Systems Portfolio

Southeast Missouri State University

12/3/2018

1 - Helping Students Learn

1.1 - Common Learning Outcomes

Common Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities expected of graduates from all programs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated common learning outcomes, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Aligning common outcomes (institutional or general education goals) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.B.1, 3.E.2)
- Determining common outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.4)
- Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (3.B.2, 4.B.1)
- Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes (3.B.3, 3.B.5)
- Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)
- Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes (4.B.2)
- Assessing common learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

1R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected at each degree level? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

Responses

1P1: Processes

1P1.1 Aligning common outcomes (institutional or general education goals) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution

Part 1: General education learning outcomes

The University's general education program is called University Studies. The original program was designed to achieve nine learning objectives that aligned with the University's mission as a liberal arts institution and with its general education offerings of predominantly foundational, lower-division coursework. According to historical documentation, these learning objectives also aligned with the state-wide requirements for general education at that time. (Note: "University Studies" and "general education" are used synonymously throughout this section.)

The process for aligning general education outcomes to the institution's mission, offerings, and degree levels was designed by the University Studies Council (USC) in 1988, when the program was created. Historical documentation suggests this process involved "consultation with the departments and disciplines that traditionally provide general education, with input from the faculty and Faculty Senate" and was facilitated by "a broadly representative committee that included elected faculty representatives from each college" (see Systems Portfolio, 2014, p. 3).

In 2018, the University adopted the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) CORE42 Learning Competencies as the general education learning objectives for the University Studies program. The process of aligning the CORE42 Learning Competencies to the state's mission for general education was carried out by the MDHE in collaboration with the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee. The USC carried out a separate process to align the CORE42 Learning Competencies with a set of learning goals that represented the institution's mission (See 1P1.2).

Part 2: Institutional learning outcomes

In March 2018, the provost's office initiated a process to select and align institutional learning outcomes to the mission, offerings, and degree levels of the institution. To undertake this process, the associate provost successfully applied for a grant from the National Institute for Learning Outcomes and Assessment (NILOA) to fund an assessment coach. On March 9, 2018, Dr. Tami Eggleston, NILOA assessment coach, provided an on-site consultation. During Dr. Eggleston's visit, she facilitated two workshops for faculty and staff. One workshop, called Selecting Institutional Learning Outcomes for Southeast, focused on developing common learning outcomes for the University. The workshop participants reviewed key themes and phrases from the University's mission, vision, values, strategic plan, and from nationally recognized frameworks for student learning assessment, such as the Degree Qualifications Profile and the AAC&U's LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. Participants selected a set of five to seven outcomes that characterized the priorities for student learning at Southeast (see 1P1.2 for more detail).

During the 2017/2018 academic year, the University's Academic Assessment Committee developed a Three-Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment that outlines the process for aligning institutional learning outcomes with the educational offerings and degree levels of Southeast. The key mechanism to illustrate this alignment is the Institutional Learning Map that shows where each institutional learning outcome is addressed (see 1R1 and 1I1).

1P1.2 Determining common outcomes

Part 1: General education learning outcomes

The process to determine general education learning outcomes took place during the 1980s, when the University Studies program was being developed. According to historical records, the objectives were determined by a committee in consultation with internal and external stakeholders. Archival copies of the *University Studies Handbook* suggest that the nine learning objectives of the original program have not changed substantively during the last 30 years.

Of the original nine general education learning objectives, two measures—written communication and critical thinking—evolved as institutional priorities for student learning and were most often used as "common outcomes." The Writing Outcomes Program, which originated in 1987, prioritized and assessed students' proficiency in written communication (see 1P1.8). Furthermore, standardized testing of general education—such as the California Critical Thinking Skills test, which was used by the University from 2005 to 2008 and the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP), which was adopted by the University in 2009—provided a way to understand students' ability to engage in critical thinking. As such, the University has a long-standing practice of assessing the written communication and critical thinking common learning outcomes.

The University Studies Council (USC) developed seven general education learning goals that align with both the CORE42 competencies and the University's mission for supporting a liberal education. On April 23, 2018, the USC voted unanimously to adopt the four CORE42 learning competencies and seven general education learning goals for the University Studies program at Southeast (see 1R1).

Part 2: Institutional learning outcomes

The process for determining institutional learning outcomes began with the March 2018 NILOA workshop Selecting Institutional Learning Outcomes for Southeast (see 1P1.1). The results from this workshop led to a proposal from the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) to adopt five institutional learning outcomes (see 1R1).

The proposal to adopt institutional learning outcomes was presented by AAC chairperson to various stakeholder groups for input before it was presented to the Academic Assessment Committee and Academic Council for endorsement on May 1, 2018 and to executive staff for endorsement on May 14, 2018. The proposal received final approval from the president on August 20, 2018.

1P1.3 Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes

Part 1: General education learning outcomes

The purposes, content, and level of achievement of general education outcomes are available on the University Studies webpages as general information and guidance for faculty and students. The process for collating and drafting this information involved three steps:

Step 1: The University Studies Council (USC) reviewed the Missouri Department of Higher Education CORE42 guidance on learning competencies and selected the appropriate text to describe the four learning competencies (see 1R1).

Step 2: The associate provost, as USC chairperson, referred to the AAC&U VALUE definitions for each of the seven general education learning goals to construct description of these goals for Southeast (see 1R1).

Step 3: In October 2018, the USC conducted a survey of all general education instructors to ask which of the newly adopted seven learning goals best described their own courses and to determine whether they already used a signature assignment to assess the respective goal/s (see 1R1).

The General Education Assessment Plan calls for the use of AAC&U VALUE Rubrics to assess each of the seven general education learning goals (see 1P1.7). These rubrics outline the assessment criteria and level of achievement for each goal.

Part 2: Institutional learning outcomes

A new process was implemented in Summer 2018 to identify the curricular and cocurricular activities that introduce, develop, or assess the newly adopted institutional learning outcomes. This process involves three key activities. The first activity was a workshop with the Enrollment Management and Student Success staff on June 15, 2018. As part of this workshop, attendees were asked to identify activities in their areas that supported students' development toward the five institutional learning outcomes. The two subsequent steps in this process are planned for spring 2019 (see 1I1).

1P1.4 Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes

Part 1: General education learning outcomes

There is a long-established process for using the curriculum to help students achieve the University Studies learning objectives. The University Studies Council (USC), which is charged with reviewing and approving proposals for new or revised general education courses, utilizes curriculum approval forms that show the alignment of the proposed course to the general education objectives. As part of the approval process, academic departments requesting approval of these courses are required to supply a sample syllabus showing the key activities and assessments that support students' achievement of the respective outcomes.

The General Education Learning Map, shown in 1R1, provides a guide for understanding where the newly adopted general education goals are taught and assessed.

Part 2: Institutional learning outcomes

The first draft of the Institutional Learning Map, shown in 1R1, provides a starting point for understanding where the newly adopting institutional learning outcomes are introduced, developed, and assessed.

1P1.5 Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs

Part 1: General education learning outcomes

According to historical documentation, a review of the University Studies learning objectives was carried out in the late 1990s and again in 2011. These notes refer to the processes as reaffirming "the value and continued support for using these objectives to guide the liberal education experience at Southeast." The review process is described as faculty-led and leading to a set of recommendations.

The newly adopted general education learning goals align directly with the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) CORE 42 learning competencies. These competencies were designed by the State's Core Curriculum Advisory Committee to reflect appropriate student, societal, and workplace needs for a general education curriculum.

Part 2: Institutional learning outcomes

The process for ensuring that institutional learning outcomes are relevant and aligned is underpinned by the crosswalk of institutional learning outcomes to the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP), AAC&U LEAP, and MDHE CORE 42 learning outcomes. Since these learning outcomes are newly articulated by the University, there are no current activities to ensure they remain relevant. However, the Three-Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment includes a reflective activity during year 3 to revisit the institutional learning outcomes and the general education learning goals for the purposes of determining if they are still suitable.

1P1.6 Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning

The University provides a robust offering of cocurricular activities that support students' educational efforts. Cocurricular activities include residential learning communities, campus lectures, student organizations, study abroad opportunities, the Jane Stephens Honor Program, and leadership development programs (see below). The process to align existing cocurricular activities to the institutional learning outcomes is described in 1P1.3.

In some cases, professional staff working with major student organizations, such as the Student Activity Council, utilize competency guides such as the Competency Guide for College Student Leaders to direct their work. Each student, during their regular meeting with their advisor reviews these competencies and chart their progress for each area (see SAC Competency Checklist). In other areas, such as residential learning communities, the University created a learning community team, comprising faculty and staff who attended the National Summer Institute on Learning Communities at Evergreen State College in July 2017. This team leads efforts to enhance the design, delivery, and assessment of learning communities at Southeast.

The campus operates a tiered leadership development program for students that begins with the First-year Leadership Program (FyLP), which is a series of workshops offered each fall semester for students to explore and build on their innate leadership strengths through fun and engaging activities led by upper-class student facilitators. After completing FyLP, students move to the Emerging Leaders Program, which is designed for sophomores and junior students. Senior students can apply for selection into the President's Leadership Academy, the capstone leadership development program.

1P1.7 Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes

Part 1: General education learning outcomes

The process for selecting tools, methods, and instruments used to assess general education learning outcomes was created by the University Studies Council and the Academic Assessment Committee. Members of these groups invited input from James Madison University, recipient of the 2018 NILOA Excellence in Assessment Award, to learn more about their communities of practice and learning improvement approach. Members of these groups also attended the HLC Workshop for Assessing General Education in February 2018 and Missouri State University's Assessment Workshop in May 2018. Insights gained through this research and training informed the development of the current process at Southeast.

The process includes 1) adopting MDHE CORE 42 general education learning goals; 2) creating a curriculum map to see where these outcomes are being assessed across the general education courses; 3) using respective VALUE Rubrics to assess samples of students' work; 3) hosting communities of practice workshops to discuss assessment data on these outcomes; and 4) identifying and supporting projects for learning improvement within these communities of practice. Steps 1-3 were piloted in spring and fall 2018 (see Three-Year General Education Roadmap).

Part 2: Institutional learning outcomes

The first step of this process was carried out to identify curricular and cocurricular assessments that align with the institutional learning outcomes (see 1P1.3).

1P1.8 Assessing common learning outcomes

The current process for assessing general education learning outcomes follows the AAC&U VALUE Rubric approach. In Spring 2018, the University participated in the VALUE Institute for general education assessment. As a former member of the Multi-State Collaborative for the VALUE project, the University was able to submit up to 300 student learning artifacts (i.e., 100 artifacts for three VALUE Rubrics) to be scored by VALUE Assessors. In Fall 2018, a series of internal scoring workshops took place using the same samples that were scored by the VALUE Institute. Data and other insights gleaned from these internal workshops were considered during a Closing the Loop Luncheon on November 26, 2018.

Prior to adopting the AAC&U VALUE Rubric approach, the University prioritized the assessment of two specific, general education learning objectives: writing proficiency and critical thinking. As the University moves toward full implementation of the VALUE Rubric approach to assessment, the existing processes for assessing writing proficiency and critical thinking may be phased out. The current processes are described below.

Writing proficiency is assessed at three points in a student's experience at Southeast: 1) the WP001 exam, for placement into English Composition (composition I) for students with an ACT score lower than 18 on the written component; 2) the WP002 exam, in order to complete coursework in Rhetoric and Critical Thinking (composition II); and 3) the WP003 exam, as a graduation requirement after the student has accumulated at least 75 credits (see WP Exam Information). The WP Exams are scored by faculty in the English department and staff in the Center for Writing Excellence using a holistic rubric (see also: Holistic Scoring Narrative).

Critical thinking is assessed using the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) exam, which is administered to students once they have completed 75 credit hours and is a requirement for graduation. The MAPP exam is administered by Testing Services. In 2018, a proposal to adopt the shortened version of the MAPP exam though Summer 2019 was endorsed by the Academic Assessment Committee, Academic Council, and executive staff.

1R1: Results

1. As a result of the process described in 1P1.1, the University Studies program was implemented in 1988 to support student learning toward nine learning objectives.
2. In May 2018, the University adopted the Missouri CORE42 Learning Competencies. As a result of the process described in 1P1.1, seven general education learning goals were identified and adopted at Southeast.
3. Following a process to select institutional learning outcomes for Southeast, the following institutional learning outcomes were selected as best describing the institution's priorities for student learning, mission, and vision.
4. The General Education Curriculum Map was compiled in Fall 2018 to show where each general education goal is assessed.
5. As a result of the cocurricular learning workshop in June 2018, the first draft of the Institutional Learning Map was compiled, showing examples of where the newly adopted institutional learning outcomes are introduced, developed, and assessed.
6. Through more than 200 student organizations, various community service opportunities, leadership development programs, and many other activities, first year students and seniors reported equal to or higher rates of a supportive environment for "attending campus activities and events" when compared to other schools in the same Carnegie class in the 2015 National Survey of Student Engagement.
7. Residential learning communities continue their growth at Southeast, with ten active communities supporting 311 students. In support of the learning community program, the team from Southeast that attended the National Summer Institute on Learning Communities created a two-year comprehensive plan for the further development of the learning community program at Southeast.
8. This table shows the AAC&U VALUE Rubrics that were selected for each general education learning goal. In May 2018, the University participated in the VALUE Institute. The results from the Institute provide insight into whether the assignments used were well-aligned with the VALUE Rubric criteria.
9. Assessment workshops were carried out during November 2018 to test the process internally. Findings from these workshops were discussed at the General Education Assessment Closing the Loop Luncheon (see Closing the Loop 2018 report).
10. Based on a 2018 report from the University's Center for Writing Excellence, 1,449 incoming first-year students took the WP001 English placement exam. The percent of tests passed by this cohort increased by .68 percentage points from the 2016 academic year, and the average score increased by 0.32 points during this time. In the same report, 2,206 students took the WP002 exam (common Composition II final) during the 2017-2018 academic year. The percent of tests passed increased by 1.07 percentage points from the 2016 academic year, and the average score increased by 0.31 points during this time. Finally, 1,630 student took the WP003 (graduation exam). The percent of tests passed by this cohort increased by 3.81 percentage points from the 2016 academic year, and they average score increased by 0.29 points during this time (see WP College Pass Rates and Average Scores).
11. MAPP assessment data are reported to the MDHE each year by the Institutional Research Office.
12. In May 2018, the University submitted a sample of 290 student learning artifacts to the VALUE Institute for assessment across three general education learning goals: Written Communication, Critical Thinking, and Global Learning. The VALUE Institute provided the University with an

assessment report and a scoring dataset for each sample (Critical Thinking Report, Written Communication Report, Global Learning Report).

1I1: Improvement

1. The Three-Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment outlines the University's next steps toward enhancing assessment of common learning outcomes, i.e. general education learning goals and institutional learning outcomes at Southeast. Work will be done over the next two years to implement an assessment process for institutional learning outcomes and to develop more fully the assessment processes for general education learning goals.
2. Data from general education assessment activity will be included in the 2018-2019 General Education Assessment Report, which will be distributed in December 2018.
3. The MAPP exam will be phased out by fall 2019, and will be replaced with the sampling and scoring approach for critical thinking.
4. Assessment of cocurricular activities will be strengthened in the next two years by improving the Institutional Learning Map and by inviting these units to participate in the annual Learning Improvement Reporting process (see 1P2).
5. Although very aspirational, the University aims to promote its work to enhance academic assessment—including the work to improve academic and cocurricular program review processes—through national platforms, such as NILOA, in the next five years.

Sources

- C.1.1_AAC Minutes 10-10-18
- C.1.1_Attendees from ILO workshop
- C.1.1_Closing the Loop Luncheon 2018
- C.1.1_Closing the Loop Report Nov 2018
- C.1.1_CORE 42 Learning Competencies
- C.1.1_Course Approval_Change Form
- C.1.1_Critical Thinking VALUE Institute 2017-2018 Report
- C.1.1_DHE-PIS 2018_SEMO
- C.1.1_Email advertising general education assessment workshops Oct-Nov 2018
- C.1.1_Email advertising NILOA assessment workshops
- C.1.1_Email confirmation of ILO approval
- C.1.1_Email confirming registration to the VALUE Institute
- C.1.1_Email from HLC showing group attending HLC Assessment Workshop_Feb 2018
- C.1.1_Email showing group attending Missouri State University Asssessment Workshop
- C.1.1_Emerging Leaders
- C.1.1_Evidence of NILOA grant application
- C.1.1_Executive Staff Presentation_Academic Assessment
- C.1.1_First Year Leadership Program
- C.1.1_General Education Learning Map
- C.1.1_Global Learning VALUE Institute 2017-2018 Report
- C.1.1_Honors Program
- C.1.1_Institutional Learning Map Draft 1
- C.1.1_James Madison University PPT Fulcher_VirtualWebinar_12_7_2017
- C.1.1_Learning Communities Action Plan
- C.1.1_Living-Learning Communities web information
- C.1.1_NACACompetencyGuide

- C.1.1_National Summer Institute on Learning Communities _ The Washington Center web information only
- C.1.1_NSSE Engagement Indicators
- C.1.1_PPT_Adopting Institutional Learning Outcomes
- C.1.1_Presidents Leadership Academy
- C.1.1_Proposal to revise approach to MAPP2 testing
- C.1.1_Revised Syllabus Template
- C.1.1_SAC Competency Checklist
- C.1.1_Speaker Series
- C.1.1_Student Organizations web information
- C.1.1_Study Abroad web information
- C.1.1_Three Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment
- C.1.1_Three Year Roadmap for General Education
- C.1.1_University Studies Assessment Plan
- C.1.1_University Studies Council 2018-2019
- C.1.1_University Studies Learning Goals Survey
- C.1.1_WP Exam Information
- C.1.1_WP Holistic Scoring narrative
- C.1.1_WP Holistic scoring rubric
- C.1.1_WP003 College Pass Rates and Average Scores 2018
- C.1.1_Writing Outcomes Program
- C.1.1_WritingProficiencyScores WP001_002_003_15-18
- C.1.1_Written Communication VALUE Institute 2017-2018 Report
- C1.1_CORE42 Learning Competencies and General Education Learning Goalsl [Adopted May 2018]
- C1.1_Crosswalk of ILOs to other assessment frameworks
- C1.1_Historical documentation showing program reviews
- C1.1_Historical documentation suggesting alignment to state-wide mission
- C1.1_Institutional learning outcomes [Adopted August 2018]
- C1.1_Screenshot showing archives of University Studies Handbooks
- C1.1_Student-facing information about MAPP2
- C1.1_University Studies Assessment Webpage
- C1.1_University Studies Learning Objectives [1988-2018]
- C1.1_USC Minutes April 23 2018

1.2 - Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities graduates from particular programs are expected to possess. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated program learning outcomes and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Aligning learning outcomes for programs (e.g., nursing, business administration, elementary teaching, etc.) to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution (3.E.2)
- Determining program outcomes (4.B.4)
- Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes (4.B.1)
- Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs (3.B.4)
- Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning (3.E.1, 4.B.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes (4.B.2)
- Assessing program learning outcomes (4.B.1, 4.B.2, 4.B.4)

1R2: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected in programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Overall levels of deployment of the program assessment processes within the institution (i.e., how many programs are/not assessing program goals)
- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained

1I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.B.3)

Responses

1P2: Processes

1P2.1 Aligning learning outcomes for programs to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution

This process begins when new programs are proposed for approval. The Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) provides a new program approval form, which asks the proposer to certify that the program is within the approved mission and geographic region of the institution. The program learning outcomes are written and submitted to the Academic Assessment Committee, which reviews the outcomes using the PLO Rubric.

