

Timeline

October 5-6	Site Visit
September 1	Team has access to assurance argument
July 1	Executive summary complete – distribution in August
June/July	Post link for third party comments
March 17	Next draft of assurance argument with evidence attached will be complete
February 1	First draft of federal compliance report will be complete

Assurance Argument – 35,000 words

We will have a very good third draft done soon.

Evidence files – Evidence that shows that we meet all criteria and core components.

85-90% complete

What can you do to help in the next two weeks?

- Read through the steering committee's lists of strengths and concerns. It will be important that they align with our visioning/long range planning. Send me feedback.
- Block your calendars for October 5-6. There will be at least three open forums related to the five criteria and you will be invited to participate.

What can you do to help between April 1 and June 15?

- Read the next draft. It will be posted on our website - <http://www.missouristate.edu/hlc/preparation.htm>
- Encourage your colleagues to read the next draft.
- Send comments or questions to me or any member of the steering committee. TameraJahnke@missouristate.edu

August – Read the executive summary.

October – Attend open forums and any other meetings that you are invited to attend.

Alignment of strengths and areas of concern with visioning at Missouri State.

January 12, 2015

HLC Criteria and latest version of strengths and areas of concern.

Criterion One: Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Strengths

1. The purpose of developing educated persons and the public affairs mission are strong, clear and have staying power.
2. Over time, the mission has been developed so it takes on an increasingly richer meaning in curriculum, co-curricular activities and relationships/partnerships with the community.
3. The University's budget process is a model for campus-wide participation and transparency.
4. The mission has provided a strong foundation for the University's progress in diversity and inclusion.

Areas of Concern

1. Even with the public affairs mission further incorporated into General Education, the University will need to continue to find fresh ways in which to incorporate the mission into the curriculum at all levels, as well as all aspects of campus life.
2. While much progress has been made on diversity, with significant increases in the student body, the University must continue to explore opportunities to achieve goals of more diversity in its workforce.

Criterion Two: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Strengths

1. The combination of the policy library, the Office of Internal Audit and Compliance, the information security officer, and the annual external financial audit help set Missouri State apart from many institutions.
2. The public affairs mission provides a strong philosophical foundation for ethical and responsible behavior, including the celebration of freedom of thought and speech, and the initiatives to expand diversity among students and employees.
3. Codes of conduct are clear for all members of the campus community, from the Board of Governors, to faculty and staff, to administrators, to students.
4. Missouri State remains an honest broker and strong partner with many institutions, organizations and other entities.

Areas of Concern

1. Given the importance of cost to its students, Missouri State must continue to find the clearest ways in which to list the price of education.
2. The University must remain diligent in its goal of increasing all forms of scholarly activity.
3. Building on its current policies and practices, the University must address new challenges as they arise, including honesty and integrity with online courses.

Criterion Three: Teaching and Learning; Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Strengths

1. Faculty are highly qualified, as evidenced by more than 90 percent of the full-time ranked faculty holding the terminal degree in their field.
2. The University has a strong philosophy of evaluating both its academic programs (accreditation and program review) and its students (learning objectives and exit exams).
3. Missouri State has a nationally recognized Academic Advisement Center which provides faculty and staff advisors with the Master Advisor Program to help ensure quality advising.
4. The General Education Program recently underwent a thorough review, resulting in changes so that courses more closely aligned with the University's mission in public affairs.

Areas of Concern

1. Need to ensure that policies and syllabi differentiate between graduate and undergraduate learning outcomes.
2. Need to ensure that policies and practices adequately review and provide resources for per course faculty.

3. Need to continue to increase the number of students who participate in high impact experiences such as service-learning, study away, and internships.

