of degree programs, often with no specific faculty champion or program owner. Student enrollment is diluted across many similar programs each with only

marginal factors of differentiation. Chairs were tasked this spring to identify program champions by May 8, and to review program outcomes - documenting assessment through the action steps for at least one (preferably more) program-level outcome per degree by June 1, with additional findings/actions by December 1. Identifying program champions for each degree will increase accountability and completion of this step.

- We have not started program review in academic affairs using a criteria-based template adopted in spring 2018. At the time of the 2016 visit we had begun a prioritization-focused program review process at the degree-program level. The HLC report stated *"Overall, LSSU has well-developed, comprehensive and transparent processes for assessment of student learning; while that is the case, the implementation of those processes is not consistent across programs and areas of the University"* In retrospect, this approach was too fine-grained and while some areas did make progress in this realm we were not on our projected schedule at the time of the visit - again tied to the number of degree programs. With the redefining of university mission, strategic plan and organizational structure, our degree program homes in the new structure were undefined and progress has been delayed as the new schools worked this spring on visioning sessions, development of school goals, and the new college goals. The current template uses the college as the program-level - this is now likely too course-grained and may need to be recast with the process of program review aligned to school-level. Academic units will be able to focus on this after the orientations in July.
- We have little-to-no systematic documentation related to assessment in non-academic and co-curricular areas. This is an area highlighted by the 2016 HLC team who noted we claimed *"that assessment of non-curricular programs has been ongoing and showing signs of growth, and that the Office of Student Life "has been developing an assessment structure" for its programs. However, no evidence is provided of actual assessments."* This does not mean that there is no data, but that those activities have not been captured and used to develop documentation record of actions. HLC reviewers are fond of saying "if it isn't in print, it didn't happen." The transitions of senior leadership in key positions coupled with a very focused effort to build enrollment this past year, jump-start marketing, and transition people into new (both to them and the institution) roles have made us a bit myopic in many respects related to our planning and assessment efforts. As an example, current efforts to restructure Laker Week (the days prior to the start of fall 2018) and incorporate a freshman-year experience are important, and the full scope of activity should be documented both in terms of the baseline evidence which led to the changes, establishment of criteria for success and processes to collect such evidence, and clear documentation our analysis of effectiveness of the changes and plans to use that analysis in early fall in a process of continuous improvement.
- We have a new structure for the assessment of the general education outcomes using a common rubric for each of the seven key areas, but need to document its use. While Criterion 3.B was met in 2016, the team commented that *" Although the general education program shows evidence of clearly stated outcomes, the program needs to have a clear assessment plan to provide evidence of student learning. "* To move forward in this area, faculty need to document this current semester's student learning using these rubrics, and may be able to reconstruct prior semesters to a limited extent. It is critical to

complete this process and for the general education subcommittees to review the findings from this semester and develop action plans to improve student achievement, and to incorporate analysis of the newly adopted institutional learning outcomes which must be a part of program goals. Reminders have gone out to faculty, and next Monday/Tuesday are university assessment days for faculty to enter their assessments.

- We do not have an existing University Assessment Committee. Such a group was established prior to the 2011 visit comprised of faculty, staff and students, led by the Assoc. Provost. Around the time of the 2016 visit, the committee was subsumed into a faculty-led shared governance committee which met irregularly and which was disbanded with all shared governance committees late that spring. Discussions about the development of a faculty senate dominated the spring 2017 collective bargaining discussions which ended with a 1-yr agreement and language to authorize a senate once bylaws were established - a process which has still not been resolved. The draft Senate bylaws have an Assessment Committee proposed, but its scope would only address academics, and its authority is as a recommending body. If the Senate is empowered, then a parallel group should be formulated for areas outside academics to provide review and feedback on the balance of institutional activities. Without a Senate, we may need to task an assessment group at the university level. The 2016 team noted the uncertainty regarding the future of this group, it would be advisable to reconfigure it.
- The University Strategic Plan is a framework, but the strategic plan has not been operationalized. In 2011 the team noted dismally that *'there was no "evidence that whatever data that were either available to, or acquirable by, the institution were being analyzed to inform the planning and execution of academic, administrative, and support programs, and other activities that are important to LSSU's future."'* By 2016 the situation had improved with the team summarizing that *"While there has been significant progress, not all academic, co-curricular, and administrative units use their findings from assessment to improve student learning."* Ratification of the CAFE structure took a very long time, documented below in the 'summary of progress' document. During that time it was difficult to get units moving on assessment against the old plan, and to work on a new plan that was still in development. The CAFE structure has not been translated into measurable goals useful to guide the institution, KPIs or other meaningful integration of program review into strategic planning and budget. The priority for this late spring, summer and early fall is to have units now define, formalize and implement unit-level goals aligned with the CAFE planning framework. From these unit-goals we should be able to identify institutional KPI markers useful for broader planning and budget purposes. Documentation of unit-goals will be aggregated across the institution to present useful information in usable reports or on KPI dashboards.
- While not a part of the 2016 monitoring requirements, there are new HLC guidelines regarding faculty qualifications which went into effect September 1, 2017. We were not in compliance with the guidelines at that time and notified our HLC Liaison of the fact. New language was added to the 2017-2018 Faculty Agreement to allow for the comprehensive review of all faculty qualifications in order to ensure compliance with the HLC guidelines. Faculty have submitted portfolios and schools have been conducting reviews of these portfolios to establish school-level recommendations. Deans should

complete their reviews in May and be ready for Provost review and finalization in June or July.