Two examples of how program learning outcomes are aligned to the mission of the institution are included below.

Example 1: Social Studies Education (SSED) Program

The SSED has seven program learning outcomes (PLOs). PLOs 1–3 focus on knowledge required of social studies education students; PLOs 4 and 5 focus on skills required of students; and PLOs 6 and 7 focus on application to civic and professional life. Since the mission of the University includes an emphasis on student-centered and experiential learning, PLOs 6 and 7 best reflect the University's mission.

PLO 6: Apply professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teaching as defined by the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs

PLO 7: Practice continuous self-evaluation, reflection of own performance, flexibility, and adaptation to feedback from students, peers, and administrators

Example 2: Department of Nursing (DoN)

The DoN's mission is complementary, as well as congruent with the mission, role, and scope of Southeast Missouri State University and the College of Education, Health, and Human Studies mission statements. This table demonstrates a side-by-side alignment.

1P2.2 Determining program outcomes

As part of an HLC Action Project called Development, Implementation, and Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (2016–2017), all programs were asked to submit three to seven program learning outcomes for review by the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC). The AAC evaluated the draft PLOs using a PLO Rubric, and the committee provided feedback to program faculty.

The director of assessment tracked the program using a spreadsheet. In 2017, program coordinators who had not submitted their PLOs were supported through face-to-face workshops and email guidance to create PLOs. All certificate, associate, undergraduate, and graduate programs currently have program learning outcomes. As new programs are proposed and developed, the departments construct and submit PLOs to the AAC for consideration and feedback (see 1P2.1).

1P2.3 Articulating the purposes, content, and level of achievement of the outcomes

Academic departments are encouraged to include the program learning outcomes on their department web pages, with an explanation of the purposes for program learning outcomes. Programs have curriculum maps to show where the program learning outcomes are assessed (see

Example 1; Example 2; Example 3). The maps provide a way to communicate the level of achievement of the outcomes by showing the course numbering/level where the outcome is assessed. Proficiency of most program learning outcomes is assessed in upper division courses, and this is demonstrated on the curriculum maps.

1P2.4 Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs

Academic programs undergo program review on a five-year rotation (see 1P3.4). During this process, department faculty are responsible for assessing the programs they offer using pre-determined and self-selected performance indicators. Relevance of learning to workplace needs is typically demonstrated by graduate destination data, i.e., job placement or advanced studies, which is provided by Institutional Research for departments going through program review.

More than 34 academic programs hold specialized accreditation or certification. The accreditation process requires that the program learning outcomes are consistent with national standards for student learning. These standards reflect workplace and societal needs, as well as the continuing professional needs of the individual learner.

Several departments utilize advisory boards comprising industry leaders and other stakeholders. These boards provide insight into societal and workforce needs, which can influence academic programming.

Example 1: The Harrison College of Business and Computing (HCBC) has external advisory boards that meet on a regular basis for both the college as well as individual programs, such as accounting. The HCBC also seeks guidance from employers of their graduates as well as through surveys completed by employers providing internships. HCBC student organizations, such as Beta Alpha Psi and the Center for Public Trust, maintain relevance with industry needs through on-campus presentations and relationships with professional affiliates.

Example 2: During the Annual Computer Science Advisory Board meeting, which takes place each spring, the department of computer science requests oral and written feedback from board members to evaluate if outcomes align with workplace needs.

Example 3: Missouri's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education implements a first-year teacher evaluation tool that allows alumni and principals who hired the first-year teacher to assess the mastery of key knowledge and skills of the educator curriculum. This allows principals and alumni to provide feedback as to how well educators are prepared for the workforce.

Example 4: The engineering and technology department meets with their advisory board annually. This board includes faculty, students, and industry representatives. In the meetings, learning objectives are discussed at both the department level and program/option level. For the latter, the board breaks up into smaller groups by area to discuss the curriculum in detail to ensure the class matches workforce needs (see agenda showing breakout sessions).

1P2.5 Designing, aligning, and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning

Academic departments identify opportunities for cocurricular activities and are responsible for designing and delivering these activities. As explained in 1P1.6, cocurricular activities include residential learning communities and the Jane Stephens Honor Program.

Example 1: The Business Learning Community (BLC) was designed to provide an enhanced learning and social experience for first-year students with a declared business major. Students in this community live together in a wing of a residence hall. This learning community can accept 32 students each fall. There is no cost for students to participate in the BLC beyond their normal housing and course fees. During the 2017/2018 academic year, BLC students took three courses together and participated in social activities as a group (see full report).

Example 2: The Jane Stephens Honors Program is a cocurricular program designed to help high-achieving students maximize their potential and find their own path to success among a supportive group of peers, faculty, and staff. This work consists of courses already within academic majors and the University Studies program and so is delivered in concert with existing curricula that aligns with our corresponding student, course, and program learning outcomes and goals. Students who successfully complete the Jane Stephens Honors Program set themselves apart, typically comprising less than 3% of graduating seniors, and are designated as Honors Scholars (see fuller narrative).

1P2.6 Selecting the tools, methods, and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes

The two tools that are used to assess student learning at the program level include curriculum maps and Learning Improvement Reports.

Curriculum maps are required for each undergraduate and graduate program. Curriculum maps show where the program learning outcomes are assessed across the program. The process for selecting curriculum maps took place during the AQIP Action Project to Develop, implement, and assess program learning outcomes. The process for selecting an approach for assessing PLOs originated with the appointment of a director of assessment in summer 2015, who worked collaboratively with the provost, vice provost, deans, department chairpersons, and the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) to develop a process for constructing meaningful PLOs and curriculum maps. Once the process was designed, the director of assessment and the Center for Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning worked with academic departments to develop or enhance PLOs. A PLO rubric was developed by the AAC to evaluate the structure of the PLOs. In fall 2016, departments were asked to create curriculum maps showing where the PLOs were assessed. In June 2017, the incoming associate provost absorbed the work of the director of assessment.

Learning Improvement Reports were implemented in spring 2017 to prompt academic departments to carry out data collection, analysis, and reflection on student learning. Learning Improvement Reports ask program coordinators and their colleagues to gather evidence (direct and indirect) of student learning toward PLOs and to draw conclusions from these data. The report asks for action plans for improving student learning where learning has been deemed ”poor” or “fair.” The report is now required on an annual basis and as part of the program review process. The process for selecting this approach originated with the former director of assessment and the AQIP Action Project mentioned previously. Originally, the process was designed to mirror the continuous improvement narrative that is required by accredited educator preparation programs. A second option based on Brigham Young University's "alignment tables", called the Table Option, as well as an Accredited Programs Option to cross-reference relevant parts of recent accreditation reports were added at a later date.

1P2.7 Assessing program learning outcomes

PLOs are assessed within the course-level assessment that aligns to the program outcomes (as shown on the program's curriculum map). The process for assessing program learning outcomes involves the Learning Improvement Reports (LIRs) that program faculty are required to complete each year (see 1P2.6) by the end of February. LIRs are reviewed by two members of the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC), who provide formative feedback to the department (see 2018 review schedule).

New measures have been implemented to promote student learning assessment as a meaningful and vital process. In fall 2017, the AAC and the provost's office hosted the Provost's Fall Speaker Series on Student Learning Assessment. The series included guest speakers from Brigham Young University, Salt Lake Community College, and James Madison University. The annual Provost Award for Excellence in Student Learning Assessment was introduced in spring 2018, with the first award recipient announced in April 2018. Also, in March 2018, the University was successful in its application for a grant-funded assessment coach from the National Institute for Learning Outcomes and Assessment to visit the campus (see 1P1).

1R2: Results

1. As a result of the AQIP Action Project to develop and assess PLOs, and the follow-up activities to support academic departments, all certificate, undergraduate, and graduate programs have PLOs and curriculum maps.
2. As a result of implementing Learning Improvement Reports, all academic departments engage in an annual process of data gathering, reflection, and action planning using assessment data.
3. Program review processes now include program learning assessment, which helps to formalize recommendations and action plans for learning improvement.

1I2: Improvement

1. The Three-Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment, which is shown in 1P1, outlines the goals for the next two years. In terms of program learning assessment, activities will include creating SharePoint sites for each academic department to house and update PLOs, curriculum maps, and Learning Improvement Reports. Additionally, in Year 3 of the plan, the University will explore assessment software to provide more sophisticated tools for aligning PLOs with institutional learning outcomes; gathering, analyzing, and reporting program assessment data; and formalizing learning improvement projects.
2. The alignment of cocurricular learning goals with institutional learning outcomes will be supported with the implementation of the Institutional Learning Map, as discussed in 1P1.

Sources

- C.1.2_2018-2019 Accreditations and Certifications
- C.1.2_Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes_Eng_Tech
- C.1.2_Advisory Committee Member List_2018_Eng_Tech
- C.1.2_Assessment website
- C.1.2_Corporate Advisory Board as of 11-28-18
- C.1.2_CS Advisory Board Membership Spring 2018

- C.1.2_CSAdvisoryCommitteeFeedback2018
- C.1.2_Development_Implementation_and_Assessment_of_PLOs
- C.1.2_Email advertising Assessment Speaker Series
- C.1.2_Email showing support for PLOs and curriculum maps
- C.1.2_Example 1_Music Curriculum Maps and CLOs Updated 051217
- C.1.2_Example 2_Curriculum Map BSBA Marketing
- C.1.2_Example 3_MMED PR Curriculum Map Submission051817
- C.1.2_Example of department KPIs
- C.1.2_Example of department website showing PLOs_Psychology
- C.1.2_FYTS and FYTPS Description and Data
- C.1.2_FYTS Teacher 2018
- C.1.2_FYTS Teachers Principal 2018
- C.1.2_HCBC Employer Survey
- C.1.2_Institutional Learning Map Draft 1
- C.1.2_Institutional Program Review Schedule AY15-19
- C.1.2_Institutional Program Review Schedule AY20-24
- C.1.2_Jane Stephen Honors Program Narrative
- C.1.2_Learning Improvement Report (Table Option)
- C.1.2_MDHE New Program Approval Form
- C.1.2_Narrative for Business Learning Community
- C.1.2_Partners in Progress Advisory Board Membership
- C.1.2_PLO tracking spreadsheet example from 2016
- C.1.2_PLO-CLO rubric guidance
- C.1.2_Program Approval Process - Southeast Missouri State University
- C.1.2_Program Assessment Report Narrative Option
- C.1.2_Provosts Awards for Teaching Excellence
- C.1.2_Sample Completed PLO Rubric - Accounting
- C.1.2_Schedule for Peer Review of Assessment Tools and Reports for Departments 2018
- C.1.2_Screenshot showing Learning Improvement Reports options
- C.1.2_Table 1P2_DoN Mission Alignment Example
- C.1.2_Three Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment

1.3 - Academic Program Design

Academic Program Design focuses on developing and revising programs to meet stakeholders' needs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.C. and 4.A. in this section.

1P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for ensuring new and current programs meet the needs of the institution and its diverse stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs (1.C.1, 1.C.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs
- Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary (4.A.1)

1R3: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution's diverse stakeholders? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

1P3: Processes

1P3.1 Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs

University processes for early alert, placement testing, academic support services, and the SupportNET retention platform are included 2P1.

Additionally, academic departments and colleges often use their own processes for understanding students' educational needs.

Example 1: The MS in Applied Computer Science and MS in Cybersecurity used internal surveys to gauge interest from undergraduate students in these programs. Initial internal surveys indicated that approximately 40% of Southeast's undergraduate students expressed interest in these master's degree (see report).

Example 2: Data from student performance on the MoGEA and MoCA teacher education exams resulted in the College of Education, Health, and Human Studies purchasing online and hard copy study materials to improve exam passage rates for these required exams. In addition, EHHS developed a Holmes Honors program to support successful matriculation of underrepresented students through the education program.

Example 3: The Holland College of Arts and Media and its academic departments meet with all first-year students the Friday before school begins. Processes for the college are discussed and students are introduced to the people they need to contact in case they have any issues or needs (see dean's notes). These student groups and faculty communicate to their chairpersons questions about activities, conferences, and travel experiences (see department meetings with students).

1P3.2 Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs

Advisory boards, which are utilized by several academic departments and colleges, provide insight into workforce needs in their areas.

Example 1: Within the Holland College of Arts and Media, the department of art and design uses the Art Task Force and the Interior Design Advisory Board (see meeting notes); the department of mass media uses the Mass Media Professional Advisory Council; the department of music uses the Symphony Society; the Conservatory of Theatre and Dance uses the Theatre and Dance Society. The college is supported by the River Campus Board of Managers.

Example 2: Within the College of Science, Technology, Education, and Mathematics, the agriculture department uses the Agriculture Advisory Board and the engineering and technology department uses the Engineering and Technology Advisory Board.

Example 3: Departments within the Harrison College of Business and Computing receive input from the St. Louis Corporate Advisory Council, the Computer Science Advisory Board, the Cybersecurity Advisory Board; the Partners in Progress (Accounting Advisory Board); the Healthcare Management Advisory Committee; the Hospitality Management ACPHA Accreditation Advisory Council; and the Student Advisory Council.

Example 4: The College of Education, Health, and Human Studies (EHHS) receives input from the EHHS Student Advisory Board, the EHHS Alumni Advisor Board, and the Educator Preparation Student Advisory Board.

Example 5: The College of Humanities and Social Sciences elicits input and support from from the Criminal Justice Advisory Board and the Social Work Advisory Board.

The University is affiliated with 26 accrediting bodies, which provide educational standards and guidelines for designing and delivering academic programming. These criteria are reflective of the employer needs across the sector.

Southeast Online works with nine industry partners to determine their needs and develop responsive programming.

1P3.3 Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs

These examples show processes for developing responsive academic programming.

Example 1: Comments from English–Writing Option graduates and information from the Bureau of Labor Statistics influenced the program design and MDHE approval of both the BA and MA in Professional Writing (see College Council minutes and minutes from board of regents meeting).

Example 2: During the 2017/2018 academic year, the Criminal Justice Advisory Board provided strong support for the merger of the criminal justice and the social work departments, suggesting both groups of students would benefit from cross-pollination of ideas (see minutes).

Example 3: During the recent Mass Media Professional Advisory Council, discussion was started by professional members about the skills they are looking for when hiring graduates to work in their companies. The faculty and chairperson were very receptive and began talking about curriculum development ideas from this discussion (see minutes).

Academic programs with specialized accreditation modify academic programming to respond to the requirements of their respective accrediting body, and make continuous improvements to academic programming based on feedback from site-visits and other input from peer reviewers.

Example 1: During the 2012/2013 academic year, all education programs underwent curricular revision to align with new accreditation standards. After the last visit from CAEP in 2010, the following improvements have been implemented: 1) better tracking of diversity of field placements; 2) closer attention paid to the consistency of the faculty evaluation process; and 3) enhanced processes for ensuring that mentor teachers have appropriate qualifications as defined by the State (see update).

Example 2: During the accreditation visit for The Conservatory of Theatre and Dance in 2012, the National Association of Schools of Dance commented on the lack of live musicians in ballet and modern classes. Now all levels of ballet and many of the modern dance classes utilize part-time staff to provide live music (see NASD Action Report).

Example 3: The National Association of Schools of Theatre identified an area in the theatre program that was not developed as strongly as it should be for a BFA in acting program. In the past, the department had a vocal voice teacher to conduct voice lessons for music theatre students. However, the department did not have a vocal person specializing in spoken word. This weakness was brought to college administration, and they assisted in establishing a faculty line to address this problem (see NAST Response 2013).

Through conversations with industry partners, Southeast Online works with other campus partners to develop custom educational pathways for partners' employees. For example, a recent partnership between TG Missouri (a local automotive manufacturing facility) and the University led to a custom leadership program for TG Missouri employees.

1P3.4 Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs

The University carries out an established academic program review process. The process is managed by the associate provost and Faculty Advisory Committee for Program Review. All academic departments participate in a five-year rotation for reviewing the programs within each department. Approximately four to seven departments are scheduled for cyclical program review each year.

