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### Project Goal

**A:** Our project will define the measurable indicators that will help to actuate our institution's development from a good institution to a great one, becoming the University of first choice for students, faculty, and staff. Among our questions are what makes Southeast a university of first choice for members of each of the three groups, for what reasons do members dissociate from the university, and what factors most contribute to members' participation in university organizations both during and after their term as student, faculty, or staff. (85 words)

### Reasons For Project

**A:** This project depicts the next logical, ongoing step for our university, and encapsulates our President's convocational message, our mission of top-notch education and service, our goal to provide culture to our region, and our recognition of the need for a strong, permeating institutional identity.

### Organizational Areas Affected

**A:** All departments and units across the university and its regional campuses will be affected.

### Key Organizational Process(es)

**A:** We expect the project to improve marketing, hiring, curriculum evaluation, program design, budgeting, planning, and recruiting.

### Project Time Frame Rationale

**A:** In the first year, we will survey the three groups of students, faculty, and staff—upcoming, current, and previous—to map the indicators for which we wish to gather further data. The second year will involve gathering further feedback with those specific indicators garnered in year one of the project. Implementation of action based upon the feedback will likely be divided into several different Action Projects or smaller “QuIP” Projects.

### Project Success Monitoring

**A:** Our AQIP Steering Committee will meet regularly to monitor the design, gathering, analysis, and dissemination of the responses to our questions to the stakeholder groups.

### Project Outcome Measures

**A:** Outcomes to be measured include development of a succinct group of indicators, stakeholder satisfaction, and increased retention and recruitment.

### Other Information

Southeast Missouri State University

The Higher Learning Commission Action Project Directory

The Higher Learning Commission Action Project Directory
Each action project will have its own team and designated leader. The AQIP Steering Committee will provide oversight through regular communication with the team. The team will also have some members from the Steering Committee. The composition of the Steering committee makes it a strong vehicle for communicating activities with the rest of the campus. The co-chairs will assure that the administration is informed on all relevant activities, findings and plans.

Project Update

1: Project Accomplishments and Status

An Indicators of First Choice Action Project Committee was formed and commenced work in fall 2007. It brought forward its recommendations to the AQIP Steering Committee in spring 2008. The recommendations were accepted by the AQIP Steering Committee and approved by the President to be implemented by Institutional Research in FY2009. Indicators can now be accessed online at http://ww4.semo.edu/insresearch/First%20Choice/FirstChoiceIndicators.pdf#pagemode=bookmarks The Action Project Committee recommended assessment measures for three major groups: faculty, staff, and students. Each measure is an indicator that the University is indeed becoming, as it says, a University of First Choice. Indicators for each group are identified for Entering Yield, Midpoint Satisfaction, and Reflection (Satisfaction). For faculty, these indicators are (1) percent of qualified applicants who accept the University’s offer of employment; (2) cohort tenure and promotion rates (number of successful candidates over number of applications); and (3) HERI faculty survey questions (“I would like to be teaching at this institution one year from today”; “I recommend Southeast Missouri State University as a great place for a faculty career”; and “It would take a lot to get me to leave Southeast Missouri State University.”). For staff, the indicators are (1) percent of qualified applicants who accept the University offer of employment; (2) first year retention rates; and (3) reflection questions from the staff survey (parallel to faculty questions). For students, the indicators are (1) enrollment over number of applicants, enrollment over acceptances and acceptances over number of applicants offered a place at Southeast Missouri State University; (2) first year retention rates and graduation rates; (3) a NSSE survey item (“If you could start over again, would you choose Southeast Missouri State University?”) The work of this action project is now complete.

2: Institution Involvement

The University of First Choice Action Project Committee included faculty, staff, administrative, and student representatives. The Committee called on key constituencies across the University, including deans, Institutional Research, Enrollment Management, and others, in doing the research that led to its recommendations. A complete report was made to the AQIP Steering Committee. A final summation and review of the project was made at Administrative Council Retreat (the President’s chief advisory council including representatives from all employee groups, deans, chairpersons, major directors, and vice presidents) in August 2009.

3: Next Steps

Some data is not yet generated because it will become available only in the next survey cycle (for example, the HERI faculty survey). As the indicators are reviewed annually, it is expected that other indicators (such as items on the entering freshmen survey) might be added.

4: Resulting Effective Practices

This project was significant in answering the call to establish measurements for institutional success. The process of annual review of data that was established in its wake, including an open review of data at the annual retreat of Administrative Council, marks a significant step toward a quality improvement process.

5: Project Challenges

No significant challenges remain.

6: AQIP Involvement
# Update Review

## 1: Project Accomplishments and Status

The project has developed some measurable indicators; however, these indicators do not address all of the questions proposed in the Action Project's goal. For example, the indicators do address the first question: "...what makes Southeast a university of first choice for members of each of the three groups"; but they do not address the other two questions: 1) "...for what reasons do members dissociate from the university", and 2) "what factors most contribute to members' participation in university organizations both during and after their term as student, faculty, or staff." Perhaps the scope of this project changed, but the only previous report was dated 9/14/2007, and there was no mention of reducing the scope in that report. Was there a report in 2008? For the indicators you developed, was any consideration given to establishing benchmarks? For example, what percentage of Entering Yield, or what percentage of promotion or retention would indicate Southeast was the institution of first choice? Was there any consideration of defining the terms used in the document produced by Institutional Research? For example, "Post Professorial" or "Presented Candidacy". If 45 Post Professorial faculty presented candidacy, and 35 were promoted, what positions were they promoted to? How did 35 get promoted when none were eligible?

## 2: Institution Involvement

The composition of the committee appears to have broad representation from the institution and input solicited from key constituent groups. The feedback from the 2007 report suggested you ensure the level of commitment from the members of the committee. Is it possible a lack of commitment may have resulted in scaling back the project and developing a narrower scope of indicators? What were the results from the planned focus group interviews?

## 3: Next Steps

Hopefully this project has given you a base to develop broader indicators and gather even more meaningful data to help Southeast become the institution of first choice.

## 4: Resulting Effective Practices

A process of annual review, if taken seriously, should lead to continuous quality improvement. The key here is to use the data to develop performance improvements and define deeper layers of data collection.

## 5: Project Challenges

### AQIP Involvement

A:

## Project Outcome

### 1: Reason for completion

All objectives accomplished

### 2: Success Factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A:</th>
<th>Successfully defined targeted indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:</td>
<td>Unsuccessful Factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>Targeted indicators may require additional review to determine how effectively they point to the goal of being an institution of first choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>