

University of Missouri-St Louis
Re-accreditation Self-Study Design and Procedures

July 2007

Table of Contents

Purpose of the Self-Study3

Design of the Self-Study3

Implementation of the Design4

 Phase I4

 Phase II4

Request for Reviewers.....5

References.....6

Appendix I: Self-Study Timeline.....7

Appendix II: Re-Accreditation Steering Committee.....9

Appendix III: Outline for Phase I and Inventory of Electronic Resources16

Appendix IV: Communication Plan for University Re-Accreditation24

University of Missouri-St Louis Re-accreditation Self-Study Design and Procedures

Purpose of the Self-Study

The University of Missouri-St Louis will undergo a self-study and site visit for Higher Learning Commission (HLC) re-accreditation in 2008-2009. Beyond the obvious goal of meeting all the expectations without a follow-up focused visit, the university will use the self-study process to institutionalize the University of Missouri's quality improvement agenda in every unit of the campus. Specifically, the self-study process provides an opportunity for the university to reflect on assessment activities currently in place for student learning and institutional effectiveness and how assessment informs institutional planning and improve effectiveness of the integration of planning and assessment (Middaugh & Sibolski, 2007). The expectation is that the process will also enhance our ability change to HLC's AQIP model for re-accreditation in the future.

Design of the Self-Study

Because of the nature of the self-study process, we will use a qualitative research design following the broad definition of Strauss and Corbin (1990) that qualitative research includes interpretation of data beyond quantitative procedures. Although we will employ quantitative analyses of data, we plan to interpret the findings to meet HLC reviewers' expectation of compelling evidence and evaluative narrative (Funk, 2007; Walker, 2007) in the self-study report. Qualitative research allows interpretation of the meaning that events have for the individuals who experience them as well as the researchers' interpretations of those meanings. This allows researchers to pay attention to the idiosyncratic as well as the pervasive (Hoepfl, 1997).

A Steering Committee made up of researchers and administrative leaders will determine the conceptual framework for the self-study report. In qualitative research this consists primarily of setting flexible boundaries to help focus the study. For example, at the start of the data collection, the Criteria and Indicators naturally serve as boundaries. As reports are being compiled, gaps may appear or themes may emerge that will change those boundaries.

Some authors (e.g., Maxwell, 2005) consider research questions as a component of the conceptual framework because the questions frame issues to be studied. It is expected that in compiling the Criteria Document, Committee members will recognize such questions or issues that deserve deeper study. These will become informal research questions.

Since qualitative research problems tend to be framed as open-ended questions that support discovery of new information (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), the final self-study is expected to evolve. We will collect data first by asking, "What evidence is there at the university meets the Criteria and their Indicators?" Additional data collection and the final report, however, are expected to take the study beyond the Criteria. For example, the

report will describe and interpret findings from the perspective of "empathic neutrality" (Patton 1990, p. 55) to be able to translate the findings into compelling evidence.

Implementation of the Design

The self-study will consist of two phases. The Timeline (Appendix I) indicates when each activity is expected to be complete. This is, however, an iterative process that will require cycling back to many activities after their due date.

Phase I

Data Collection. Steering Committee members (Appendix II) will review the Inventory of Electronic Resources (Appendix III), which is an outline for Phase I. They will determine the following:

- Do extant documents provide evidence for the Criteria and Indicators?
- What else is needed to meet the Criteria and Indicators?

Staff members in Academic Affairs and Institutional Research will ask others on campus for evidence and add those documents to the Inventory. If data do not already exist, the staff members will plan ways to collect data and provide evidence.

Preparation of Draft I. Staff will write a brief description of how the evidence meets the Criteria and Indicators and provide links to the Inventory. Despite the overlap among the Indicators, they will not avoid duplication at this stage. There will also be overlap with the responses to the Suggestions and Recommendations from the site visit of 1999. Although evaluative statements are not necessary at this stage, staff members may add them to enhance the work of Phase II.

Dissemination to Campus Community. Draft I will be available for discussion in a wide variety of campus venues starting October 2007. The Communication Plan (Appendix IV) describes activities that will take place to help educate the campus about the Criteria and Indicators and how the campus meets them or not. It should also raise other issues, including omitted evidence, which will be added to the Criteria Document.