Central to the process is a set of key performance indicators for each academic department. The key performance indicators are standard for each department, with one indicator being "department-selected." These indicators include number of full-time faculty, student credit hours, number of majors, number of degrees awarded, and number of scholarly or creative outputs (see example from the department of child and family studies).

In 2017/2018, a project was initiated called Enhancing Program Review at Southeast. A 2017 white paper called "Program Review at Southeast" outlined seven principles for academic program review based on international best practices. The white paper recommended a pilot process that enshrined these principles.

The Enhancing Program Review Project Plan was designed and implemented in fall 2017 to test this pilot process. The seven departments undergoing cyclical program review during the 2017/2018 academic year were invited to participate in the pilot project.

1P3.5 Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary

An Extraordinary Program Review process was established in fall 2017 to review 19 low-completer academic programs. The Missouri Department of Higher Education provided to public institutions a list of programs with fewer than 10 graduates per year averaged over the last three years for undergraduate programs and fewer than five graduates per year averaged over the last three years for graduate programs. The Extraordinary Program Review followed an eight-step process, leading to a decision to "delete," "enhance," or "maintain" the program.

1R3: Results

1. A revised five-year rotation for program review has been developed based on the new academic structure (see Introduction) and on upcoming dates for specialized accreditation reviews.
2. Over the last two years, 13 academic departments have undergone academic program review (see sample report 1; report 2; report 3; report 4).
3. The pilot project to enhance the program review process has yielding insights. The process is now being piloted a second year to gather additional input from participants.
4. The Extraordinary Program Review process resulted in the deletion of four low-completer programs in addition to the five low-completer programs that had already been identified for deletion by college deans.

1I3: Improvement

1. Five academic programs are currently undergoing academic program review during the 2018/2019 academic year. Additionally, one cocurricular program—Tomorrow's Teachers Learning Community—is piloting the cocurricular program review process this year.

2. The Physics program will undergo a second extraordinary program review following feedback from the provost in 2017.
3. Currently, Southeast Online is working with a local hospital to develop and strengthen health career pathways and promote lifelong learning in the region.

Sources

- C.1.3_2018-2019 Accreditations and Certifications
- C.1.3_Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes_Eng_Tech
- C.1.3_Advisory Committee Member List_2018_Eng_Tech
- C.1.3_Biology Program Review Report 16_17
- C.1.3_Board minutes 5-11-18 showing approval of writing option_pp. 28-66
- C.1.3_CAEP Recommendations
- C.1.3_CJ Advisory Board Minutes November 2017 Meeting
- C.1.3_Cocurricular program review process_pilot
- C.1.3_College Council minutes 2018 01 19 showing support for writing option
- C.1.3_Corporate Advisory Board as of 11-28-18
- C.1.3_CS Advisory Board Membership Spring 2018
- C.1.3_CSAdvisoryCommitteeFeedback2018
- C.1.3_Educator Preparation Student Advisory Board Overview
- C.1.3_Email evidence of HCAM meetings with students
- C.1.3_Enhancing Academic Program Review_Project Plan
- C.1.3_Examples of department KPIs_Child and Family Studies
- C.1.3_Extraordinary Program Review Process Flowchart
- C.1.3_Faculty Advisory Committee for Program Review 2018-2019
- C.1.3_Holmes Honors Program Fall 2016 Report
- C.1.3_Holmes Honors Program information
- C.1.3_Holmes Honors Program Spring 2017 Report
- C.1.3_Institutional Program Review Schedule AY15-19
- C.1.3_Institutional Program Review Schedule AY20-24
- C.1.3_List of low completer programs
- C.1.3_List of Online Partners
- C.1.3_Mass Media Program Review Report 16_17
- C.1.3_Memo to MDHE with outcome of Extraordinary Program Review 2017
- C.1.3_NASD Action Report 10.6.17
- C.1.3_Notes from Interior Design Advisory Board
- C.1.3_Outcomes of CS survey example
- C.1.3_Partners in Progress Advisory Board Membership
- C.1.3_Program review at Southeast_final
- C.1.3_Program Review flowchart for Year 2 of Pilot
- C.1.3_Program Review PSPR_17_18
- C.1.3_Program Review Report 2018 Department of Computer Science
- C.1.3_Response to 2013 NAST Commission Action Report
- C.1.3_TG Missouri Partnership web information
- C.1.3_Welcome to new students 2018_deans speaking notes
- C.13_MM_Professional Advisory Council Minutes 10 30 2018

1.4 - Academic Program Quality

Academic Program Quality focuses on ensuring quality across all programs, modalities and locations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.A. and 4.A. in this section.

1P4: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for ensuring quality academic programming. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses and learning they will pursue (4.A.4)
- Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs (3.A.1, 3.A.3, 4.A.4)
- Awarding prior learning and transfer credits (4.A.2, 4.A.3)
- Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s) (4.A.5)
- Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels (3.A.2, 4.A.6)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities

1R4: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of assessments (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I4: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

1P4: Processes

1P4.1 Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses, and learning they will pursue

The advising process is a primary mechanism for determining and communicating expectations to students regarding their academic preparation. Additionally, the University's FirstSTEP orientation process provides students with initial insight into what they will need to do to prepare for their first semester of coursework.

The University provides detailed degree maps for each major to help students know how to plan their courses and understand sequencing or priority ordering of courses (see sample degree map). The degree maps are available online and used during advising sessions.

DegreeWorks is a software platform for degree planning, and is used by advisors when meeting with students. DegreeWorks helps students and advisors plot out the students' intended pathway toward graduation and identifies any corequisites or prerequisites that may be needed for particular courses (see user guidance).

In addition to these university-wide support measures, there are college- and department-level activities as well.

Example 1: The mathematics department does a statistical analysis of student success data to determine course prerequisites. These data have been used to set both ACT score prerequisites and grade requirements for prerequisite classes.

Example 2: The dean or associate dean for the College of Education, Health, and Human Studies provides a lunch session at each FirstSTEP to make incoming education majors aware of expectations; including the use of iPads, required standardized testing, and GPA expectations.

Example 3: Within the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, the cognitive and academic skills needed to succeed are discussed with students in each program during group and individual advising, and during recruitment visits. The specific skills are determined by the program faculty within each academic department after reviewing strengths and weaknesses of incoming and graduating students (see schedule of department meetings).

Example 4: For Holland College of Arts and Media programs, academic department webpages (see Piano Proficiency Policy as example) and the *University Bulletin* address the preparations required for specific programs. Many of these degrees require auditions or interviews. In addition to having this information available on the web and in the *Bulletin*, departments create recruiting materials to advertise the audition dates. For example, Saturday, November 17, 2018 was Dance Day. A large over-sized postcard was created to advertise this activity and distributed at multiple recruiting events (see front and back). Students could take master classes to get to know the faculty and students and were able to audition for the program that day.

1P4.2 Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs

Each course, regardless of delivery mode, has standard learning outcomes to ensure academic quality and consistency regardless of the class format or location. Faculty define specific learning outcomes for courses and those outcomes are approved by the department and college council (see example). The course learning outcomes are included in every course syllabus and each outcome is assessed. The assessment data are requested from faculty each fall and spring semester. Faculty report these data via the Course Learning Outcomes Portal at the end of each semester (see entry page and landing page).

In 2017, the University implemented an annual process, called Learning Improvement Reports, for academic departments to assess student learning against program learning outcomes (see

1P3). This process applies to all departments, regardless of delivery location or mode.

Students taking courses at the additional locations are held to the same standards, assessments, and assignments as students taking the same courses on the main campus or online. Additional locations students are required to take the same placement exams for English and mathematics as the main campus students. Students in educator preparation programs are required to take the MoGEA exam for general education and the MOCA exam, like students at the main campus. These exams are administered at the additional locations by Testing Services proctors.

All courses offered by the University, regardless of location or mode, are evaluated by students using the SmartEvals system. The evaluations are administered and responded to online, which assures complete confidentiality and accuracy (see user guidance and core questions).

1P4.3 Awarding prior learning and transfer credits

Applicants from regionally accredited colleges or universities who have completed 24 transferable semester hours with a cumulative transfer grade point average of 2.0 or higher on a four-point scale are considered for admission upon presentation of official transcripts showing statements of credits and honorable dismissal. Applicants who have completed fewer than 24 transferable semester hours must also meet First Year Student admission requirements (see 2P1.1 for admissions criteria).

The process for awarding transfer credit is outlined in the *University Bulletin*. The process for awarding prior learning credits is also outlined in the *University Bulletin*.

Some academic departments have their own processes for awarding credit for prior learning. For example, the department of engineering and technology shows options for portfolio assessment of prior learning on their degree map.

1P4.4 Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s)

Southeast is affiliated with 26 external bodies that accredit or certify 34 academic programs. The process to select, implement, and maintain specialized accreditation is overseen by the respective academic department chairperson. Occasionally, the department chairperson appoints a department accreditation coordinator to serve as the point of contact. The academic department identifies relevant, specialized accreditations and gains the support of the dean and provost to apply for accreditation. The provost's office supports the department chairperson with the application and provides necessary funding for application fees through a central budget index. The application for accreditation is reviewed by both the provost and the president prior to submission.

Once the accreditation has been awarded, the academic department oversees the requirements for maintaining and reaffirming accreditation. When the accreditation is college-wide, or even university-wide (as in the case of secondary education programs), an associate dean facilitates these processes. For example, the associate dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Studies, working with the dean, facilitates the CAEP accreditation processes for all educator preparation programs. The associate dean of the Harrison College of Business and Computing, working with the dean, facilitates the AACSB accreditation processes for the accredited programs in that college.

Self-study reports and site visits are scheduled in advance and these activities are recorded with the provost's office. The associate provost coordinates with the Budget Office and Facilities Management to ensure that funding is available for accreditation activities each year, and that necessary work is done to prepare the campus for site visits. Following site visits or feedback received from reports, the department is responsible to communicate the findings to key stakeholders and to address any areas or concerns.

Letters to confirm accreditation or reaffirm accreditation are sent to the associate provost and stored electronically in the provost's office (example 1; example 2). The associate provost coordinates updates to information related to specialized accreditation that appear on the provost's web pages or in the campus *Bulletin*.

1P4.5 Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels

Career Services coordinates graduate outcomes data collection in accordance with the National Association of Colleges and Employers standards of best practice. The University works with students and alumni throughout a twelve month data collection period to offer career assistance and track employment status. Utilizing digital resources, data are collected from graduating students with post-graduation plans at commencement. Surveys are emailed to non-Southeast email addresses as well as existing Southeast email accounts every two months post-graduation. Career Services staff also utilize additional data sources–social media, National Student Clearinghouse, International Student Scholar Management–during the twelve month period post-graduation to collect outcome information.

1P4.6 Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities

Program rigor is assessed in a number of ways (see 1P4.2). The process for selecting these approaches varies, depending on the aspect of program rigor that is being assessed.

Example 1: Each fall, spring, and summer semester, faculty are requested to report course learning outcome (CLO) data via the CLO portal. This is an online reporting tool that was developed internally as part of the AQIP Action Project called Development, Implementation and Assessment of Formalized Course-Level Student Learning Outcomes, which was completed in 2016. This reporting tool was selected as a way to conveniently input and edit course learning outcomes, and to report students' achievement of these for each class. Additionally, the Action Project team wanted department chairpersons and the former dean of online learning to be able to access these data for aggregate reporting processes. Therefore, special access was created within the system to support this functionality.

Example 2: Learning Improvement Reports were implemented in spring 2017 to prompt academic departments to collect data related to program learning outcomes, reflect on these findings, and propose actions to improve student learning. The process for selecting this tool is explained in 1P2.

Example 3: In 2014, the University became affiliated with Quality Matters (QM) and used these resources to implement a quality assurance process for online course design. The process to select Quality Matter originated with the University leadership team, who expressed a concern about a particular trend in student behavior, specifically student drop rates during winter semester. A small team of faculty and instructional designers explored the QM Rubric and attended QM training. An internal grant, made available through

Southeast's Funding For Results program, provided resources to carry out a small-scale implementation for high demand courses with particularly vulnerable student populations. The effectiveness of the instrument was assessed anecdotally from faculty participating in the initial implementation. Based on these insights, a full implementation of QM was initiated by the Office of the President.

1R4: Results

1. Southeast is the only university in the state of Missouri accredited in all the arts. In 2001, only music was accredited. Work began during this time to create the River Campus, the only campus dedicated to all four areas of the arts in the state. With the idea of a new arts campus, accreditation possibilities were discussed. Theatre was accredited next after working and growing the department for a decade. After theatre received accreditation, work was completed to achieve dance accreditation. Last year, the final piece was in place when art was accredited. All of these accreditations originated within the departments and driven by the desire of the faculty and chairpersons to offer high quality, recognized programs.
2. For students enrolled in one of the K-12 teacher programs at an additional location, the academic departments track student learning based on the Missouri General Education Assessment (MoGEA) and the Missouri Content Assessment (MOCA) exam scores and produce recommendations to support students at these locations. There has been improvement in students' exam performance at additional locations but the department intends to continue providing additional support (see APE report).
3. As a result of the efforts to collect graduate outcome data, summary reports are now available.
4. As a result of the QM initiative that launched in 2014, evidence is now available to suggest a positive correlation between the QM process and student engagement (see QM Impact Report). The University was awarded the QM Impact Award in November 2018 for its work to improve the design of online courses and student engagement in online courses.

1I4: Improvement

1. In 2018, the University acquired Starfish Retention Software, which has been implemented and branded by Southeast as SupportNET. Once fully adopted, this tool will be able to filter data by student location and view students' academic performance (see more in 2P1).
2. Recently, the process was changed to exempt additional locations students from taking the MAPP (Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress) exam as a graduation requirement. This exam is being phased out as a requirement for main campus students by fall 2019, and because additional locations students often needed to travel to the main campus to take this exam, it did not make sense to continue requiring the exam for this group.
3. The Three-Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment, shown in 1P1, aims for the University to acquire assessment software in 2020 that will be able to provide better tracking of student performance across all modes and locations.
4. Now that all online courses have been reviewed using the QM rubric, the University will enter a phase to revisit these courses for continuous improvement.

Sources

- C.1.4_2018-2019 Accreditations and Certifications
- C.1.4_Academic Advising at Southeast Missouri State University
- C.1.4_Accreditation letter example_CFLE

- C.1.4_Accreditation letter example_NASAD
- C.1.4_Advising Outcomes
- C.1.4_Advising Syllabus Fall 18
- C.1.4_APE 217 18 report
- C.1.4_AQIP Action Project Charter_Formalizing course learning outcomes
- C.1.4_CLO reporting tool landing page
- C.1.4_College Council minutes showing CLO approval in yellow
- C.1.4_College Meetings and Departmental Breakout Locations
- C.1.4_Course Approval_Change Form
- C.1.4_Credit by exam policies and procedures
- C.1.4_Dance Day postcard back
- C.1.4_Dance Day postcard front
- C.1.4_Degree Map Example_HCOBC_ACCT_Accounting
- C.1.4_DegreeWorks Landing Page
- C.1.4_Department webpage showing Music Major Day information
- C.1.4_Evidence of department meeting showing approval of syllabi of four courses
- C.1.4_FirstSTEP 18-19 Agenda with Descriptions
- C.1.4_FirstSTEP 2019 Final Recruitment and Orientation Dates
- C.1.4_FirstSTEP Student Parent Advising Worksheet Updated
- C.1.4_Graduate outcomes data report 2016_2017_all students
- C.1.4_Guidance for staff using DegreeWorks
- C.1.4_HCAM Recruiting Materials example 1
- C.1.4_HCAM Recruiting Materials example 1 [back]
- C.1.4_Math department outputs of statistical analysis for coreq_prereq
- C.1.4_Piano Proficiency Policy
- C.1.4_PLA example from Eng and Tech Degree Map
- C.1.4_QM Impact Infographic_final
- C.1.4_Quality Matter Award email
- C.1.4_Quality Matters information_CSTL
- C.1.4_Reporting CLO Data Access Page
- C.1.4_Revised Syllabus Template
- C.1.4_SmartEvals core survey questions
- C.1.4_SmartEvals user guidance
- C.1.4_Teacher Education 2018
- C.1.4_Web information for transfer admission policy
- C.1.4_Webpage listing degree maps for all majors

1.5 - Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity focuses on ethical practices while pursuing knowledge. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.D. and 2.E. in this section.

1P5: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for supporting ethical scholarly practices by students and faculty. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice (2.D., 2.E.1, 2.E.3)
- Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students (2.E.2, 2.E.3)
- Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty (2.E.2, 2.E.3)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity

1R5: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the quality of academic integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures where appropriate)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

1I5: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 1R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

1P5: Processes

1P5.1 Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice

By affirmation of the board of regents, Southeast Missouri State University endorses the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure promulgated by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors as a basic description of academic freedom (see Faculty Handbook, Section E).

1P5.2 Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students

The University Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversees the ethical research practice of students and faculty. As part of the IRB process, students and faculty conducting research involving human subjects are required to complete Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) training (see CITI Registration and HSR Training information). The CITI program is a web-based subscription service providing research ethics education to all members of the research community. CITI is a multi-language site used by over 830 participating institutions and facilities from around the world including Southeast.

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) establishes and enforces rules for the ethical treatment of non-human animal subjects in research (see IACUC membership and information).

The Office of Student Conduct provides the Student Code of Conduct and the *Responsible Redhawks* Guide, which includes the Academic Honesty Policy for students. Faculty are encouraged to use the Syllabus Template for their class syllabus, which provides a statement of academic honesty and a link to the Academic Honesty Policy.

