

## Summary of 2005 Report

Actual Report - <http://www.missouristate.edu/hlc/2005Visit.htm>

We were given kudos for presenting regular updates to administrative council and BOG from 1995-2005. There were no updates from 2005-2012. **The updates started in fall of 2012 and will continue into the future.**

1995 advancement report noted a weakness in diversity and the reviewers did not think that we had addressed this well in 2005.

**Criterion 1** - mission and integrity. Strengths - planning, financial data and access to it, unlicensed affairs and evidence of community engagement. Needs attention - diversity to address our public affairs mission.

**Criterion 2** -preparing for the future. Strengths - culture of planning and budgeting, SCUF funding, evaluation and assessment processes. Needs attention - resource base and declining state funding, more diversity in students, faculty and staff, valuing of assessment is not consistent across campus

**Criterion 3** - student learning and effective teaching. Strengths - general education curriculum and review process, well designed learning environments, assessment of student learning outcomes is across divisions and programs. Needs attention - program review process and external reviews for promotion and tenure.

**Criterion 4** - acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge. Strengths - culture of continuous learning exists on campus with many opportunities and people taking advantage of them, faculty are engaged in research, internship and service learning opportunities for students, curricular and co-curricular activities to enhance public affairs mission. Needs attention - public affairs is not imbedded into general education curriculum.

**Criterion 5** - engagement and service. Strengths - we know our internal and external constituencies and we communicate well with them, programs have been developed based on community needs, well-designed distance education programs including China program. Needs attention - we did not clearly indicate that one of our constituencies were students at other institutions - potential transfer students. Need articulation plans.

**Advancement section** - Overall impression - team was very impressed with MSU.

Finance and administrative structures - fee structure seems overly complex, students cannot easily calculate their costs, they mention SCUF fees and how we did not have a good mechanism for accounting how the money was spent (we do now!). Recognize more clearly the decreasing funding by the state - either speak louder or come up with resources.

Diversity - "MSU struggles with issues of diversity." Addressed campus climate, getting a critical mass of diverse students on campus. The reviewers were clear to say that they did not see or hear of hostility. They recommended the following tactics - Website for diversity; Faculty lines specific for diverse candidates; Develop a faculty/staff of Color network; Reach out to growing Hispanic/Latino community; Review financial aid packages to support initiatives; Develop financial aid packages for transfer students of color; Work with OTC and Drury on diversity activities to increase critical mass; Develop a diversity general education course; A concerted effort to hire students of color in residence life, student activities and other offices on campus; Office of multicultural student services does a lot but could do more; Develop an early connection with diverse students in area K-12 schools.

Targeting transfer students - better advising, more articulation, more 2+2 plans

Dual credit and dual advising - be consistent in enforcing rules across campus (the team heard in inconsistencies), price structure between dual credit and dual enrollment might give perception that one is better than the other - think about this, assessment and data for student success in dual credit and dual enrollment is incomplete,

Our website and catalogs do not prominently display accreditations.

Assessment is good but we are not assessing the public affairs mission.

Need external reviewers for program review and promotion/tenure.

Recognitions of significant accomplishments - COBA and COAL were noted as centers of excellence for specific programs. CASE and JVIC were also noted in this section.

**Evidence that we have addressed the concerns noted above –**

Hired VP of Diversity and Inclusive Excellence –

- Diversity statements in ADP
- Warming Events
- Diversity Conferences on campus
- Goals and accomplishments of this division will be documented
- Climate Survey to be done soon

Public Affairs Mission

- Additions since 2005
- Citizen Scholars
- Public Affairs Awards for Faculty and Staff
- Public Affairs graduation requirements
- Public Affairs defined in general education
- QIP

Program Review

- External reviewers
  - Policies now require external reviews for promotion and tenure
  - Policies now require external reviewers for program review
- Review process includes follow-up with action plans and subsequent review of outcomes

Funding of Higher Education - Evidence of how we are weathering the storm

- Budget Committee Structure
- Decisions made over the past several years
- Differential Fees Policy

Community Colleges

- Attention to articulation agreements
- Transfer of courses

Fee Structure is overly complex – I don't think we have addressed this and we do not have to make it uncomplex. But maybe we should consider a better way of describing the structure to outsiders.

Program Assessment Plans and annual assessment reports

- Deans are responsible for programs in colleges
- Director of Assessment hired January 1, 2013