Preparation of the Criteria Document. The Steering Committee will review and edit the revised Draft I. This will become the Criteria Document or annotated Electronic Resource Inventory, which will be an appendix to the self-study that reviewers can use to cross-reference information in the self-study.

Phase II (Fall 2007-Spring 2008)

Steering Committee members, assisted by Academic Affairs staff, will classify the types of evidence available and look for themes as they interpret data in the Criteria Document. They will look for issues and themes as a qualitative researcher might: to gain new perspectives or more in-depth information. In addition to the pervasive themes, they will also look for idiosyncratic evidence that provides insights into the institution. The questions during this phase might be

- How *well* does the campus meet the Criteria and Indicators?

- What do the data tell us about the work we do and what we can do better?
- What themes emerge from the data?

Based on information gleaned at HLC conferences, workshops, and website, Steering Committee members will judge whether the quality of the resulting evidence is compelling, relevant, and trustworthy. They will draw conclusions about the value of the evidence for evaluating the university's performance by focusing on accomplishments, impact, and implementation of assessment results.

Based on the themes, their interpretations, and the quality of the evidence, Committee members will determine how the final self-study report will be organized, what material will be included in the self-study, and what will be available to the reviewers in other formats. This will allow Committee members to focus on crosscutting patterns of evidence. They will also consider HLC's four themes and six questions to judge how well the evidence matches the agency's expectations. Any of these emerging patterns may serve as the sections in the final draft of the self-study, but the Criteria and Indicators, Themes, and Questions will all be highlighted for the reviewers.

The final draft will be edited by a staff writer and then reviewed by the Committee. The goal is to have a document that is between 80 and 100 pages long with links to further evidence in electronic and paper format.

Request for Reviewers

The University of Missouri-St Louis has several comparators approved by the Vice President of Academic Affairs for the University of Missouri System. Any of those that are also accredited by HLC are likely to have reviewers that would understand our context. Those universities are Wichita State University, Northern Illinois University, Wright State University, Western Michigan University, Kent State University, Indiana State University, University of Akron, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Illinois State University, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Cleveland State University, University of Toledo, University of Colorado at Denver, Wayne State University, New Mexico State University, Bowling Green State University, University Of Cincinnati, Ohio University, and Southern Illinois University-Carbondale.

Selected References

- Funk, K. (2007). *Evidence of student learning (what it is and where to find it)*. Workshop presentation. Higher Learning Commission, Lisle, IL. March.
- Hoepfl, M. C. (1997, Fall). Choosing qualitative research: A primer for technology education researchers. *Journal of Technology Education*, 9(1), <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTE/v9n1/hoepfl.html>.
- Massy, W. F. (2003). *Honoring the trust: Quality and cost containment in higher education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Middaugh, M. & Sibolski, E. (2007). *Integrating higher education planning and assessment*. Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research 2007 Annual Forum, Kansas City, Missouri, June 2 - 6, 2007.
- Moak, M. M. (2000). A view from the states: A survey of the collection and use of cost data by states. In the Institute for Higher Education Policy (Ed.), *A compilation of background papers prepared for a seminar on cost measurement and management*, pp. 10-27. Washington, D.C.: self.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Stringer, W. L., Cunningham, A.F., Merisotis, J.P., Wellman, J.V., & O'Brien, C.T. (1999). *Cost, price, and public policy*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- Walker, I. (2007). *Evaluative writing in the self-study*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Higher Learning Commission, Chicago, IL.