1P5.3 Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty

Multiple avenues are available to students for expressing concerns or making complaints about teaching or research practices (see 2P4). Myriad processes are used by the University to confirm ethical teaching practices. Examples that provide insight into teaching practice include:

- faculty observations of classroom teaching
- feedback from student evaluations
- four year dossier reviews of tenure track faculty
- Department Tenure and Promotion Committee evaluations
- College Tenure and Promotion Committee evaluations
- University Tenure and Promotion Committee evaluations
- Chairperson evaluations
- Dean evaluations

Chapter 3, Section A of the *Faculty Handbook* includes a statement of Professional Ethics, which outlines the professional commitment required to operate in an honest and ethical manner. Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Handbook* outlines the University's Academic Honesty Policy for all members of the campus community. This policy is reflected in the information provided to students in the *Responsible Redhawks* Guide mentioned above.

In September 2018, the University hosted its first annual Integrity Week, which was designed to promote honest and ethical practice in the personal, professional, and academic lives of all members of the campus community. Multiple workshops, seminars, and other engaging activities were offered by internal and external facilitators to all faculty, staff, students, and community members (see 2018 program).

Over the past few years, the Center for Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning (CSTL) has provided workshops to support faculty on topics related to academic integrity (see sample). In 2017, the CSTL submitted a proposal for a Funding for Results grant to purchase text-matching software. This proposal was awarded the full amount requested in the proposal.

1P5.4 Selecting the tools, methods, and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity

The Office of Student Conduct uses a spreadsheet to track reported cases of academic misconduct that are escalated to university-level review panels. Discussion has taken place, informally, to consider whether a more formal system should be implemented.

The University used to use Turnitin as a text-matching tool for both students and instructors to determine whether correct approaches for referencing sources had been used. Due to a reduction in financial resources, a decision was made in 2017 to discontinue the subscription to this software. As mentioned in 1P5.3, a successful grant proposal was submitted by the CSTL to purchase a less expensive text-matching tool. However, in the meantime, this vendor merged its products with Turnitin, making the proposed solution less affordable.

A deliberate attempt has been made to provide faculty development and student training to support honest and ethical teaching and learning practices. A meeting with key stakeholders took place during summer 2018 to discuss a more robust approach to supporting academic integrity. As a result, this group endorsed the idea to host Integrity Week in September as a pilot exercise.

1R5: Results

1. To date, 519 faculty, staff, and students have taken the CITI training programs required by the IRB.
2. According to the final report from the planning team, 201 members of the campus community attended workshops, seminars, and other events during Integrity Week 2018. Through advice sessions and talking booths, the team engaged with 779 members of the campus community. Give-aways were provided to 950 members of the campus community (see p. 2 of the report).

1I5: Improvement

1. The planning team for the 2018 Integrity Week event met in October 2018 to reflect on the event and to outline actions for the next academic year (see report).
2. The CSTL intends to work with other campus partners to propose the reacquisition of Turnitin software through the Information Technology Committee and Budget Review Process (see 5P2 for more information on these processes).

Sources

- C.1.5_CITI Registration Page - Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative
- C.1.5_Faculty Handbook Chapter 4 Academic Honesty
- C.1.5_Faculty Handbook Section E_Academic Freedom
- C.1.5_FFR
- C.1.5_Human Subjects Research (HSR) – CITI Program
- C.1.5_IACUC - Southeast Missouri State University
- C.1.5_IACUC Membership
- C.1.5_Institutional Review Board Information
- C.1.5_Integrity Week 2018 Follow Up Report
- C.1.5_Integrity Week 2018 Newswire announcement
- C.1.5_Recent CSTL workshops for faculty to support academic integrity
- C.1.5_Responsible Redhawks Academic Honesty Policy
- C.1.5_Revised Syllabus Template
- C.1.5_Statement of Professional Ethics_Faculty Handbook Chapter 3

- C.1.5_Student Code of Conduct

2 - Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

2.1 - Current and Prospective Student Need

Current and Prospective Student Need focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 3.D in this section.

2P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for serving the academic and non-academic needs of current and prospective students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs (3.D.1)
- Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs (3.D.2)
- Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry (3.C.5)
- Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, labratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty (3.D.1, 3.D.3, 3.D.4, 3.D.5)
- Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services
- Meeting changing student needs
- Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans) (3.D.1)
- Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful (3.D.2)
- Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported (3.C.6)
- Communicating the availability of non-academic support services (3.D.2)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs
- Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

2R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if current and prospective students' needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P1: Processes

2P1.1 Identifying underprepared and at-risk students and determining their academic support needs

Academically underprepared students are identified during the admissions process. Southeast’s guidelines are available on the Admission’s webpage and align with the Missouri Coordinating Board of Higher Education's selectivity guidelines. A combination of standardized test scores, such as the ACT, high school grade point average, and high school college preparatory courses are used to assess the academic preparedness of entering freshmen.

Students considered at-risk because of low high school grade point average and living within a 50-mile radius of Cape Girardeau can be admitted but must participate in the Academic Coaching Program (ACP), a fall semester transitional program. Students may enroll full-time and register for 12 credit hours their first semester. An ACP student signs an academic contract the summer before beginning classes. This agreement outlines the student’s responsibilities, such as regularly meeting with Academic Support Center staff, attending workshops, and utilizing academic support services. ACP students "graduate" by successfully fulfilling their contracts and meeting any additional requirements, based on the student’s needs and requests. The ACP is also offered to other students who successfully appeal for admission to Southeast.

Southeast determines a student’s readiness for college-level English and mathematics courses through evaluation of ACT or SAT sub-scores. Students entering without test scores take the English placement exam, administered by the Center for Writing Excellence, and an online math placement exam.

Southeast maintains formal partnerships with 14 community-based, non-profit organizations that mentor students who otherwise may not have the necessary support systems or financial means to attend and complete college, such as students who are low-income, first generation, or are members of underrepresented race or ethnic groups.

Southeast uses early alert processes to identify students who may be at risk. The early alert process involves faculty identifying students who have not engaged with the class or who are not performing well by the fifth week of the semester. In fall 2018, the University implemented SupportNET, a retention software platform powered by Hobson's Starfish. This platform provides more insight into how individual students are performing and engaging, and it provides a means for effectively communicating with students.

2P1.2 Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs

Support services are promoted at on-campus, new student recruitment and orientation events. Entering students also meet with the deans, chairpersons, faculty, and advising staff for further guidance. Students and their family members receive a series of New Student Programs newsletters with information about academic services, upcoming deadlines, and cocurricular opportunities.

The First-Year Seminar (UI100), a course designed to introduce new students to academic coursework and the university community, is required of all students with less than 24 transferable credit hours, excluding dual credit, early college credit, and military credit.

The Academic Support Center staff are cross-trained to support a wide array of academic support programs, including Learning Assistance Programs (Academic Coaching Program, Academic Improvement Program, College Success Plans, College Success Seminars, Supplemental Instruction, and Tutorial Services); Educational Access Programs (Academic Mentoring Program and College Access Partners); TRIO McNair Scholars; and TRIO Student Support Services. Learning assistants are trained under the College Reading and Learning Association standards, and Supplemental Instruction leaders are trained using the International Center for Supplemental Instruction standards.

2P1.3 Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry

Each course syllabus is required to include faculty contact information, such as email, office phone, office location, and office hours. Faculty availability for student inquiry, detailed in the *Faculty Handbook* (Chapter 3, Section 5), mandates a minimum of three office hours weekly. Students are encouraged to meet with faculty with questions about course content and assignments and for course assistance.

Student organizations have formal faculty mentor relationships. Faculty informally meet with, support, and mentor students. Library faculty support student inquiry through information literacy instruction, reference desk support, chat service, and in-person and virtual research consultations.

2P1.4 Determining and addressing the learning support needs of students and faculty

Every student is assigned an academic advisor who may be a professional staff advisor, a faculty advisor, or an Academic Advising center graduate assistant. In fall 2012, three of the six college advising centers were centralized into a single unit, reporting to the director of Academic Advising and Career Services. In April 2014, the University invited the National Academic Advising Association to do an external review of Southeast's advising, resulting in a centralized model.

Typically, new faculty are not assigned advisees until after their first year of teaching. Academic departments pair with a professional advisor liaison for advising support. Full-time, professional academic coordinators are located at the Kennett and Sikeston regional campuses and at the Cape College Center. Students pursuing a program of study online are supported by Southeast Online program specialists. The Athletics Department collaborates with professional and faculty advisors to provide academic advising and support through the Redhawk Success Center. Academic advisors, coordinators, and online program specialists meet and communicate regularly to ensure a consistent academic advising experience.

Drawing on similar practices at Missouri State University, the Master Advisor Program, began at Southeast in 2016. The Master Advisor Program is a mechanism for strengthening relationships with students and for improving retention and graduation rates. A Southeast faculty member advisory board was formed, responsible for launching the program. Under the direction of the director of academic advising and career services, a series of topical professional development workshops are offered and required to obtain and maintain Master Advisor Certification.

The University's systems for meeting students' learning support needs were cited as a strength in the 2014 portfolio and continue to mature. Tutoring is available to enrolled students and provided through scheduled appointments at the main campus and additional locations. Supplemental Instruction (SI) is provided for courses that have high withdrawal, fail, and incomplete rates as identified by the Office of Institutional Research. A student who has successfully completed the course is designated as the SI leader, attends all classes, and leads bi-weekly sessions where questions are addressed in a collaborative peer environment.

In September 2016, Kent Library faculty and staff gathered to identify barriers to effectively utilizing the Library's services, resources, and spaces. The ideas and suggestions generated during that session were compiled in to a document. Each fall and spring, information on new or changed library services, resources, and spaces that support faculty and student teaching, learning, and research is shared with department liaisons.

The curriculum approval process, which previously did not include discussion of library resources and services to support curriculum additions or revisions, was modified to include a formal library review. During a library review, library faculty use the course addition/change document and syllabus to evaluate library resources (databases, journals, books, and media collections) and services to determine if the breadth and depth of resources available are sufficient to support the proposed curriculum. If found to be weak, Kent Library makes one-time funds available to departments to improve library resources.

Colleges and academic departments support a number of academic services, laboratories, and spaces that enhance student learning, experiential learning, research, and facilitate interaction between faculty and students. These include Catapult Creative House, the Communication Studies Speakers Lab, computer labs, the EDvolution Center, the Mathematics Learning Centers, the Rust Center for Media, the Writing Lab, and the annual Undergraduate Research Conference.

2P1.5 Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services

Southeast has deployed several strategies to identify new student groups to target for educational offerings and services. The Strategic Enrollment Management committee is responsible for identifying new student groups to target that align with the needs of the marketplace as part of the strategic enrollment management planning process. New academic program opportunities are identified, developed, and proposed by academic departments. Examples include the new cybersecurity program and the business data analytics minor. The dean of the regional campuses works with local advisory boards and academic colleges and departments to determine new degree offerings. Southeast Online collaborates with colleges and departments about new online programs. Regional high schools contact the University if they are interested in providing dual credit classes.

2P1.6 Meeting changing student needs

Southeast's mission statement indicates the University "provides student-centered education." Direct student input factors into University efforts to meet the changing needs of students. The Entering Student Survey is administered at new student orientation and provides information on students' educational and life plans. A range of student governing boards, such as the Student Government Association (SGA), Residence Hall Association, Greek governing councils provide valuable insights into students' needs and expectations. SGA routinely surveys students, using the student portal, to solicit input. SGA shares survey results with University personnel. Living at Southeast, is a Facebook page where students share their experiences, thoughts, and needs concerning campus life. This page is followed by many employees and administrators and used as input for short- and long-term planning.

2P1.7 Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs

At Southeast, students most likely to leave college are those who are a combination of first generation, low family income, and low high school grade-point average. First generation students with an expected family contribution of less than $7,000 are coded in the student information system for “first generation targeted support.” These students are individually supported by an academic advisor or Academic Support Services staff member who connects students to campus resources to help them develop college readiness skills and engage with academic support, such as tutoring.

Students at all levels are encouraged to attend career fairs and drop-in services provided by Career Services for help with resume and cover letter writing and practice interviewing. The Office of Military and Veterans Services assists military veterans and their family members in meeting their educational goals. There are several residence hall living/learning communities that support students with shared academic interests or experiences, such as, business, teachers, and the Honors program. The TRIO/McNair Scholars programs support first-generation and underrepresented ethnic groups. International Education and Services fields international admissions inquiries, supports incoming students, and provides students information about studying abroad. Students at the additional locations are aided by on-site staff. Kent Library has a family-friendly student study room for student parents and their children and a meditation/prayer room that was created at the request of the Saudi student group. Students requesting academic accommodations self-identify at Counseling and Disability Services.

2P1.8 Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful

The Student Government Association provides opportunities for students to develop and communicate recommendations pertaining to their non-academic support service needs.

Example 1: A list of student organizations with descriptions is available on a Campus Life and Event Services webpage. Students are invited to start a new group if interested.

Example 2: Counseling Services help students with personal and social issues and provide crisis intervention. Counseling staff, licensed counselors, and social workers are available to assist students. Referrals are made to appropriate psychiatric services or other specialists as needed. The Counselor Education Training Clinic has evening hours to support students with busy schedules. Training Clinic counseling sessions are provided by masters level practicum and internship students under the supervision of a licensed faculty member. Counseling appointments are also available weekly at the River Campus. Individual and group counseling is provided to enrolled students at no cost. A Students of Concern Team is in place to assist students with personal emergencies.

Example 3: Carpe Diem is an annual festival hosted by international and multicultural students that highlights students from diverse cultures, celebrating their heritages and their differences. The festival showcases their cultures through educational information sharing, clothing, food, music, and dance. The festival is open to University students, faculty, staff, and the local community.

2P1.9 Ensuring staff members who provide non-academic student support services are

qualified, trained and supported

Position responsibilities and required qualifications are established for staff employment positions. Human Resources evaluates all candidates to assure minimum requirements are met before search committees evaluate applicants. Employee performance is evaluated annually by supervisors, and evaluations are reviewed by supervisors' supervisors as well. Units offer in-office, specialized training, as well as external professional development opportunities to employees.

2P1.10 Communicating the availability of non-academic support services

Campus resources and services are promoted to students at resource fairs, through advisors, and in classes throughout the academic year.

Campus Life and Event Services communicates information about services through the student portal, new student orientation, Camp Redhawk, and the undergraduate involvement ambassador program.

The student newspaper includes features articles and information pieces about support services.

University Marketing creates marketing campaigns to promote services. University Communications communicates the availability of support services internally using newsletters and externally through social media and news releases.

The provost shares information about non-academic support services with faculty, to be shared with students, using an email list. Direct emails to all, or large student groups, are deployed as needed but on a limited basis through the dean of students.

2P1.11 Selecting the tools, methods, and instruments to assess student needs

Tools and instruments selected are nationally and regionally recognized and provide opportunities to determine similar and unique Southeast students' needs.

Example 1: The National Survey of Student Engagement is used to compile information on the student experiences and needs.

Example 2: Southeast participates in Missouri's Partners in Prevention higher education substance abuse consortium surveys.

2P1.12 Assessing the degree to which student needs are met

The Student Government Association (SGA) holds a two-day retreat at the beginning of the academic year where university leaders are invited to attend for 30-60 minutes to share priorities and plans for the upcoming year and listen to student input. The University president and other University leaders meet periodically throughout the year with SGA leaders. A faculty representative attends most SGA meetings and one or more SGA representatives attend university standing committees, such as the Budget Review Committee and the University Task Force on Student Success. Additionally, a student liaison attends Faculty Senate. The SGA by-laws provide written procedures for the role of non-voting members.

Southeast participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) every three years. First-year students and seniors are invited to participate in the online survey.

2R1: Results

1. The University benchmarks alignment with the Missouri Coordinating Board of Higher Education's selectivity standards by comparing itself to other Missouri public baccalaureate institutions. The most recent comparison data available show that 77% of Southeast first-time, full-time students meet the moderately selective guidelines in the state. The data are becoming less relevant, however, as many high schools in Missouri no longer report high school class rank which is used to calculate the rates listed in this table. Southeast continues to monitor progress toward this goal as these guidelines remain in effect. The results of this benchmarking analysis are shared in Southeast's Strategic Enrollment Management plan as one measure of the quality of the beginning freshmen class.
2. Students academically underprepared for college-level English and mathematics courses are required to complete remedial coursework in English and/or mathematics. In 2013, the University participated in the Missouri Completion Academy, a program sponsored by the Missouri Department of Higher Education and Complete College America. This resulted in implementation of a corequisite model to support English and mathematics remediation. This continuity of instruction is yielding positive results as students can immediately apply what is learned in EN099 to their EN100 coursework. This table demonstrates there are significantly more students completing the EN100 course successfully using the corequisite model than were completing the course in two semesters under the previous model.
3. The department of mathematics uses the corequisite model (slide 1) as well. Beginning in fall 2014, students who require remediation for Numbers and Operations for Educators (MA118), Survey of Mathematics (MA123), or Statistical Reasoning (MA155), enroll in a one-credit lab section that meets twice a week and provides just-in-time preparation and support for content covered in the mathematics course. Comparison data of the first-time, full-time freshmen with that of the enrolled general population for the three-credit courses are also assessed. The table (slide 3) of first-time, full-time students for fall semesters from 2009 to 2017 shows for each year, the percentage of students who were successful.
4. The Academic Coaching Program 2012-2018 persistence table provides information on student persistence and graduation rates. Students in these cohort fall below the regular admission standards and typically have a high school grade point average of 2.00 to 2.50. Fall-to-fall retention of these student cohorts range from 46.4% to 63.6%. In comparison to the internal benchmark of a range of 71.1% to 75.1% for other first-time, full-time freshmen for this same time period, this is a substantially lower success rate.
5. The Transfer Mentor Program, first initiated in February 2017, enables community college students to plan their course of study for multiple semesters within Southeast's degree audit system, before they even begin classes at Southeast. DegreeWorks, an online tool that aligns degree requirements with the student's completed coursework, shows progress towards meeting graduation requirements. This audit reduces student time to completion and saves tuition dollars. Over 175 students, from five community colleges, have registered to participate in the program as of fall 2018.
6. The NSSE indicator "supportive environment" is a scale composed of affiliated survey items related to student perceptions of the campus environment. Southeast's mean values on the scale for both first-year students (34.7) and seniors (32.3) were not significantly different from comparison groups. In the 2018 study, 74 percent of the first-year students said that they felt the institution emphasized using learning support services (tutoring, advising, and other resources). Among seniors, 62% felt this was an emphasis. The scale mean for first-year students was unchanged from NSSE 2015, while it increased by 0.6 for seniors compared to 2015.
7. Additional funding has been allocated through the University's budget review process to expand tutoring services and supplemental instruction due to increased usage.