- We do not have an established KPI system in place. Enrollment and Budget are obviously critical. The 2016 HLC Team noted at the time that we had *"a budgeting system increasingly based on realistic and attainable goals. The fact that the 2016-17 budget is also the first one to be balanced in some years is also reason for optimism. The key to the financial stability of the institution will be whether enrollment growth can begin to increase revenues to support increased needs for operational support."* Unfortunately we were not able to maintain that pattern for FY18. The monitoring requirement in this area establishes an accountability for our continued attention to this area, and implies the establishment of KPIs to track critical factors. Specifically, the HLC Team noted that *"these reports should include an analysis of enrollment patterns, operating budget deficit/surplus numbers, and the status of repayment of the general fund debt."* While there are many options to address this, Impact(TM) is an example of a system we could examine which is integrated with our institutional assessment software (Improve(TM)). Impact builds on a SharePoint environment and is useful to organize and highlight data sets from across the institution, providing direct linking of data views as evidence for strategic planning and broader institutional assessment.
https://www.nuventive.com/storage/app/media/Nuventive_DataSheet_Nuventive%20Impact_060717.pdf

Assessment activities are documented on this web site (<https://www.lssu.edu/assessment/>) contains key documents including a summary of progress which chronicles our work in strategic planning, program assessment.

- [Strategic Planning, Assessment, Program Review – Summary of progress 19FEB2018](#)

The Higher Learning Commission's Criteria for Accreditation are available on their website:

<https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html>

It should be noted that these criteria are currently under review and new (revised) standards will go into effect by the fall 2019 or 2020, depending on the extent of revisions. Of specific concern were Core Components 4A, 4B, and 5A. Details on the HLC evaluator's comments are a part of the team's [2016 Final Report](#)

4. If you have any written reports that have been submitted, please send them to me.

We submitted the first monitoring report on the Federal Credit Hour policy in January. The full report is posted to the accreditation page ([Lake Superior State \(1337\) Compiled Interim Report on Credit Hours 2017](#)). The report was accepted in March.

5. Please send your timeline for getting all of this done to me.

Projected timeline:

May 8 - deans and chairs identify academic degree program champions

May 21 - administrative units identify assessment champion to serve as unit contact

June 1 - academic program champions provide assessment findings and actions for their degree programs.

June 1 - academic units (deans and chairs) verify all course outcomes in their units are student focused and measurable, and address Institutional Learning Outcomes. Each degree program must have one or more findings with action.

June 1 - administrative units submit 3-7 unit-level goals, aligned with CAFE strategic plan, and the unit's unique mission/vision.

June 1 - assessment office documents degree program champions produces report to campus and initiates follow up on program assessment

June 15-25 New student orientation sessions

June 25 - deans and chairs submit school-level program goals, college goals, and assessment plans for each

July 1 - assessment office updates findings actions in Improve, produces unit reports to campus

August 1 - administrative units submit program goal assessment with findings and actions for at least two goals each aligned with the strategic plan

August 20 - Distribute expectations for course-level assessment (every general education outcome and at least two course outcomes with findings/actions)

October 1 - 1st draft of Interim report on enrollment and finance

October 1 - Course assessment update due - produce report for campus

October 1 - academic units submit program goal assessment with findings and actions for at least two goals each aligned with the strategic plan

November 1 - final draft of Interim report on enrollment and finance

November 15 - 1st draft of Focused Visit report

December 1 - deans and chairs complete update of degree program assessment (at least two goals assessed, including at least one goal aligned to ILO)

December 3 - Deadline for submission of Interim Report on enrollment and finance

December 15 - 2nd draft of Focused Visit report

January 15, 2019 Final draft of Focused Visit report

January 25 Submission deadline of Focused Visit Report

March 25-26 - HLC Focused Visit Team on campus

6. If there are certain areas on campus that are compliant with the standard(s), let me know who they are. Also, let me know which areas are not compliant. I am not trying to get anyone in trouble, I am simply trying to do what is best for LSSU.

As I'm sure you know, compliance with the standard(s) isn't a black/white issue, but there are some units more engaged than others. On the whole, academic affairs has made some progress. Curriculum proposals now come with assessment data justifying proposed changes, and committee members are free in their criticism when colleagues don't provide them. Yet still, in academic affairs there are many degree programs where no assessment has been documented, and student learning outcomes in some areas are still not based on student achievement statements. Attached are two status reports, derived from assessment data documented in Improve(TM), our relational database for institutional assessment. The Program Assessment report summarizes academic degree-program assessment of active learning outcomes. The standard four-column format presents information about outcomes (goals),

strategy (assessment methods), findings, and actions. Areas without findings and actions become quite apparent as you scroll through the document, and many of the areas with findings have not been active since before the last visit. The second file is a summary of course-level learning outcomes. While a course-level four-column report can be produced for courses as well, the goal in this report was to give chairs/deans an opportunity to quickly review and update learning outcomes. After June 1 we can produce this same reports again, track progress, and identify areas of continued concern.

Very little progress overall has been made in administrative areas and co-curricular areas. This spring we defined the administrative and student support "Planning Units" - those units responsible for reporting on their activities in Improve(TM). Since that time much energy has been expended in budget and enrollment activities and there has been almost no forward movement in assessment. A similar four-column report from these areas could be prepared, but would not be informative. Institutionally, we need a much stronger focused effort to identify KPIs, and to use program review evidence to guide strategic planning and budget. With the defining of the planning units, establishment of the CAFE structure, and a charge to cabinet for the development of unit goals and assessment plans, we are positioned to benefit from some well-focused attention and accountability. The intensity and sense of urgency must be significantly increased, coupled with careful monitoring, if we are to have evidence to present when we submit our required reports.