Appendix I

Self-Study Timeline

Deadline	Task	Responsible Party
June 2005	Establish an electronic site for self-study documents	Assoc Provost
July 2005	Establish a timeline for the self-study process	Provost
Aug 2005	Prepare & post online an Assessment Guide for Departments	Assoc Prov
May-Oct 2005	Departments submit baseline learning outcomes	Deans
	Administrative Units submit mission and goals with assessment plans	Vice Chancs and provosts
Sept 2005	Senate Assessment Committee gives input to the plan and establishes their role in accreditation self-study process	Senate Chair and Assoc Provost
Sept 2005	Connect 5-Yr Reviews to Criterion 3	Assoc Provosts
Nov 2005	Appoint Self-Study Steering and Subcommittees	Provost
Dec 2005	Departments submit baseline assessment and program “renovation” plans	Deans
Jan 2006	Plan coordination of self-study with other reviews and Action Plan	Assoc Provost
Jan 2006	Respond to 1997 Review	AA staff
Mar 2006	Attend HLC Annual Meeting in Chicago	Committee reps
April 2006	Departments submit assessment and program “renovation” updates	Deans
April 2006	Administrative Units submit updates to processes based on reviews	Vice Chancs and provosts
May 2006	Refine plans for data requests and submit to IR	Steering Com/ Deans
WS 2007	Refine 5-year reviews for greater attention to quality improvement	Assoc Provosts
WS 2007	Convene General Education Task Force to review its content and procedures	Provost
Mar 2007	Attend HLC Annual Meeting in Chicago	Campus reps
May 17, 2007	Summarize what was learned at HLC	Assessment leaders
May 23, 2007	Plan responses to Criteria	Steering Com
May 2007	Departments submit assessment and program renovation updates via annual reports	Deans
May 2007	Announce accreditation on home page	Assoc Provost
May 2007	Administrative Units submit updates to processes based on reviews via annual reports	Vice Chancs and provosts
May 2007	*Design Communication Plan	AA Staff
June 2007	Update Response to 1997 Review	AA Staff
July 2007	Submit Self-Study Design to HLC and arrange for HLC staff to visit campus	AA Staff
July 2007	Update Compliance Sections	Student & Academic Affairs; MTS
July 25-27	HLC workshop on co-curriculum/gen ed	Student Affairs, dean of A&S, chair,

		gen ed task force
Aug 2007	Collect data for all criteria	Steering Com & Staff
Sept 2007	First draft of college sections of Criterion 3	Deans
Oct 1, 2007	*Conduct first accreditation-preparedness check	Chairs, Directors
Oct 2007	Produce Initial Draft of Self-Study based on criteria	Steering Committee
Oct 2007	*Circulate draft to campus for input	Staff
Nov 2007	Determine conceptual framework for self-study analysis	Steering Com
Nov 14-15, 2007	Visit by Dr. Mary Breslin, HLC staff liaison	
Jan 2008	Review Self-Study draft & *conduct mock site visit	Tom McPhail
Jan 31-Feb 1, 2008	*Announce Self-Study to Curators	Chancellor
WS 2008	*Campus conversations about self-study With lunch, “tests,” and prizes	Steering Com and staff
WS 2008	Contribute to revision of Action Plan	Steering Com
May 2008	Revise Self-Study	Steering Com
Sept 2008	*Announce visit to constituents	Staff
Oct 2008	Complete Self-Study and post it online	Staff
Nov 2008	Plan Site Visit Agenda & Communicate with Review Team Leader	Steering Committee
Dec 2008	*Conduct final accreditation-preparedness check	Chairs, Directors
Nov-Dec 2008	*Conduct meetings with stakeholders to prepare for visit. *Distribute “Cliff Notes” of self-study around campus	Steering Com, Senate, Deans
Jan 2009	Recruit students and advisory board members to attend site visit	Deans
Feb 2009	Team Visit	Campus
May 2009	Respond to team’s recommendations	Provost with Steering Com
May 2009	Celebrate and plan presentation at next HLC conference	Campus

* See Communication Plan

Appendix II
Re-Accreditation Steering Committee

College/Department	Member	Criterion
Academic Affairs	Glen Cope, Provost	<i>ex officio</i>
Academic Affairs	Pat Dolan	staff
Academic Affairs	Aaron Proctor	writer
Administrative Units	Gloria Schultz	5
Advancement	(To be named)	2
Arts & Sciences		
Humanities	Eric Wiland, Philosophy	1
Natural Sciences	Keith Stine, Chemistry	3
Social Sciences	Sel Dibooglu, Economics	3
Business	D'Anne Hancock, Finance	2
Business	Malaika Horne, ELI	1
Continuing & Distance Ed	Tom Walker	5
Education	Vic Battistich, Educational Psychology	3
Fine Arts & Communication	Susan Cahan, Art History	5
General Education	Nancy Gleason, Honors	3
Graduate School	Judith Walker de Félix	chair
Information Technology	Jim Tom	4
Institutional Research	Carol Sholy	staff
Library	Raleigh Muns	staff
Nursing	Susan Fabermann	5
Optometry	Tim Wingert	3
Senate & Assembly	Tim Farmer, Accounting	2
Student Affairs	Curt Coonrod	staff
Student Affairs	Nancy Magnuson	3
Student Government Association	Bryan Goers (others to be added)	