8. In November 2016, Academic Council approved making the library review a mandatory part of the curriculum approval and revision process. The library review for a new program is more involved; an example is the cybersecurity program memo and sampling of associated library reviews.
9. In May 2017, a new Kent Library homepage was launched. Design of the new webpage is purposefully student-centered in look, feel, and navigation. In summer 2018, the library moved to a standalone library management system, allowing decision making that best meets the needs of Southeast users, such as implementation of a new discovery interface.
10. The Master Advisor Program resulted in 222 advisors who were successfully 'certified' as master advisors; including 180 faculty advisors, 25 professional advisors, 15 professional staff, and one graduate assistant (as of May 15, 2018).

2I1: Improvement

1. In fall 2018, the University launched a student information database to track student participation in the Transfer Mentor Program. Academic advisors at participating community colleges will have permission to view data and reports in the database for their college. In 2019, Southeast plans to strengthen relationships with existing community college partners and invite new community college partners to join the program.
2. Implementation of SupportNET (Starfish) enables more consistent, inclusive tracking of student advising, academic success, and academic challenges. For example, students in the Academic Coaching Program will be closely followed to ensure they have every opportunity to succeed. SupportNET is also streamlining advising from simplifying the making of advising appointments to easily sharing of information between faculty and staff advising students. Incorporating SupportNET data into a new data analytics platform will make information easier to gather, analyze, and share with administrators, faculty, and staff.
3. The University plans to add an entrepreneurship living-learning community in fall 2019.

Sources

- C.2.1_Academic Council Minutes 2016 11 01
- C.2.1_ACP Cohort Persistence
- C.2.1_ACP Contract fall 2018
- C.2.1_Admissions Criteria Page
- C.2.1_Carpe Diem
- C.2.1_Community ASC Partners
- C.2.1_Counseling Services
- C.2.1_Cybersecurity Library Review
- C.2.1_EN099 EN100 Student Success FA13-SP16
- C.2.1_English Placement Guidelines
- C.2.1_English Remediation Table
- C.2.1_Human Library 2 book sample
- C.2.1_Human Library project appreciation
- C.2.1_Kent Library Barriers
- C.2.1_Kent Library Department Liaison Handouts
- C.2.1_Kent Library homepage
- C.2.1_Library Review Award
- C.2.1_Living at Southeast
- C.2.1_Master Advisor certified advisors

- C.2.1_Master Advisor wkshp attend
- C.2.1_Master Advisory Bd
- C.2.1_Math corequisite model data
- C.2.1_MDHE Admission Guidelines Results
- C.2.1_MDHE Southeast MS Cybersecurity
- C.2.1_NSP newsletters
- C.2.1_SEMO NSSE18 MultiYear Rpt
- C.2.1_SGA Bylaws Sec 4 No 5
- C.2.1_Student organizations
- C.2.1_Transfer Mentor Participation
- C.2.1_UI100 Txtbk table of contents
- C.2.2_SEM PLAN 2015 to 2019
- C.2_Tutorial and SI AY comparison
- C.4.3_CBHE Moderately Selective

2.2 - Retention, Persistence, and Completion

Retention, Persistence and Completion focuses on the approach to collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion to stakeholders for decision making. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 4.C. in this section.

2P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data (4.C.2, 4.C.4)
- Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1, 4.C.4)
- Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion
- Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion (4.C.1)
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion (4.C.4)

2R2: RESULTS

What are the results for student retention, persistence and completion? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years? (4.C.3)

Responses

2P2: Processes

2P2.1 Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data

The process for collection student retention, persistence, and completion data is outlined in the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan. The Strategic Enrollment Management Committee, the University Task Force on Student Success, and subcommittees and subgroups collaborate in developing objectives and strategies to meet established retention and graduation rate goals.

Data used to monitor student retention, persistence, and completion are stored in the

University's Banner student information system. The ability to accurately and effectively analyze student data requires a high level of data integrity. Southeast has integrated several processes into daily business operations to ensure the accuracy of student records.

The Banner Management Committee is coordinated by Information Technology and includes representation from all campus business units using the system (see 5P1).

Personnel who create and maintain student records—including Admissions, Registrar, Student Financial Services, and others—have integrated data entry training into new employee orientation programs. There are several data integrity checks in place to identify and correct data entry errors or identify missing data. These processes are documented in departmental procedure manuals.

2P2.2 Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion

In 2012, the State of Missouri adopted a performance funding model to allocate the majority of funding increases to higher education institutions based on institutional specific performance measures. Student success and progress are performance indicators for all Missouri public four-year institutions, and institutions select from a list the other indicators by which they will be measured as well as the institutions to be within their peer group. Institutions have the option of updating their indicators and peer group annually. At Southeast, the Office Institutional Research (IR) manages the process used to select the measures and peer institutions (see 5P3).

In 2016, Southeast adopted the aspirational goals of retaining 80% of first-time, full-time students and graduating 60% within six years. The University's administration established these goals based on a review of internal and external data. Internally, first-time, full-time student, fall-to-fall retention rates were improving incrementally, and the University was progressing in its efforts to adopt explicit, repeatable processes to support student persistence. The University president has spoken frequently about these goals with students, faculty, staff, and the local community. The State of Missouri and the federal government have voiced growing expectations that higher education institutions will prioritize and improve completion rates.

2P2.3 Analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion

IR collects data and analyzes factors significant to student persistence at Southeast. This includes several student demographic, academic background, and college experience variables. Student demographic variables include age at the time of admission, gender, ethnicity/race, first generation status, family income, and state/nation of residence. Academic background variables include high school grade point average, standardized test scores, and participation in Southeast's dual credit classes. College experience variables include grades, credits attempted and completed, living on campus, financial aid received, and participation in activities such as athletics, Greek Life, and the Jane Stephens Honors Program.

Retention and graduation rates, listed by academic program, are produced by IR and disseminated annually to college deans and department chairpersons. This information is evaluated by the deans, chairpersons, and faculty, and the information is used in activities such as reviewing programs, exploring methods for ameliorating high course fail rates, and advising activities.

While there is a significant focus on the retention of first-time, full-time students, the University is committed to supporting all students through graduation. Retention data are also monitored for students who transfer to Southeast and for students enrolled at one of the additional locations or through Southeast Online.

2P2.4 Meeting targets for retention, persistence, and completion

Progress of students in the first-time, full-time cohort is closely monitored. In the first two weeks, faculty are encouraged to report students who have not attended class. These students are dropped from the class, and associated tuition and fees cancelled. Midterm grades are reported for all undergraduate students.

Retention rates are compiled by IR at census and on a monthly basis after spring registration begins. The report compares the progress of the current student cohort to the three previous years at the same point in time. IR distributes the report to executive staff, which shares it with deans, chairpersons, the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee, and others. Academic advisors have access to a database that produces a list of students who have not registered for the next term. The advisors personally reach out to students to talk about their plans and educational options.

2P2.5 Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence, and completion

Representative working groups are formed to research the adoption of new tools, methods, and instruments, and are responsible for assessing solutions and recommending strategies to executive staff. In summer 2017, the provost formed a Retention Software Task Force of faculty, staff, students, and administrators to review various solutions and to recommend which product or products best meet Southeast's needs. The task force conducted a needs assessment, created a list of institutional priorities, evaluated potential vendors and software solutions, and submitted a recommendation.

2R2: Results

1. A status report for the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan 2015-2019 has been issued in fall 2016, 2017, and 2018.
2. The 80% retention and 60% graduation rate internal targets are well established among faculty, staff, and students, and with the board of regents. The Southeast community understands these goals are only achievable through widespread support by every employee and through their student interactions. The goals are restated regularly in forums such as the annual legislative brief, the annual State of the University Address, and in meetings with faculty, staff, and students. The University Task Force on Student Success maintains a webpage to share progress toward these goals publicly.
3. The Registrar prepares and distributes lists of students who have earned a mid-term grade of D, F, or W to the college deans and several campus departments, including Academic Advising, Academic Support Centers, Athletics, the Dean of Students, Residence Life, and Student Financial Services. Students are contacted through a coordinated effort among offices to offer additional advising and support services.
4. Advisors follow an established process for contacting the students to encourage registration. Using the new SupportNET system, professional academic advisors invite students to schedule an advising appointment and follow-up with non-enrolled students to encourage their enrollment. Similarly, the Academic Support Centers contact students participating in their programs to encourage registration. The Strategic Enrollment Management Business Process Improvement Task Force continues to address barriers and to streamline and simplify

processes (see 6P2). Another example is the Guided Pathways Initiative, sponsored by the Missouri Department of Higher Education. In response to a 2017 call for proposals, Southeast submitted a proposal to develop three-year degree maps, corresponding course rotations, and meta majors. The pilot project also involved implementation of a retention software platform to encourage proactive advising.
5. The Retention Software Task Force used the results of a needs assessment to prepare the retention software Request for Proposals (RFP). Using evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP, the task force evaluated the platforms and made a recommendation to executive staff. It was determined that Hobsons Starfish provided the suite of services, communication tools, and predictive analytics that best meet Southeast's needs. The University is in the process of completing a three-phase implementation of SupportNET.

2I2: Improvement

1. In January 2018, the Missouri Department of Higher Education released a report recommending revisions to the State's performance funding model. If adopted, the new student success and progress measurement relating to student completion will use completions per full-time equivalent student.
2. The Strategic Enrollment Management Committee is in the process of developing a new multi-year plan.
3. The University is implementing Ellucian Ethos and Analytics to provide more robust analysis and reporting of retention and completion data.

Sources

- C.2.2_Banner Management Committee Charge and Membership 2018-2019
- C.2.2_Degree Map Process
- C.2.2_FTFT Retention Monthly Progress rpt
- C.2.2_Guided Pathways
- C.2.2_Retention and graduation by academic progam sampling
- C.2.2_Retention Software Recommendation
- C.2.2_Retention Software Task Force List Progress Report
- C.2.2_SEM BPI Responses to UTF defined obstacles as of 2018 09
- C.2.2_SEM Committee agenda handouts and minutes 2018 11 27
- C.2.2_SEM PLAN 2015 to 2019
- C.2.2_SEM PLAN Status rpt_Fall 2016
- C.2.2_SEM PLAN Status rpt_Fall 2017
- C.2.2_SEM PLAN Status rpt_Fall 2018
- C.2.2_SEMO Performance Funding 2017_REV Outcomes_Data Form
- C.2.2_SEMO Performance Funding 2017_REV student success
- C.2.2_SupportNET implentation phases
- C.2.2_Task Force for Student Success

2.3 - Key Stakeholder Needs

Key Stakeholder Needs focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of key stakeholder groups, including alumni and community partners.

2P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for serving the needs of key external stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)
- Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership
- Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs
- Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

2R3: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P3: Processes

2P3.1 Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)

The Office of New Student Programs invites local businesses affiliated with the Cape Girardeau Chamber of Commerce and area non-profit organizations to participate in the move-in day information fair and the annual welcome back picnic. Restaurants, service providers, and off-campus housing providers attend these events to introduce new students to the Cape Girardeau community. Some businesses use the events as an opportunity to recruit part-time employees. Non-profit organizations attend these and other events throughout the year to encourage students to volunteer with their organizations.

Employers who hire Southeast graduates are a vital external stakeholder group. Office of Career Services (CS) is responsible for developing and maintaining relationships with employers and finding ways to engage current students and alumni with potential employers. CS routinely utilizes multiple methods to encourage employers, organizations, and graduate schools to recruit on campus, conduct on-campus interviews, and provide mentoring opportunities to students and alumni.

Every fall, the Southeast Missouri School Counselors Associations holds its first meeting of the year on Southeast's Cape Girardeau campus. Faculty from the College of Education, Health, and Human Studies, and staff from Academic Advising, Admissions, Career Services, and Student Financial Services attend the meeting. School counselors attend school-level breakout sessions as part of this event. These sessions are used to identify the changing needs of this stakeholder group.

University faculty, staff, students, administrators, and alumni directly engage with community organizations and employers to determine needs. Examples stakeholders include: Big Brothers Big Sisters, Community Caring Council, Downtown Cape Girardeau Improvement District, Gibson Recovery Center, Humane Society of Southeast Missouri, Kennett and Sikeston business, educational, and political leaders; Old Town Cape, Rotary clubs, Safe House for Women, and the United Way of Southeast Missouri.

Southeast students, student organizations, faculty, and staff regularly volunteer in the community. In fall 2015, a service week called Southeast Serves was developed. The intent of this week is to bring together University volunteers and dozens of organizations and individuals in need of assistance.

2P3.2 Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnerships

Academic deans and department chairpersons engage directly with new area business and employers and partner in internship or mentorship opportunities. An internship's real-world experiential learning provides students' first-hand knowledge of the workplace. University faculty and staff are encouraged to network with alumni and business leaders to identify possible new partnerships. Potential employers often self-identify in an effort to recruit recent graduates.

The academic colleges and departments host numerous targeted events and competitions for K–-12 school-aged children designed to support learning and career exploration (see list of examples).

2P3.3 Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders

The University's Economic and Business Engagement Center (EBEC) facilitates innovation and enhances the regional economy in partnership with external stakeholders to create new, high-value jobs, positive economic and social benefits, and enhanced entrepreneurship. Under the EBEC umbrella, Southeast's Department of Continuing Education fosters workforce and professional development with area businesses and industries to offer noncredit courses to help increase the skill level of the region's workforce and enhance the quality of life. The Small Business and Technology Development Center offers comprehensive business development services. The Missouri Innovation Corporation provides financing assistance to help entrepreneurs in the region grow and succeed. The Economic Development Administration University Center (one of 75 in U.S.) advances the economy by drawing on regional assets and combining research and applied strategies to grow and strengthen rural communities.

The College of Education, Health and Human Studies' EDvolution Center assists Southeast students and area educators with successfully integrating technology into the classroom. Center staff support existing classroom technologies and incorporate new technologies as they become available. Guiding students and educators through learning, using, assessing, changing, and replacing classroom technologies provides invaluable professional development.

The University's David M. Barton Agriculture Research Center provides opportunities for students to participate in all aspects of row crop and beef herd management, and serves as a site to conduct research in partnership with the United States Department of Agriculture. In collaboration with the Missouri Rice Council, students and faculty conduct research in rice production management and provide information to improve profitability and competitiveness of Missouri's rice producers.

The University's Autism Center for Diagnosis and Treatment is one of four Missouri Autism Centers for Excellence designated by the Missouri Department of Mental Health. The Center provides services for individuals and families to address autism-specific needs across 19 counties in southeast Missouri.

Opened in May 2017, the Center for Speech and Hearing at Southeast provides diagnostic and intervention services for children and adults with communication disorders. Approximately 150 clients from Missouri, Illinois, Kentucky, and Arkansas receive services from the Center for Speech and Hearing each year.

2P3.4 Selecting the tools, methods, and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs

In the last few years, the Office of Career Services has changed the way it communicates internship, employment, and event information with students and alumni. Through rebranding and marketing of REDHAWKjobs.com (online jobsite), employer registrations have increased by 77% and student viewership and applications have increased 312% from AY2015/2016 to AY2017/2018.

Prior to 2015, the University did not use a formal means to address the need, interests, and concerns of government stakeholders. Beginning in 2015 impact briefs were provided to regional members of Congress. In 2016, additional information on scholarship and financial aid assistance, community partnerships and initiatives, the University's economic impact, recognitions, and awards were added. In 2017, the report expanded again, to include student and alumni demographic information for each of Missouri's 163 state House districts and 34 Senate districts. These changes made the report relevant to every Missouri state and federal officeholder, and detailed the impact of Southeast Missouri State University in their areas. This comprehensive report was updated in 2018 and will be published again in 2019.

2P3.5 Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met

Assessing enrollment, retention, persistence, and completion data is one process for determining whether stakeholder needs are being met. Others processes include: soliciting feedback from academic and program advisory boards; meeting with area business, education, and political leaders; engaging with public/partnership boards such as the River Campus Board of Managers and boards overseeing the Show-Me Center and the Capaha baseball field.

Tracking the number of clients served though the Autism Center and the Center for Speech and Hearing and improvement of client conditions is another process for assessing if needs are being met.

Other methods for assessing and evaluating if Southeast is meeting stakeholder needs include reviewing the number of grants secured, the amount of state appropriations received, and legislative success.

2R3: Results

1. Through a mixture of social media recruiting, alumni referral, direct email, and organic customer service, CS staff have been able to increase the number of employers and students attending the semi-annual career expos each year.
2. CS coordinates the collection of graduate outcome data through digital surveys, alumni phone calls, and social media research (see 1P4).
3. For more than a decade Academic Support Centers, Athletics, Campus Life and Event Services, Greek Life, and the College of Education, Health, and Human Studies have supported Big Brothers Big Sisters. University students and employees are recruited to serve as "bigs" for the program's participating boys and girls. ABC Today, a new organization formed in 2012 under the Big Brothers Big Sisters umbrella, has received consistent support from Southeast employees and students.
4. The impact of the Economic and Business Engagement Center's (EBEC) work is measured in a number of areas including increases in clients' annual sales, the number of jobs created/retained, the number of training attendees, and the amount of public and private investment the EBEC assisted clients in obtaining. Increases occurred in jobs created/retained and annual sales between 2016 and 2017, while training attendees and investment decreased somewhat.
5. Since 2016, EDvolution has hosted more than 2,000 K-12 students, teacher candidates, local teachers, faculty, and community members for workshops or tours.
6. Starting in fall 2018, Southeast, in conjunction with Three Rivers College (TRC) and the Cape College Center, launched an early college program for Cape Girardeau High School juniors and seniors. It allows students to earn either an Associates of Arts degree from TRC or complete the Missouri 42-hour general education block. Students also have the ability to participate in all extracurricular activities at their school. Five students are participating in this first year.