Criterion Four. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Strengths

1. Enhanced a program review with external evaluations, a clearer calendar, and developed a webpage to store all reports. The program review process was assessed after the first cycle with minor changes recommended for the second cycle which began in 2013.
2. Completed a review of the General Education program and implemented a new curricular structure with learning outcomes and assessment plans looking specifically at the University's statewide mission of public affairs.
3. The Office of Assessment was reinvented to focus on institutional assessment, benefiting from outside consultants, the National Institute for Learning best practices, and a Quality Initiative Project (QIP) that assesses the public affairs mission.
4. Increased the emphasis on, and the tools available to measure, the success of Missouri State graduates and alumni.

Areas of concern

1. Missouri State University continues to refine its customized approach to assessment. Departments and programs write their own assessment plans, collect and analyze data and finally make changes in the curriculum based on the data. There is a need to develop a map and calendar of college, unit, division, and institutional assessment for accountability and improvement of student learning. This will connect assessment occurring at departments and the university that can lead to improvement in student learning.
2. Continue to have conversations centered on postgraduate success, bringing together institutional data from the Office of Institutional Research and Grad Track data from Career Services evaluate postgraduate success.

Criterion Five. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Strengths

1. Since 2005, the budget process has become increasingly transparent and participatory, aided by the creation of "cost centers," multi-leveled budget committees, public budget records. One outcome has been a strong reserve fund which is now being used to enhance programs and facilities.
2. The five-year cycle of strategic planning is now part of the institutional fabric, maintained through annual updates to institutional goals, Key Performance Indicators, and performance funding. Contributing to this cycle is the improved program review process for academic units, with clear expectations, templates and timelines for effective planning and assessment.
3. The changes in the governing board since 2005 – from statewide membership to the committee structure – have been positive changes for the University. The changes have allowed the Board of Governors to engage more in the vision for the University and the strategic planning to achieve the vision.
4. Conscientious attention, aided by improved technology, to improved communication and provided greater transparency throughout the campus has led to increased institutional effectiveness. Some of the examples include President's regular communication provided in blog format, the Provost's Communiqué, Twitter feeds, the expanded and inclusive budget process, the Public Affairs Conference, the Statewide Collaborative Diversity Conference, and the Public Affairs convocation speaker.

Areas of Concern

1. Much has been accomplished toward the goal of making the cost of Missouri State University clear and transparent for students and their families. Still, further simplifying and clarifying the cost of education is an ongoing goal.
2. Absent comprehensive state funding for facilities for more than dozen years, the University must continue to find ways to fund improvements in buildings, labs, classrooms, and other facilities, as well as address deferred maintenance and repair needs.

3. More must and will be done to link assessment of student learning and success with strategic planning and budgeting.
4. University must address increasing numbers of students and class sizes without significant additional resources.

Six Task Forces

Missouri State Vision:

Our Passion for Excellence

Preamble

All task forces will operate with these guiding principles:

- ✓ Achieving excellence (top priority)
- ✓ Raising University profile
- ✓ Building/enhancing relationships
- ✓ Being student-centered with specific focus on student success
- ✓ Incorporating the three pillars of the public affairs mission: ethical leadership, cultural competence, and community engagement
- ✓ Making “data-informed” decisions – including, but not limited to, demographics, best practices, analysis of University’s current position, etc.
- ✓ Identifying key elements necessary to achieve goals

1. FUNDING: Envisioning the long-term financial vitality of the University and position the University to deal with changes and challenges that might be anticipated in the next 10-12 years.

2. ACADEMIC PROFILE: Envisioning alignment of the University’s array of academic programs, strategic partnerships, and research emphasis to help ensure the next generation of students/learners succeeds.

3. INFRASTRUCTURE: Envisioning a campus infrastructure – facilities, technology, environmental sustainability – that supports the academic programs and research initiatives, as well as contribute to the University’s overall operational efficiency.

4. DIVERSITY: Envisioning a campus community that embraces diversity in all aspects of campus learning/life.

5. GLOBALIZATION: Envisioning integration of globalization in all University endeavors in order for the campus community to compete, function and succeed in the worldwide environment/ economy.

6. STUDENT EXPERIENCE: Envisioning a rich, memorable and distinctive educational experience that helps ensure success for students.