Role: The Steering Committee is responsible for

- Overseeing the re-accreditation process;
- Assembling the self-study;
 - **Draft 1 due October 1, 2007**
 - **Final draft due October 15, 2008**
- Participating in the mock site visit late FS 2007;
- Reviewing and editing the self-study to emphasize student learning in all criteria;
- Supporting logistics for the reviewers' site visit;
- Participating in one workshop or conference on re-accreditation, assessment, or quality improvement;
- Suggesting responses to the reviewers' comments;
- Other activities to assure a successful re-accreditation process.

Suggested Procedure:

- To prepare the self-study, Steering Committee Members will serve as co-team leaders for one of the five criteria. Data Collection Teams assigned to each criterion (please see below) will provide data for possible inclusion in the self-study. The team leaders from the Steering Committee will determine which data are included in the self-study and which will be referenced only as available for reviewers.
- The Steering Committee will review drafts and determine whether or not each criterion is described sufficiently and whether the document suffers from any redundancy, gaps, or inconsistencies to produce a first public draft to share with the campus by October 1, 2007.
- The Steering Committee will lead the campus in a mock site visit WS 2008 to get feedback on the draft self-study and educate all members of the campus community about the real site visit, probably February 2009 (but no earlier than November 2008).
- The Steering Committee will finalize the self-study report to submit to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) no later than October 15, 2008.
- When the site visit is scheduled, the Steering Committee will recommend logistics so that the reviewers will see the campus in the best light during their short visit.
- The reviewers will provide verbal feedback during the visit. This gives the Steering Committee time to consider the official university response after we receive the written feedback.
- At the end of the process, the Steering Committee will be invited to provide formal recommendations to the provost and chancellor for sustaining quality-improvement processes

Resources:

- Each team member will be funded to take a workshop on assessment or accreditation so that all are aware of what is expected under the new HLC criteria.
- A draft outline of the self-study, the 1998 self-study, and reports from other universities are available.
- Each team member will have access to the password-protected site where many of the materials are stored. Data Collection Teams will post resources and ideas for the self-study there.
- The Assessment website (<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/assessment.html>) serves as the public site for information about the accreditation process. After the mascot is selected, there will be a call for public input into accreditation on the university's home page.
- Pat Dolan (who is ABD in Higher Education Administration) is the Academic Affairs staff person assigned to the Steering Committee. A graduate assistant will polish the first draft that the Steering Committee prepares.
- After gaining insights from a mock site visit led by HLC reviewers on campus during fall 2007, the Steering Committee will determine what additional resources they will need to prepare the final self-study report.

Data Collection Teams

Role: Each member of a Data Collection Team is expected to

- Think creatively about the criteria for re-accreditation.
 - While focusing on the major criterion and work group assigned, also consider what other criteria could also benefit from your discoveries.
 - Review self-studies from comparators for more ideas.
- Plan responses that show the university most appropriately, even if we fall short in some areas.
- Locate appropriate extant documents that provide evidence of our activities and post them on a password-protected site for the Steering Committee to cite in the self-study. Many Senate/Assembly Committees and Task Forces have documents appropriate for this use.
- Compose a brief summary of the ways that the resources meet the criteria.
- Communicate with Steering Committee members who are the leaders for your team.
- Share your findings and experiences with non-team members and invite others (faculty, staff, students, administrators, alumni, community members, and/or parents) to join your team. (**During the site visit, reviewers may ask anyone on campus what they did to contribute to the self-study.**)

Timeline:

- Draft 1 of the self-study must be completed by October 1, 2007. *Steering Committee members must have your data before classes start in FS 2007.*
- A mock site visit will take place in late FS 2007.
- Gaps in the self-study may require you to add data for the final draft, due October 15, 2008.
- The site visit has been requested in February 2009 (back-up date is December 2008).

MISSION AND INTEGRITY TEAM

Criterion One: Mission and Integrity. The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

1a. The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments.