2I3: Improvement

1. The University's Autism Center for Diagnosis and Treatment plans to open a second location in Sikeston in 2019. This will bring autism services geographically closer to individuals and families living in the Missouri Bootheel.
2. A Career Services Career Ambassador Program was piloted in fall 2018 to enhance the availability of walk-in hours for undergraduate students seeking information or assistance with resume and cover letter writing, interview preparation, LinkedIn photo and networking strategies, or general job search information including help with REDHAWKjobs.com.

Sources

- C.2.3_ABC Today SEMO partnership
- C.2.3_Autism Center
- C.2.3_Autism Ctr and Speech Hearing Clients
- C.2.3_Career Services Participation Rates
- C.2.3_Childrens Theatre workshop

- C.2.3_Congressional Impact Rpt 2015
- C.2.3_Early College Program MOU 2018 05 07
- C.2.3_EBEC Impact 2016 2017
- C.2.3_EDvolution Center
- C.2.3_Examples of K12 events
- C.2.3_History Day field trip example itinerary
- C.2.3_Legislative Book 2018
- C.2.3_Music private lessons
- C.2.3_Robotics competitions
- C.2.3_SEMO Regional Science Fair
- C.2.3_Welcome back picnic rates

2.4 - Complaint Processes

Complaint Processes focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key stakeholder groups.

2P4: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students and stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Collecting complaint information from students
- Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders
- Learning from complaint information and determining actions
- Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

2R4: RESULTS

What are the results for student and key stakeholder complaints? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I4: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P4: Processes

2P4.1 Collecting complaint information from students

Student complaints involving other students are typically reported to, and handled in, the Dean of Student's Office. The Dean of Student's webpage encourages students to make contact about their concerns. A specially trained Office of Student Conduct assistant may work with students on resolving disagreements or incidents through mediation in which all persons directly impacted agree to participate. When mediation is not successful or appropriate, the matter goes before a panel of peer students who hears cases and determines outcomes, including sanctions, of alleged violations of the Statement of Student Rights and Code of Student Conduct. Members of the All University Judicial Board (AUJB), a branch of Student Government, recognize their leadership role and understand the importance of confidentiality. The only appeal beyond the AUJB is the dean of students.

Student complaints concerning faculty are usually reviewed at the department level. Class syllabi contain the statement, “Questions, comments, or requests regarding this course or program should be taken to your instructor. Unanswered questions or unresolved issues involving this class may be taken to [name of department chairperson]." If a student believes the grading procedures and criteria described in the course syllabus were not consistently and accurately followed when the faculty member determined the student's grade, the student has the right to appeal, first with the faculty member, then with the department chairperson, and finally with the University Academic Appeals Committee.

Complaints that cannot be resolved at the department level, or are deemed of sufficient seriousness, are forwarded to the college dean. Occasionally, students take their complaints directly to the provost or president. When this occurs, it is customary to refer the student back to the relevant department chairperson or dean so that the concern can be resolved in normal order.

Criminal behavior and crimes are reported to and handled by Southeast’s Department of Public Safety and appropriate local and state authorities.

At times, student protest is a result of events and injustices happening elsewhere. When this happens, University executive staff determine the appropriate course of action.

2P4.2 Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders

The Office of Institutional Equity & Diversity develops, implements, and monitors the university-wide affirmative action plan, as well as ensures adherence to Federal equal opportunity laws and State and Federal civil rights laws. The Office is also responsible for the implementation and enforcement of the University's Non-Discrimination/Affirmative Action and Sexual Harassment policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that no person is discriminated against or harassed in employment, educational programs, and activities on the basis of race, color, gender, national origin, or disability. Individuals who witness or experience any bias within the Southeast community are encouraged to report the incident, either by name or anonymously. A bias incident reporting form and directions for reporting incidents are available on a Southeast webpage.

Faculty members’ concerns and complaints can be addressed to department chairpersons, college deans, and the provost. Faculty can initiate a formal grievance using the process outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Staff members’ concerns and complaints can be addressed to their supervisor, their supervisor’s supervisor, and others in the appropriate organizational line. Formal staff grievances are handled as outlined in the *Business Policy and Procedure Manual*.

Complaints about University environmental issues, such as food service, parking, and WiFi connectivity, are reported through Living at Southeast (See 2P1.6), communication with the service provider, surveys, and organizations like Residence Life or Student Government. The information is forwarded to the appropriate stakeholder or organization for attention.

2P4.3 Learning from complaint information and determining actions

Faculty, department chairpersons, managers, and others with leadership roles are responsible for monitoring complaints and analyzing patterns to identify areas needing improvement. Appropriate action is taken when patterns or trends are identified. At times, minor behavior modifications may be all that is needed. Other times this may involve in-depth or improved staff training within the unit or through Human Resources, faculty working with someone from the Center for Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning, or other suitable professional development.

2P4.4 Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders

The dean of students maintains a log of complaints submitted through the online submission form or sent directly to the dean. The dean of student's staff are tasked with following up with the appropriate student, faculty, staff, or support unit to resolve the issue. Staff report their findings back to the complaining student to complete the communication cycle. Student privacy is respected and sensitive complaints are kept confidential.

University personnel issues are not shared publicly and issues are handled at the appropriate level.

Complaints on environmental issues that surface through Living at Southeast are often updated through that social media platform as issues are resolved or addressed.

2P4.5 Selecting the tools, methods, and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution

Southeast has defined and documented processes for students, faculty, and staff to report complaints. The University has created online complaint reporting forms that are available to students, faculty, and staff.

Effectively engaging with University students requires being in spaces where they are comfortable. Social media is one such space and Living at Southeast is a university-sponsored Facebook page where students share their thoughts, questions, and frustrations about their educational and campus experiences.

Another highly effective method for resolving complaints involves being accessible to students, faculty, and staff when and where they are. Examples include the following:

Example 1: The University often invites students to participate in focus group discussions to learn more about their experiences. Recent focus groups have included African American students, international students, and transfer students.

Example 2: The August 2014 shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri triggered student protests at Southeast. The day of the protests, several University staff met with protesters in informal conversations and encouraged the students to share their concerns.

Example 3: In 2016, the Office of Institutional Equity & Diversity developed Employee Resource Groups (ERG). One of the defined benefits of these groups is to provide a venue for employees to be themselves and discuss issues and areas of concern which may be holding them back from progressing within the organization. Southeast currently has two active ERG including the SEMO Black Faculty and Staff Alliance and SEMO Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer + Employee Alliance.

Example 4: In the days following the 2016 Presidential election, international students reported concerns for their safety to various university personnel. In response, the University hosted an open forum to give all students, international and domestic, an opportunity to vocalize concerns, share their experiences, and learn more about university resources.

2R4: Results

1. The August 2014 shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri triggered student protests at Southeast. University leaders and the Student Government Associate hosted several meetings with the student protesters. As a result, the President's Task Force on Diversity Education was formed. The Task Force report has the University making changes and implementing its recommendations.
2. Students' requests for better understanding of, and transparency surrounding, the University's management of reports of sexual misconduct resulted in a review of Title IX and processes and procedures in place for accepting reports, investigating, determining, and taking appropriate actions. The Title IX review resulted in creation of the End Sexual Violence webpage and focused on the message that sexual violence will not be tolerated and survivors will be supported at Southeast. The webpage supports education and prevention, reporting, investigations, and transparency in the process and data.
3. A number of social media complaints focus on campus information infrastructure and technology. Examples include: complaints about the campus WiFi network, limited email storage, and timely notifications for breaking or emergency news.

2R4: Improvement

1. To resolve complaints about the campus information infrastructure and technology, the Office of Information Technology (IT) has a multi-year project underway to improve the campus network and increase WiFi access. IT implemented Microsoft 365 which resolved the email storage limitations.
2. The Department of Public Safety implemented the SEAlerts Emergency Response System as a measure to provide timely notifications and warnings to students, parents, and the University community when an emergency or event occurs that threatens campus safety or security. Student and parent orientations and employee onboarding all encourage signing up to receive SEAlert messages. SEAlerts is available as a mobile app to facilitate rapid notification.

Sources

- C.2.4_Business Policy Manual staff grievance
- C.2.4_Dean of Student webpage
- C.2.4_End Sexual Violence
- C.2.4_Faculty Handbook Grievance Policy
- C.2.4_Office of Equity Diversity
- C.2.4_SE Alerts
- C.4.3_Diversity Task Force Report

2.5 - Building Collaborations and Partnerships

Building Collaborations and Partnerships focuses on aligning, building and determining the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution.

2P5: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for managing collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)
- Building and maintaining relationships with partners
- Selecting the tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness
- Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

2R5: RESULTS

What are the results for determining the effectiveness of aligning and building collaborations and partnerships? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

2I5: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 2R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

2P5: Processes

2P5.1 Selecting partners for collaboration

Southeast Missouri State University prides itself on collaborating effectively with its many educational, community, and business partners to meet institutional enrollment and student success goals. The partnerships noted in this table are a sampling of collaborative relationships maintained by the University.

2P5.2 Building and maintaining relationships with partners

University faculty and staff are encouraged to seek partnership opportunities that will enhance students' educational experiences and support the institution's goals. The following examples demonstrate the process that is followed to build and maintain relationships with partners that support the student success, enrollment, and community engagement goals.

Example 1: The dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Studies serves as liaison to the University's charter school, the Lift for Life Academy (Lift) in St. Louis. The college provides direct program oversight and guides the school in maintaining high academic standards and ensuring compliance with State statutes. Southeast education majors have the opportunity to student teach at Lift. In addition, the Tomorrow's Teachers learning community provides community service activities at the school. Annually, the board of regents receives a report on the status of this partnership. The University president and Admissions staff also visit the school. In December 2018, a Lift graduate currently enrolled at Southeast will make the "student presentation" to the board of regents.

Example 2: The assistant vice president for academic diversity and outreach serves as the liaison to the University's partnership with community-based college access partners. A written agreement is in place to define the role of the University and the partner.

Example 3: The assistant director of transfer recruitment serves as the liaison to the University's community college partners. At a minimum, visits are made each semester to the University's top feeder community colleges. A full-time academic and student services coordinator was added at the Three Rivers College transfer center in 2015. The Transfer Mentor Program was developed in 2017 to improve the student experience and potentially reduce student time to degree completion. The University president visited each of the Transfer Mentor Program partners in advance to discuss partnership opportunities and again when the agreements were signed.

Example 4: The Office of Admissions is responsible for maintaining relationships with high schools in the service region. Staff visit the top feeder high schools at a minimum, each fall and spring. Additional visits are made to support college planning, financial aid awareness, and application processing. The director of dual credit is responsible for developing dual credit opportunities at regional high schools. In 2017 and 2018, President Vargas and Southeast faculty, staff, and students, visited more than 20 community colleges and high schools to build relationships and define ways to improve the University's readiness to educate their students.

2P5.3 Selecting tools, methods, and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness

The University conducts qualitative and quantitative evaluations annually to maintain mutually beneficial relationships with its partners. University personnel involved in the partnership meet with the partners and maintain and strengthen the relationship.

Example 1: The University is represented on the Lift for Life Academy school board and attends all meetings.

Example 2: The Office of Dual Credit utilizes an in-house database to effectively manage information sharing with dual credit partner high schools. Additionally, an annual report is produced as part of the Strategic Enrollment Management process to assess the level of dual credit earned by graduating students and the University's yield from this student population.

Example 3: International Education and Services evaluates the effectiveness of partnerships with international agencies by visiting the agencies in their country, having virtual meetings, through semester enrollment reports, and by talking one-to-one with students recruited by the agencies.

2P5.4 Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective

Southeast has effectively developed and maintained relationships with several community-based college access partners, some of which have recognized the University for the level of academic support provided to students. In 2017, Big Brothers Big Sisters of Eastern Missouri selected Southeast as their Community Partner of the Year. In 2018, Southeast was profiled by St. Louis Graduates in their report, Degrees with Less Debt. Also in 2018, Southeast was one of five institutions selected to participate in a Lumina Talent Hub initiative, coordinated by the St. Louis Regional Chamber of Commerce and St. Louis Graduates.

The academic program business partnership between the department of engineering and technology and TG (Toyoda Gosei) has students participating in TG capstone projects, internships, and part-time work experiences. These frequently turn into full-time positions with the company. University alumni and current students are working in engineering, maintenance, supervision, and management at TG.

Since the 2013 inception of Southeast's Show-Me GOLD program, it has trained 27 soldiers, who completed Officer Candidate School, and now serve as lieutenants in the Missouri Army National Guard (MOARNG).

The College of Education, Health, and Human Studies has a partnership with Eagles College to provide student teachers the opportunity to teach in an English Immersion School in Iquique, Chile. Through this collaboration, the College developed a new partnership with Alturo Pratt University in Iquique, resulting in an educational exchange that has brought six Chilean scholars to campus for a two-week intensive learning program.

2R5: Results

1. Partnerships with community colleges continue to grow and strengthen through a full-time presence on the campus of Three Rivers College, the partnership at the Cape College Center with Three Rivers and Mineral Area Colleges, and through the Transfer Mentor Program. Data provided by the Missouri Department of Higher Education show that enrollment at Missouri's community colleges has decreased 19% from 2012 to 2017 and by 24% in the community colleges considered "top feeders" for Southeast. During this same time period, new transfer enrollment has declined 9% at Southeast and by 23% from the top feeder community colleges in Missouri. These data demonstrate that new transfer enrollment trends align with regional student demographics.
2. Recognizing the growing industry of international agency recruitment, Southeast began to develop a relationship with international recruitment agencies approximately 10 years ago. Efforts to evaluate and strengthen these relationships are reviewed continuously. Data reports are reviewed every semester, by agency, to determine the outcomes of these relationships.

2I5: Improvement

Academic, administrative, and faculty leaders continue to seek out opportunities to establish mutually beneficial relationships and provide students with high impact learning experiences. Examples of actions planned to strengthen select partnerships include:

1. The newly restructured College of Education, Health, and Human Studies is exploring opportunities to expand the EDvolution program and elements of the Apple Distinguished School program to the health and human studies disciplines.
2. International Education and Services will develop new partnerships to encourage enrollment of students for short-term, visiting, and cooperative program experiences through a newly establishedSoutheast Partnership Award program.
3. Southeast will continue to explore the opportunities and challenges associated with flexible learning strategies, including the potential for partnering with an online program manager.
4. Southeast will continue to develop the Transfer Mentor Program by improving training, reporting, communications, and articulations with existing partners and will seek new partners in Missouri.
5. Southeast will participate in the summer 2019 American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Sino-American Cooperation on Higher Education and Professional Development meetings to explore developing a partnership with a university in China. Presently, the department of music is evaluating this opportunity.

Sources

- C.2.5_Campus Health Clinic Annual Evaluation mtg handouts and agenda
- C.2.5_Community TRIO Partner New Student Enrollments
- C.2.5_Degrees with less debt_Executive Summary
- C.2.5_Dual Credit Enrollment Yield Rates 2016 to 2018
- C.2.5_International Agency Semester Enrollment Report Sample
- C.2.5_Jefferson College TMP MOU
- C.2.5_Kauffman Scholars signed agreement
- C.2.5_Lift For Life Academy Agenda 2018 11 29
- C.2.5_Lumina subgrant ltr SEMO
- C.2.5_Mumps Outbreak Summer 2017 Final Rpt
- C.2.5_New Transfer UG Enrollment Trends
- C.2.5_SEMO Partnership table

3 - Valuing Employees

3.1 - Hiring

Hiring focuses on the acquisition of appropriately qualified/credentialed faculty, staff and administrators to ensure that effective, high-quality programs and student support services are provided. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. in this section.

3P1: PROCESSES

Describe the process for hiring faculty, staff and administrators. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values (3.C.6)
- Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs (3.C.1, 3.C.2)
- Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities (3.C.1)
- Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

3R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring and orienting practices ensure effective provision for programs and services? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

3I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 3R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

3P1: Processes

3P1.1 Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values

The Office of Human Resources (HR) oversees the processes for hiring, interviewing, and reviewing all University employees. Checklists for faculty recruitment and staff recruitment, outline the processes for hiring units to follow.

The process for recruiting, hiring, and orienting faculty, staff, and administrators is facilitated through use of the NEOGOV platform, beginning with the development of a position description, which is written and submitted by departments or units requesting the new position (see full process here). HR specialists may research similar position descriptions and job advertisements from other institutions' recruitment websites, as well as from national job posting sites to assure that the description reflects the qualifications, skills, and values that are required for similar positions. Position descriptions are approved by the respective chain of command to ensure they reflect the qualifications, skills, and values desired for the role. The positions are advertised in local news media, national industry publications, national job posting websites, and any relevant media that can ensure access to a diverse pool of applicants. A search consultant is sometimes used for executive-level searches to enhance the University's ability to attract and select candidates.

Following the checklist guidance, search committees are formed by the hiring units. These committees use evaluation criteria that align specifically with the qualifications, skills, and values presented in the position description and job advertisements. Applicants for the position are given the opportunity to articulate how their qualifications, skills, and values reflect the position in letters of application and, if receiving further consideration, in telephone and face-to-face interviews. In some cases, testing for keyboarding and Microsoft proficiency is required to demonstrate skills.

New employees can complete required online training such as Title IX, anti-harassment training, budgeting/finance system training, required employment forms, faculty and staff identification card applications, and activation of Southeast employee portal access through an online checklist accessed in NEOGOV onboarding section. HR also facilitates weekly benefit orientation sessions, which employees can opt to join, that provide guidance on employee benefit options, policy and procedure concerning leave benefits, and retirement investment options.

Additional onboarding activities are provided to faculty by the Center for Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning. Historically, this process involved a week-long orientation called Teaching Enhancement Workshop. A new process for faculty onboarding, called Thrive in 5, was introduced in fall 2018 (see 3I3).

New employees are expected to demonstrate the skills and values reflected in their position descriptions during the probationary period of their employment, which is defined as the first six months of employment for staff and the first three years of employment for tenure-track faculty.

3P1.2 Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs

The process for developing academic credentialing standards for faculty is informed by the HLC guidance for determining faculty credentials (see Assumed Practices B.2.a and B.2.b; and Faculty Roster with qualifications).

The required credentials for faculty are drafted by the hiring academic departments and listed in the job posting. HR requires transcripts from faculty who apply for the position. Transcripts are verified at the time of hire, uploaded to NEOGOV, and retained in HR personnel files.

Faculty having terminal degrees are eligible for Graduate Faculty status, a university requirement to teach graduate courses. A review of Graduate Faculty status occurs every five years, with reappointment contingent upon demonstration of scholarly activity, supervision of graduate student work, and expectation of continued graduate instruction.

Occasionally, other parties may also confirm faculty credentials. For example, The Office of Dual Credit partners with academic departments on campus to ensure that all dual credit instructors working in high schools are qualified (see process flowchart).

3P1.3 Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities

The University collects and analyzes data from various sources for decision making and regularly participates in the Delaware Study, which provides program cost and outcome comparisons to peers within the same Carnegie classification. Institutional Research assists in the preparation of departmental key performance indicators (KPI) each year, and the Budget Office provides reporting of faculty workload and use of part-time or overload resources. Additionally, the college deans and provost monitor student credit hour production per FTE, the number of hours of reassigned faculty time in an academic department, and the utilization of part-time and overload assignments. These metrics are combined with planning for any new programs to determine whether to fill a faculty vacancy as it had been, internally reallocate it to a different field or discipline, or transfer the faculty line to a different college where greater needs are perceived. Using KPI data described above, departments engage in academic program review every five years (see 1P1.3), which provides a formal, systematic mechanism for identifying and communicating faculty needs to the dean, provost, and president.

The process through which Academic Affairs can request funding for new faculty lines involves the annual Budget Review Committee processes, described in 5P1.2. Academic Affairs retains 25% of faculty base salary savings through which some new faculty lines can be created internally as needs arise.

3P1.4 Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services?

Division managers and the respective division executives assess staffing needs and financial resources to ensure student support service units can operate effectively. Typically, an assessment is carried out by the unit manager, who makes a request to the division executive to hire additional student support staff. For example, in 2018, the director of Southeast Online presented a proposal to hire an additional online program specialist to advise online students. The proposal included a workload analysis and enrollment growth projection, and it identified a funding source. The proposal was presented to the division executive who took it forward for consideration by the president.

In addition, the University's Budget Review Committee reviews requests from division executives for new staff positions that originate from unit managers and recommends hiring additional staff when necessary (see 5P1.2).

The institution offers a graduate assistantship program for students pursuing full-time graduate study, which provides another layer of support for faculty, administrators, and the student population. Recommendations for assistantships are initiated in the department/unit and require the approval of the college dean and provost.

3P1.5 Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

HR periodically reviews data on hiring measures, such as the number of first-choice candidates accepting offers of employment and how many searches are needed to fill a position (see 3R1).

Based on recommendations from the President's Task Force on Diversity, requisitions for new job postings are reviewed by the special assistant to the president for equity and diversity to ensure they reflect the institutional values of diversity and inclusion. Relatedly, search committees can seek guidance from the special assistant regarding the composition of the committee.

In 2017, the Office of Dual Credit began an annual process to survey dual credit instructors who are working in partner high schools. The survey has been administered in 2017 and 2018.

3R1: Results

1. This table shows the number of employees by job category over a four-year period.
2. The University seeks 95% of faculty hires to be either the first or second choice from the search pools. The process for recruiting and hiring employees has resulted in 91% of first-choice candidates accepting staff positions and 86% of first-choice candidates accepting faculty positions (see chart).
3. The CUPA-HR 2018 Survey Data for Public Masters Institutions reports average turnover rates for all full-time faculty at 8% with a 13% average turnover rate for staff. These data compared to the University's faculty and staff turnover rates over the past five years indicate the University has been successful in retaining faculty and staff employees compared to other public institutions (see chart).
4. This table provides data depicting staff retention following the probationary period.
5. Data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (2018) indicated that 45 percent of Southeast first year students and 46 percent of Southeast seniors rated their quality of interactions with student services staff a 6 or 7 (on a scale of 1-7). These are increases over from 41 percent and 40 percent, respectively, from 2015.
6. In 2018, NSSE data also showed that 72 percent of Southeast first year students and 67 percent of Southeast seniors responded that the institution emphasized providing support to help students succeed academically "very much" or "quite a bit." The previous administration of the survey in 2015 had similar results with 73 percent and 66 percent, respectively.
7. The Office of Dual Credit reporting the following summary from their surveys of dual credit instructors. Finding suggested that a majority of dual credit instructors with master's degrees have their degrees outside of a content area yet enough graduate credit within the discipline to qualify as dual credit instructors. Additionally, data suggest there is a misunderstanding about how content area is defined among dual credit instructors surveyed. Of those surveyed who are not qualified to teach dual credit courses, a majority were interested in taking courses to become qualified. Yet, a majority of instructors surveyed are not currently working on any master's degree.

3I1: Improvement

1. In the summer of 2018, HR began developing an exit interview instrument and process to help measure exiting employees' satisfaction and to drive continuous improvement in the

satisfaction of existing and new employees.
2. A new staff performance evaluation process was implemented by HR in fall 2018. Features of the new process include a self-evaluation process and evaluation criteria that more closely aligns with specific core job objectives.
3. In 2019, HR will expand its onboarding process by developing a managerial training curriculum specifically for newly hired managers and supervisors.
4. The Office of Dual Credit used their survey data as a prompt to launch a pilot program that allows teachers to take the 18 required hours of content coursework in English as well as pedagogy coursework and earn a master's in educational studies. The team hopes to expand this program to other disciplines taught by dual credit partners.

Sources

- C.1.3_Employees by job category 2014-2018 IPEDS
- C.1.3_Staff retention after probationary period 2015-2017
- C.3.1_Dual Credit Instructor Approval Process Flowchart
- C.3.1_Email communication from HR to new hires re onboarding
- C.3.1_Evaluation Criteria Grid_Sample
- C.3.1_Evidence of Conducting Benefit Orientations_2018 Benefits Orientation
- C.3.1_Faculty and Staff Achieving Satisfactory Performance Ratings
- C.3.1_Faculty and Staff Turnover Rates
- C.3.1_Faculty Roster showing highest degree
- C.3.1_FLACReport
- C.3.1_FY19 Faculty Replacements
- C.3.1_GA Allocations
- C.3.1_Graduate Faculty Status Review_06082018
- C.3.1_GraduateFacultyRequirementsExcerptFacHandbookCh2D6
- C.3.1_HERC job posting
- C.3.1_Hispanic Outlook posting
- C.3.1_HLC Assumed Practices B.2.a and B.2.b
- C.3.1_HR_FacultySearchProcess
- C.3.1_HR_StaffSearchProcess
- C.3.1_Job Offers Resulting in Hiring Successful Candidate
- C.3.1_Leaves Policy_FinAdm_03-18_Policy
- C.3.1_MOSERS Retirement Investments MSEP2011_general_employees_handbook
- C.3.1_NEOGOV Dashboard example
- C.3.1_NEOGOV Dashboard showing onboarding link
- C.3.1_NEOGOV Dashboard showing onboarding page
- C.3.1_Neogov job posting
- C.3.1_NEOGOV screen showing approvals
- C.3.1_NEOGOVProcesses
- C.3.1_NoLoadOffLoad
- C.3.1_Online Program Specialist Position Request
- C.3.1_Org Chart for Human_Resources_05012018
- C.3.1_Portal showing access to Faculty Workload tool
- C.3.1_Professional development and training catalog
- C.3.1_PTOVLReport
- C.3.1_ReassignedTime
- C.3.1_Retirement Investments_CURP_Plan_Doc_Restatement_20141104

- C.3.1_Retirement Investments_FinAdm_03-21_Policy
- C.3.1_Sample KPI_department of computer science
- C.3.1_Southeast_Delaware Study 2016 Table 1
- C.3.1_TeachingEnhancementWorkshopProgramHistory_2017LettertoNewFaculty
- C.3.1_Thrivein5ProgramOverviewCSTLpage

3.2 - Evaluation and Recognition

Evaluation and Recognition focuses on the assessment and recognition of faculty, staff and administrators' contributions to the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. within this section.

3P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes that assess and recognize faculty, staff and administrators' contributions to the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees
- Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators
- Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services
- Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators (3.C.3)
- Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance
- Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

3R2: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if evaluation processes assess employees' contributions to the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

3I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 3R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

3P2. Processes

3P2.1 Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees

The Performance Management Committee was formed in spring 2018 to review the staff performance evaluation system and to recommend improvements to the president and executive staff. Drawing on their research of other institutions, the committee developed a new process that includes standardized core objectives for evaluation, a mid-year evaluation, a self-evaluation, and a training program. The new performance evaluation process is one that incorporates recommendations from the Diversity Task Force to be more diverse, culturally competent, and inclusive.

The Benefits Review Subcommittee is tasked with identifying employee needs and concerns in relation to recognition, rewards, compensation, and benefits. Needs and concerns are scrutinized by the subcommittee and formulated into strategic recommendations for improvement before being proposed to the Budget Review Committee for funding support.

The process for evaluating faculty for annual merit salary increases, as detailed in the Faculty Merit-Pay Policy, was created with input from chairpersons, deans, the Faculty Compensation Committee, and was endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

The process and general criteria for tenure and promotion are developed and revised by the Faculty Senate and the provost (see Chapter 2, Section F of the Faculty Handbook). The academic departments and colleges design guidelines that align the general criteria to the specific activities that fulfill the criteria within their departments (see example 1; example 2). Departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion are then presented for review and approval by the college councils; University Tenure, Promotion, and Sabbatical Leave Advisory Committee; and the provost.

3P2.2 Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators

Activity 1: University standing committees comprise representatives from across all employee groups who come together to address or respond to an established charge. Additionally, several *ad hoc* task force groups have been formed as short-term planning and action teams. These groups convene to address an immediate need or carry out a short-term project. Embedded in these groups are processes for eliciting input from group members, developing new policies, or processes, and communicating these changes to colleagues.

Activity 2: Faculty Senate comprises senators from each academic department to represent their colleagues in conversations and decision making related to new academic policies, processes, and institutional change initiatives. In this way, the Faculty Senate is a key mechanism for soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty. Faculty Senate meets twice monthly and hosts annual meetings that are open to all colleagues to solicit input from attendees and to share updates around key Senate priorities. These meetings also include the president, provost, and other campus leadership, so an open exchange of ideas and concerns can be shared. Faculty Senate has oversight of the Faculty Handbook, which is a central source of information about the roles and expectations of faculty.

Activity 3: A key process for soliciting input from other campus employees involves the Professional Staff Council; Clerical, Technical, and Service Staff Council; and Administrative Council. These groups comprise representatives from units, who are expected to communicate updates and request input from their constituents.

Activity 4: The University president regularly seeks input from and communicates expectations to all employees in several ways. First, the president's office provides regular "Dear Colleague" letters to campus employees about key initiatives. Second, the president engages in activities such as listening tours, town halls, and small group meetings to request input from others and share information about changes. Third, the president provides a State of the University Address each fall to inform campus employees of institutional priorities, achievements, and progress toward stated goals. Fourth, the president's office distributes an email newsletter, called the Newswire, to all campus employees twice per week, which shares key information with all employees.

Activity 5: Processes for soliciting input and communicating expectations to employees regularly involve unit leaders. For example, college deans are informed of changes to plans, policies, and processes at Council of Deans meetings, and communicate these changes to their respective chairpersons, who then communicate these changes to their respective faculty (see shared drive example used by a dean).

Activity 6: Annual performance evaluation processes, as described in the previous section, provide a basis for soliciting input from and communicating expectations to colleagues. The new staff evaluation process includes a self-reflection component that elicits input from staff on their own performance and development needs. The dialogical aspect of the evaluation process provides a mechanism for sharing this input and communicating expectations for job performance, skill development, and goal attainment.

3P2.3 Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services

The process that was used to align the staff evaluation system with institutional objectives occurred during the 2017/2018 academic year (see 3P2.1). Furthermore, performance evaluation systems are designed to correlate with the University Strategic Plan, Priority 3 Objective III. The evaluation processes support open communication and active collaboration to reflect on, assess, and develop employee performance. The staff performance appraisal document allows for goal setting, and in some cases, division executives use this section to link to institutional objectives.

Faculty performance is designed to evaluate teaching effectiveness, service, and professional development achievements. The interpretation of teaching, service, and professional development varies by department and allows faculty to contribute to both instructional and non-instructional objectives. Clear alignment to institutional objectives is demonstrated with the faculty evaluation process. For example, faculty are evaluated on *teaching effectiveness*, which directly supports the University Strategic Plan, Priority I.

The latest version of the faculty evaluation system was revised by Faculty Senate in 2013/2014. The board of regents provided final approval of the latest faculty tenure and promotion process on June 26, 2014.

3P2.4 Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators

This process is codified in the HR policies and procedures for staff performance evaluations, and the policies for the evaluation, promotion, and tenure of faculty, are listed in Chapter 2, Section F of the Faculty Handbook.

HR facilitates the annual process for staff evaluations and ensures all employees receive an evaluation report for their personnel file. The newly implemented staff performance evaluation process requires annual evaluations of staff by their direct supervisor based on standardized performance criteria and incorporates graduated ratings of performance categories to assure employees know job expectations and desired methods for performance improvement.

3P2.5 What is the process for establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance

The processes for establishing employee recognition systems are facilitated by various units, such as HR, the president, division leadership, and the alumni office. This table provides examples of employee recognition processes.

The processes for establishing employee compensation and benefits systems are facilitated by HR. Each year, HR reviews market pay for positions and base salaries by looking at updated CUPA survey data and O-NET data. Prior to posting a job, HR will review the CIP code assignment against CUPA data to analyze comparability. Salary equity studies are carried out by HR every three to five years. The most recent salary equity study was completed in 2014.

A Benefits Review Subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Budget Review Committee that regularly assists HR with assessing benefit programs and making recommendations for improvements (see example; see also 3P2.1 and 5P2.2).

3P2.6 What is the process for promoting employee satisfaction and engagement

The process is informed by data collected from employee satisfaction surveys. For example, in 2012, 2014, and 2018, the University administered The Chronicle's Great Colleges to Work For survey. These comparisons are reviewed by various stakeholder groups, such as Administrative Council, executive staff, and members of the HLC Action Project who coordinate this work.

Another process to promote employee satisfaction and engagement involves the Benefits Review Subcommittee (see 3P2.5), which provides regular feedback to HR.

Myriad other activities exist under a broader process of employee engagement. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning provides faculty development opportunities throughout the year. These activities are designed to promote faculty networking with colleagues across the campus community (see 3P3).

Informal mentoring often takes place within academic departments and through employee councils, such as Clerical, Technical and Service Staff Council and Professional Staff Council.

3P2.7 What is the process for tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Data are collected by HR related to faculty performance evaluations, employee utilization of benefits, and salary equity (see 3R2). These process are tracked using the Banner ERP platform (see 5P1 for more about Banner).

Employee satisfaction and wellbeing is tracked using the HERI Faculty Survey and the Great Colleges to Work For Survey. Discussions about data from these surveys take place, informally. Efforts are currently underway to devise an institutional process to use these data as actionable insight (see 3I2 and 6P2).

3R2: Results

1. As a result of the Performance Management Committee's research and work to revised the

performance evaluation processes, a new process for staff performance evaluation was implemented in fall 2018 (see president's letter).

2. This report provides a multi-year summary of satisfactory faculty performance over the past few years. The mandatory performance improvement plan process for individuals receiving unsatisfactory annual performance ratings has been a successful mechanism for pinpointing areas of improvement with structured, deadline driven written guidelines that must be achieved to change the performance rating within a six-month period.
3. Over the past three years, 271 employees were recognized for years of service and retirements through the annual Employee Recognition Program. Additionally, the president has awarded 36 Southeast Shout Out awards to recognize faculty and staff employees since program inception. The provost award nine awards of excellence, along with the Provost's PRIDE award in 2018.
4. The results of the 2014 salary equity study resulted in an approximate $1.2 million funding of salary equity adjustments for various positions to bring salaries to a percentage of market pay based on years of service with the institution. Moving forward, the University will attempt to conduct future salary equity studies every three to five years to provide competitive salaries to influence retention and high performance of faculty and staff.
5. In 2015, the University enhanced its paid sick leave accrual system to allow for unlimited accrual, which allows for more leave hours to be banked and potentially reported to the state retirement system for additional credited service.
6. In 2016, the University implemented enhancements to its employee leave benefits, including implementation of a parental paid leave benefit available to both faculty and staff, providing a paid sick leave benefit allotment on day one to new faculty and staff employees so that they can have hours available to take when needed, and increasing the paid time off vacation accrual for staff employees.

3I2: IMPROVEMENT

1. In 2018, the University enhanced its health insurance plan offerings to faculty and staff by implementing a walking activity reward program, which provides employees with a tracking device that tracks physical activity which can result in monetary rewards deposited into employee health savings accounts.
2. The University is continuing to assess feasibility of moving to a self-funded health insurance plan offering for its employees which can potentially offer better benefits at a lower cost to employees. A current study is underway.
3. Through an HLC Action Project initiated following an HLC Strategy Forum in November 2017, Southeast is designing and piloting a process for using employee satisfaction data, such as those gathered from the HERI Faculty Survey and the Great Colleges to Work For Survey as actionable insights.