1b. In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

1c. Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.

1d. The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

1e. The organization upholds and protects its integrity.

Work Groups

Response to 1999 Visit

ADA
Admissions
University Relations
Faculty involved with previous visit

Structures That Ensure Integrity

Senate Academic Advisory Committee
Assembly
SGA
Student Support Services
Athletics
MTS

Diversity

OEO Advisory
Women's Task Force
Diversity Task Force
ADA

Academic Integrity

Senate Research Dishonesty Committee
Graduate director dealing with academic integrity
Faculty who've reported academic dishonesty
Academic Affairs staff

Student Retention

Assembly RARSFA Committee
MCR
Student Support Services
Faculty using Early Alert
Assembly Student Affairs Committee

Off-Campus Education

Faculty teaching off-campus
CE

RESOURCES AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT TEAM

Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future. The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

2a. The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

2b. The organization's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

2c. The organization's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

2d. All levels of planning align with the organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

Work Groups

Action Plan

Senate Committees that contributed
Dean(s) involved in strategic planning
IR

Budgeting and Planning for Quality

Development
Accounting faculty
Assembly B&P Committee
MTS
Faculty that teach strategic planning
Dean(s) involved in strategic planning
Chair(s) that plan for quality

Assessment

CTL
Senate Assessment Committee
College/Department assessment committee reps

TEACHING AND LEARNING TEAM

Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching. The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

3a. The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

3b. The organization values and supports effective teaching.

3c. The organization creates effective learning environments.

3d. The organization's learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.

Work Groups

Learning Outcomes

College and department assessment reps

Senate Assessment Committee

Senate C&I Committee

Support for Teaching

CTL

ITS

Faculty participants in NFTS and other
CTL projects

Senate Teaching Awards Committee

Senate Libraries Committee

Library

Support for Learners

Academic support offices

Transfer Services

MRC

Support for Learning Environments

Bookstore

Cashier

Registrar

Safety

Computer labs

Grounds

Assembly Facilities Committee

Co-curricular Learning

Counseling

Wellness

Student Life

Athletics

Assembly Publications Committee

Assembly Student Affairs Committee

Life-long Learning

Adult Education

Professional CEU

CE

PAC

Career Services

RESEARCH TEAM

Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge. The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

4a. The organization demonstrates, through the actions of its board, administrators, students, faculty, and staff, that it values a life of learning.

4b. The organization demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs.

4c. The organization assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

4d. The organization provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

Work Groups

Support for Research

ATP Committee

Library

IRB

ORA

Faculty involved in sponsored research

Senate Research Committee

Research and Creativity in the Curriculum

Faculty including research, creativity, performance in teaching

Research for Global Citizenship

Faculty conducting international research

CIS

Technology in the Curriculum

Regular and non-tenure track faculty implementing technology within their classes

Assembly IT Committee

SERVICE TO SOCIETY TEAM

Criterion Five: Engagement and Service. As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

5a. The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.

5b. The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.

5c. The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.

5d. Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.

Work Groups

Friends and Alumni

Development

Dean(s)

Alumni

Chair(s)

Economic Development

Economic Development Committee

ORA

ESI Committee

Community Outreach

Career Center

Optometry

Extension

Student Life

Development

Public Affairs

Service Learning

Faculty doing service learning projects

Appendix III

Outline for Phase I and Inventory of Electronic Resources

Chapter 1. Mission and Integrity

1. A Brief Profile of the University of Missouri-St Louis

Boiler plate from ORA website;

1998 self-study for history

Updated mission and demographics.

2. Organization of the Self-Study

3. Response to the Accreditation Visit of 1998

(<http://www.umsl.edu/NCA/id11.htm> and <http://www.umsl.edu/NCA/id12.htm>)

A. ADMISSION CRITERIA

Bulletin (<http://www.umsl.edu/bulletin/>)

Graduate School website

(<http://www.umsl.edu/divisions/graduate/prospective/howtoapply.htm#Standards>)

describes the minimal admission standards for graduate degrees.

B. RESOURCES

Action Plan (<http://www.umsl.edu/chancellor/plan/index.htm>) *updates on faculty numbers and increases in scholarships.*

Undergraduate research

(<http://www.umsl.edu/divisions/artscience/uresearch/index.html>).

Number of new programs since 1999. Tanisha Stevens

Number of faculty since 1999. Lori Morgan

Research budget since 1999. (University funds, not external funds) Brenda Stutte

C. GENERAL EDUCATION

General Education Task Force.

General education goals posted at

<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/gened-guide.html>

Academic Profile (<http://www.umsl.edu/services/cad/aptest.html> and *Senate Assessment Committee report of its failings 2004.*

Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) (http://www.cae.org/content/pro_collegiate.htm) *was piloted during fall 2007.*

Undergraduate programs' learning outcomes further enhance gen ed

(<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/critical-think.html>).

D. ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES

Spreadsheet with learning outcomes on Sharepoint under each college's college-wide folder.)

Assessment website on provost's home page

(<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/assessment.html>).

System review: (<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/univ-assessments.html>).

National Survey of Student Engagement (<https://fusion.umsl.edu/ir/main.cfm>)

E. ADA Services

website: <http://www.umsl.edu/services/disabled/>

4. Most Significant Changes 1998-2008

Chancellor's Reports to the Campus and Community from 2003 at

<http://www.umsl.edu/chancellor/speeches/speeches.htm>

ADD NEW PROGRAMS, ADMINISTRATORS, REORGANIZATION, ETC.

Criterion One: Mission and Integrity. The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

1a. The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments.

1b. In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

Chancellor's web page

1c. Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.

Action Plan on Chancellor's web page;

Reports from Diversity and Women's Task Forces on Sharepoint.

1d. The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

Chancellor's, Vice Chancellors', & Faculty Senate web pages

1e. The organization upholds and protects its integrity.

a. Handbooks and the Bulletin

Web documents

b. Dispute Resolution

Web documents, description of Mediation Services, grievance history

Collected Rules

(<http://www.umssystem.edu/ums/departments/gc/rules/fullindex.shtml>)

c. Non-discrimination and Fair Treatment

Collected Rules, OEO self-study and Advisory Group on Sharepoint

d. Academic Integrity

Policy on Academic Affairs website

(http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/policy_statements.html);

Academic Affairs reports to Senate (2006 at

http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/provosts_report_2006.html;

ORA research integrity reports & professional development from Vice Provost.

c. Transcripts

Report from Registrar on policies

d. Relationships with Other Institutions

Articulation agreements from Melissa Hattman;

Collaborative program data from Continuing Ed;

Protocol for political visits from Public Affairs.

e. Athletics and Student Organizations

NCAA reports;

Student Life reports

f. Contractual Relationships

Business services from Gloria Leonard.

- g. Federal and State Compliance
 - a. Credits and Program Length
 - Collected Rules;*
 - CBHE;*
 - Graduate School policies*
 - <http://www.umsl.edu/divisions/graduate/faculty/rulesingle.html>.
 - CHECK HLC'S REQUIREMENTS OR BEST PRACTICES.*
 - b. Higher Education Reauthorization Act
 - Financial Aid reports, especially default rates and any Title IV issues;*
 - Truthful advertising materials from Maureen Zegel & Drew Griffin.*
 - c. Professional Accreditations
 - <http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/umsl-accreditation.html>;
 - College or program summaries from deans.*
 - d. Campus Crime Act
 - Police Report on web.*
 - Online Current has article February 2007 about our safety.*
 - e. Record of Student Complaints
 - Student and Academic Affairs;*
 - Grade appeals in colleges*
 - f. Public notice of re-accreditation
 - Scheduled late Fall 2008.*

Chapter 2: Quality Improvement and Resources

Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future. The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

2a. The organization realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.

On Sharepoint, 5-year reviews and annual reports from Managerial Services, Development, and Continuing Education.

Reports from Budget & Planning (http://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/reports_06-07/all_06-07_reports.htm).

Statement on Enrollment Management from Greg McCalley.

Websites on Pre-collegiate programs and grants, e.g., Bridge, MO-STEP, GEAR-UP, etc.

2b. The organization's resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

On Sharepoint, 5-year reviews and annual reports from Managerial Services and Development;

Action Plan updates re: tenure-track faculty and scholarships from Carol Sholy.

2c. The organization's ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

5-year review process at

<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/fiveyear.html>;

Action Plan activities from Carol Sholy.

2d. All levels of planning align with the organization's mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

On Sharepoint, 5-year reviews and annual reports from Managerial Services and Development.

Reports from Budget & Planning (http://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/reports_06-07/all_06-07_reports.htm).

College planning documents' alignment with Action Plan and mission from deans.

Chapter 3. Learning

Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching. The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

3a. The organization's goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

Summaries of Colleges

(Each answers the following 5 questions)

- a. How are your stated learning outcomes appropriate to your mission, programs, degrees, and students?
- b. What evidence do you have that students achieve your stated learning outcomes?
- c. In what ways do you analyze and use evidence of student learning?
- d. How do you ensure shared responsibility for student learning and assessment of student learning?
- e. How do you evaluate and improve the effectiveness of your efforts to assess and improve student learning?

1. Arts and Sciences
2. Business Administration
3. Continuing Education
3. Education
4. Engineering
5. Fine Arts and Communication
6. Graduate School
7. Honors
8. Nursing
9. Optometry

Summaries from Deans.

5-year reviews and annual reports on Sharepoint.

3b. The organization values and supports effective teaching.

CTL 5-year review self-study on Sharepoint;

Tenure standards from Academic Affairs

(<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/documents.html>);

College documents from deans.

3c. The organization creates effective learning environments.

5-year review reports from departments and Administrative Services on Sharepoint;
Space & Facilities Committee report
(http://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/reports_06-07/all_06-07_reports.htm)
3d. The organization's learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.
Retention documents on Sharepoint;
Student Affairs Leadership Team (SALT) from Vice Provost;
Student Affairs, CTL, and ITS 5-Year Reviews and Annual Reports on Sharepoint.

Chapter 4. Research and Creativity

Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge. The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

4a. The organization demonstrates, through the actions of its board, administrators, students, faculty, and staff, that it values a life of learning.
5-year Reviews on Sharepoint;

Curators' minutes;

Assembly/Senate committee reports at

http://www.umsl.edu/committees/senate/reports_06-07/all_06-07_reports.htm;

SGA reports at <http://www.umsl.edu/%7Esga/legislation.html>;

Staff Association committee reports at

<http://www.umsl.edu/services/sassoc/committees/index.html>

Compilation of scholarly seminars from University Relations;

UG & Grad research fair participation from Mary Ellen Heckel and Mary Ann Coker.

Public Policy Research Center – Applied Research Division (<http://pprc.umsl.edu>);

Center for Molecular Electronics (<http://newton.umsl.edu/cme.html/>);

Center for Neurodynamics (<http://neurodyn.umsl.edu>);

Center for Emerging Technologies (<http://www.emergingtech.org>);

Center of Research, Technology and Entrepreneurial Expertise (CORTEX and Technology Transfer and Commercialization in ORA 5-year review on Sharepoint.

4b. The organization demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs.

Centers (above);

Faculty tenure regs at <http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/faculty.html>;

Academic Analytics study from Chronicle of Higher Education 1/11/07;

General Education and UG program alignment with GE skills

(<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/critical-think.html>).

4c. The organization assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/assessment/univ-assessments.html>;

5-year program review self-studies, including CIS, and Diversity Task Force minutes on Sharepoint;

ITS reports on website.

4d. The organization provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly.

CTL 5-year self-study on Sharepoint;

ORA report on Research Committees and IRB work;

Provost's Academic Integrity report

(http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/provosts_report_2006.html);

FERPA from Student Affairs.

Chapter 5. Service to Society

Criterion Five: Engagement and Service. As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

5a. The organization learns from the constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.

5-year review self-studies of administrative units on Sharepoint;

Pre-collegiate programs;

Economic development from Julius Johnson;

Advisory boards from deans and vice chancellors.

NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

5b. The organization has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.

5-year review self-studies of administrative units and academic programs on Sharepoint;

Action Plan updates from Carol Sholy;

Community Partnership Program at <http://www.umsl.edu/~conted/cpp/>

5c. The organization demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.

5-year review self-studies of administrative units and academic programs on Sharepoint.

5d. Internal and external constituencies value the services the organization provides.

5-year review self-studies of administrative units and academic programs on Sharepoint;

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYER AND ALUMNI SURVEYS