Sources

- C.3.2_2016 SOU Book
- C.3.2_2017 SOU Book
- C.3.2_2018 Performance Appraisal_redacted
- C.3.2_2018 SOU Book
- C.3.2_AC Agenda 10-9-18 showing discussion of Great Colleges survey data
- C.3.2_Administrative Council Charge and Membership 2018-2019
- C.3.2_ApprovalofFacultyTenurePromotionProcess

- C.3.2_Benefits Review Subcommittee_charge and membership
- C.3.2_Benefits Subcommittee Proposal to BRC 2016
- C.3.2_Brown Bag Lunch 11-7-18
- C.3.2_CTSStaffCouncilCharge_MembershipFY2019
- C.3.2_Departmental Promotional Criteria_all departments shown
- C.3.2_DialogicalAspectPerfEvalSupervisorRole
- C.3.2_Draft Program_FDD18
- C.3.2_Email evidence of internal approval of P_T guidelines_COSTA
- C.3.2_Email evidence of internal approval of T_P criteria_Social Work
- C.3.2_ES Agenda 080618 showing discussion of Great College survey data
- C.3.2_Example of shared drive used to communicate from dean to chairs
- C.3.2_Faculty and Staff Achieving Satisfactory Performance Ratings
- C.3.2_Faculty Senate Charge and Membership
- C.3.2_Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule 18-19
- C.3.2_FacultyMeritPayPolicyExcerptFacHandbookCh2C
- C.3.2_Great Colleges Summary Comparison 2012-2018
- C.3.2_HLC-Dear Colleague letter
- C.3.2_HLC-Newswire example
- C.3.2_HRProceduresStaffPerfEvalTimeline
- C.3.2_Letter from president outlining new staff evaluation process
- C.3.2_Mentor Program for Elementary Early and Special Education
- C.3.2_NewStaffEvaluationProcessPerformanceManagementPresentation
- C.3.2_Onboarding activities
- C.3.2_Performance Management Committee Members
- C.3.2_Pres_Strategic_Plan_final_12-09-14
- C.3.2_ProfessionalStaffCouncilCharge_MembershipFY2019
- C.3.2_Project_charter_Developing_a_Data-Informed_Process_for_Understanding_and_Enh
- C.3.2_Provost_PromoCriteria_Accounting
- C.3.2_RecommendationsDiversityTaskForce
- C.3.2_Salary Equity Study example
- C.3.2_SelfEvaluationFormPDFandOnlineScreenshotwithGuidelines
- C.3.2_Southeast Missouri State UHC Motion Report
- C.3.2_Table_Examples of processes for employee recognition
- C.3.2_Take Away Friday example
- C.3.2_Thrive in 5-Flyer-2018

3.3 - Development

Development focuses on processes for continually training, educating and supporting employees to remain current in their methods and to contribute fully and effectively throughout their careers at the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 5.A. in this section.

3P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for training, educating and supporting the professional development of employees. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees (3.C.4, 5.A.4)
- Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes (3.C.4)
- Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.) (3.C.6)
- Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

3R3: RESULTS

What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

3I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 3R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

3P3: Processes

3P3.1 Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees

The training and development unit within HR was implemented in 2016 to provide online and face-to-face training and professional development for employees. Certification training and testing for Microsoft Office Specialist certification is offered to all clerical, technical, and service employees, who may earn pay increases after achieving certification. Face-to-face test preparation courses are coordinated by the Training and Development unit, and the employee's respective department pays the fees for the initial exams (see list of development opportunities). Suicide training is offered to all employees and students by the Office of Disability Services.

All processes for employee training that are facilitated by Training and Development, as well as the Office of Counseling and Disability Services, require participants to register on the HR Training and Development Portal. Certificates of completion are provided following the training, which can be added to employees' professional development portfolios.

Since 1996, all faculty are required to participate in a new faculty orientation process. Prior to fall 2018, this process was called Teaching Enhancement Workshop (TEW) and took place during the second week of August. The agenda for TEW was designed to achieve objectives that were predetermined by the facilitation team.

The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning (CSTL) has a mission to support the enhancement of teaching and learning through meaningful faculty development and support for instructional design. In fall 2017, the CSTL launched its three-year Teaching Excellence Plan, which outlines key initiatives for expanding and strengthening support for faculty development. As part of this plan, the CSTL implemented a new faculty orientation called Thrive in 5 and a Faculty Certificate in Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT). The CRT specifically meets recommendations included in the final report and recommendations of the President's Task Force on Diversity Education.

The Master Advisor Program process was created in 2017 to provide development opportunities for faculty and staff advisors. The program includes basic and advanced advising strategies and techniques, understanding of ethical issues related to advising, effective use of advising technologies and resources, and understanding academic policies and procedures, as well as changes to curriculum, that impact advising (see 2P1.4).

Certain processes for professional development, such as the annual Administrative Professionals' Day program and the biannual Faculty Development Day, are well established and happen on a recurring basis. These events are carried out systematically and include guest speakers and other professional development activities.

Division executives allocate professional development funds to departments annually. The process for employees to request professional development funding varies by department but essentially involves a formal request made by the employee and approval given by a supervisor. Examples of professional development activities include conferences, training, and memberships to external organizations.

As part of its broader process for supporting professional development, employee receive an 80% fee waiver for undergraduate courses and a 60% fee waiver for graduate level courses (see policy). Additionally, the University's continuing education department provides a range of professional growth and personal enrichment opportunities to the community, of which employee can participate at affordable rates.

3P3.2 Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes

The University assists faculty in staying current with both their academic discipline and teaching role by providing financial support to engage in external activities and capacity to provide on-campus support. The process for allocating, requesting, and approving professional development funding in described in 3P3.1. Additional processes to provide funding to support external development activities include the Grants and Research Funding Committee, which provides small grants to support research. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs assists individuals in finding and applying for external grants, and in understanding and complying with federal regulations. The Funding for Results Committee awards grants annually for projects that address teaching and learning issues.

As described in 3P3.1, the Center for Scholarship, Teaching, and Learning (CSTL) provides workshops and other development activities, as well as one-on-one consultation to assist faculty in remaining current in pedagogy and technology in the classroom. Additional examples include faculty book studies, Take Away Fridays, Summer and Winter Institutes, and support for instructional design for all modes of delivery (e.g. This Old Course and Learning Design Institute). In partnership with IT, the CSTL provides training to support technology enhanced learning and it produces the Ed Tech Toolkit as a resource to faculty who wish to develop a stronger approach to using technology for teaching.

Southeast Online, in partnership with the CSTL launched the Master Template Studio in 2018, which supports faculty in designing online course templates for adjunct instructors to use for teaching and scaling online programs. Also, Southeast Online implemented the Online Teaching Academy in 2018 to provide a year-long professional development opportunity for 25 Southeast faculty each year.

Additionally, the Office of Dual Credit provides support for Dual Credit instructors to stay current in their content areas (see Handbook p. 5).

Faculty development opportunities are advertised monthly though the Faculty Development Dispatch, an email newsletter coordinated by the provost's office.

3P3.3 Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise

Example 1: Student support staff members participate in ongoing training processes that include sexual harassment prevention, armed intruder response, and a variety of other training offered through the Training and Development unit (see 3P3.1).

Example 2: The Master Advisor Program is a comprehensive training and development program for professional and faculty advisors (see also 2P1.2 and 3P3.1). Three key competencies necessary for effective academic advising are addressed in the initial, eight-hour workshop. Once advisors complete the initial intensive, one-day workshop, they gain a designation of Master Advisor. This distinction makes them eligible for rewards and recognition, providing an additional incentive and motivation to participate. Recertification of the Master Advisor designation is obtained through attendance of two topical workshops (1-2 hours in length) within two years from the date of initial certification, providing continued professional development in academic advising.

Example 3: The Center for Writing Excellence support staff increases skills and knowledge in tutoring writing through national conference attendance, cross-training as English instructors and teaching assistants, and bi-weekly seminars.

3P3.4 Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives

Processes to provide professional development align with the University's Strategic Plan, Priority III, Faculty and Staff Experience. Unit level plans reflect the priorities of the University's strategic plan and often include professional development or training goals. For example, as part of the HR unit plan, one goal for the coming year is to create supervisory training.

The Equity Officer is a member of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE), where key themes are explored that are priorities across the higher education section. NADOHE has developed a set of Standards of Professional Practice for diversity officers across 800 institutions and 500 organizations which align with accepted characteristics of professions. These standards further provide a platform for the evaluation of the equity officer's role within the University; taking into account the individual's educational background, knowledge, and other levels of expertise.

The Teaching Excellence Plan, which was designed and implemented by the CSTL in fall 2017 aligns with the University's mission to provide exceptional teaching and its core value of "Excellence". The Teaching Excellence Plan outlines actions to support faculty toward the continuous improvement of their teaching practice. The process for aligning and developing the plan took place in summer 2017.

3P3.5 Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Once registered, completion of the training can be monitored through the Skillsoft platform and reported to supervisors within employees' respective departments.

Since its inception, the TEW program (i.e. the former new faculty orientation program) used evaluations to gain insight into the faculty experience (see example).

The CSTL uses an online database to record faculty participation in development activities. Additionally, this system issues surveys to participants after each event to gain insight and feedback.

3R3: Results

1. This table outlines the Microsoft Office Specialist certifications awarded to employees (by employee group).
2. HR data reflects the number of staff logging into and completing Skillsoft training.
3. Based on feedback from a faculty focus group, the TEW model for faculty orientation was revised and launched as the Thrive in 5 program in fall 2018.
4. The CSTL tracks participation at its workshops and other events. In 2018, the CSTL experienced an all-time high of 439 unduplicated faculty attending its events. High rates of participation are common, yet goal-setting is being discussed to ensure growth in faculty engagement.
5. The Master Advisory Program continues to draw high rates of participation among staff and faculty (see 2R1 for more data).

3I3: Improvement

1. The HR Training and Development unit to develop its range of Skillsoft training offers for employees over the next few years. Additionally, plans are in place to implement leadership training opportunities for employees in supervisory roles.
2. The Thrive in 5 faculty orientation program will continue in fall 2019. Continuous

improvements to this program will be based on participant evaluations, which will be collected in spring 2019.

3. The Teaching Excellence Plan includes several initiatives that will be designed and implemented in the next two years. These include additional support for new faculty, more certification pathways for faculty development, and stronger support for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Sources

- C.3.3_2018_2019 HR Initiatives
- C.3.3_80 percent Fee Waiver Policy
- C.3.3_Administrative Professionals Days announcement
- C.3.3_Book studies aim to aid in faculty development (10_4_18) _ The Arrow
- C.3.3_Center for Writing Excellence
- C.3.3_ContinuingEducationRangeOfTrainingsforProf_PersonalGrowth
- C.3.3_CSTL Faculty Participation
- C.3.3_CSTL_ToolKit
- C.3.3_CSTLWebsiteWorshopsScreenshot
- C.3.3_CulturallyResponsiveTeachingCSTLWebsiteInfo
- C.3.3_CulturallyResponsiveTeachingFacultyDevelopmentDay2018-certificate
- C.3.3_Draft Program_FDD18
- C.3.3_DualCredit-FacultyHandbook_p.5
- C.3.3_Faculty Development Dispatch example
- C.3.3_FacultyStaff Professional Dev Fund Request (TEMPLATE)
- C.3.3_FFR call for proposals 2018-2019
- C.3.3_Funding for Results Committee 2018-2019
- C.3.3_GrantsandResearchFundingCommitteeMembership
- C.3.3_Learning Design Institute
- C.3.3_Master Advisor Program - Southeast Missouri State University
- C.3.3_MOS Certification Participation by Employee Classification
- C.3.3_MOS Certification Policy
- C.3.3_MTS Flyer
- C.3.3_NADOHE Standards
- C.3.3_National Diversity Professional Organization
- C.3.3_Online Teaching Academy Flyer
- C.3.3_Pres_Strategic_Plan_final_12-09-14
- C.3.3_Proposal for new faculty programming
- C.3.3_RecommendationsDiversityTaskForce
- C.3.3_Research_SponsoredProgramsWebsiteScreenshot
- C.3.3_Skillsoft logins and completion data
- C.3.3_Take Away Friday Example
- C.3.3_Teaching Excellence at Southeast latest version
- C.3.3_TeachingEnhancementWorkshop2017Agenda
- C.3.3_TeachingEnhancementWorkshopProgramHistory_2017LettertoNewFaculty
- C.3.3_TEWEvaluationResults2017
- C.3.3_This Old Course information
- C.3.3_Thrive in 5-Flyer-2018
- C.3.3_TrainingDevelopmentInstructorLedTrainingSessionsAvailableforStaff
- C.3.3_TrainingDevPortalQuestionPersuadeReferSuicidePreventionScreenshots

- C.3.3_TrainingDevPortalRegistrationScreenshot
- C.3.3_Winter Institute Workshop Example

4 - Planning and Leading

4.1 - Mission and Vision

Mission and Vision focuses on how the institution develops, communicates and reviews its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.A., 1.B. and 1.D. within this section.

4P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values (1.A.1, 1.D.2, 1.D.3)
- Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values
- Communicating the mission, vision and values (1.B.1,1.B.2, 1.B.3)
- Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission (1.A.2)
- Allocating resources to advance the institutions mission and vision, while upholding the institution's values (1.D.1, 1.A.3)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys)

4R1: RESULTS

What are the results for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution's mission, vision and values? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

4I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 4R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

4P1: Processes

4P1.1 Developing, deploying, and reviewing the intuition's mission, vision and values

Southeast Missouri State University's strategic plan includes statements on its mission, vision, and values. In January 2013, Fieldstone Consulting conducted interviews with faculty, staff, students, University Foundations, and community leaders. A steering committee met during spring 2013 to review and revise the previously adopted 2008 strategic plan and write the first draft. The board of regents, executive staff, and the consultant, reviewed the draft strategic plan at a retreat in September 2013. Recommendations regarding changes to the draft were made at the retreat and the board asked the steering committee to consider those recommendations.

The steering committee and members of the executive staff met twice in spring 2014 to review the board's recommendations and revise the draft. The board of regents reviewed a revised draft of the strategic plans at its June 2014 meeting.

Feedback regarding the draft strategic plan was solicited from members of the University community through fall 2014. The strategic plan was considered and discussed at planning retreats for the academic colleges, Faculty Senate, the divisions of Academic Affairs, Finance, and Administration, University Foundations, and Enrollment Management and Student Success, executive staff, and Administrative Council.

The board of regents adopted the current strategic plan on December 19, 2014. The plan establishes a set of priorities, with a set of objectives under each priority, to guide the institution's development and the establishment of its budgets. The strategic plan includes a statement of Southeast's mission, vision, and values.

Missouri Statute requires the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE) to conduct a review of all public higher education institutions' missions every five years, which is carried out by the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE). Due to Missouri Legislature conversations concerning institutional missions in 2015, the MDHE delayed the five-year review. To fulfill its statutory obligations the CBHE and MDHE are working with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) to use NCHEMS mission role and scope descriptions to advance the mission review work. MDHE staff are also looking at mission descriptions from institutions in other states as a way to inform this work and each university received a report from NCHEMS and was given an opportunity to respond.

It is Southeast administration's understanding that each institution will be required to engage in conversations with MDHE toward final agreement on a new or revised mission. The MDHE hopes to complete this work and have all missions reviewed and revised in 2019.

4P1.2 Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values

Southeast's strategic plan outlines four values: student success, excellence, access and diversity, and community. Under student success, Southeast has placed a high priority on student-centered education and experiential learning through engaged and adaptive modes in and beyond the classroom in a safe, friendly, supportive environment that helps Southeast students achieve their academic and career goals.

As part of its commitment to excellence, Southeast has a sustained commitment to quality teaching, service, research, and creative activities integrated into impactful academic and cocurricular programs. Programs at Southeast are encouraged to seek national accreditation and certification. Programs without accrediting opportunities are encouraged to continue to conduct internal reviews to strengthen their academic offerings.

The university promotes an engaged campus learning community, committed through shared purposes and service; sustained by respect, accountability, and adaptability; and strengthened through collaborative partnerships that extend the expertise and accomplishments of faculty, staff, students, and alumni beyond campus.

> **Example 1:** Opened in spring 2015, Catapult Creative House (Catapult) is Southeast's creative arts and industries incubator, designed to fuel entrepreneurship among Southeast students and the greater Cape Girardeau community. Catapult provides gallery space for artists in the Cape Girardeau and University communities; studio space for students; retail space for student and community artists to showcase their jewelry and wearables, ceramics, and other unique works of art; a printing press area; as well as a venue that hosts visiting artists and a student of the month exhibition. In spring 2017, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International recognized Catapult as one of 35 advancements driving innovation in business education worldwide.

> **Example 2:** Opened in fall 2016, the Rust Center for Media provides more than 13,000 square feet of experiential learning space for Southeast students in downtown Cape Girardeau. Students study and work in the community's "media row" with the local newspaper on one side, and radio stations and KFVS, a CBS affiliate, across the street. With this proximity to industry leaders, students studying mass media and those with The Arrow (Southeast's student newspaper), SECreative (Southeast's student advertising firm), and Riverfront PR (Southeast's student public relations firm) are able to work directly with professionals on collaborative projects and receive real-time mentoring.

4P1.3 Communicating the mission, vision and values

The University communicates its mission, vision, and values in many ways. One way is incorporation of the institution's strategic plan. The 2018 new faculty orientation program focused on the University's four values and included the president talking directly with new faculty about Southeast's mission. The president discusses the mission, vision, and values and progress and activities towards goals at the annual fall State of the University Address. Other ways in which the University communicates its mission, vision, and values include, but are not limited to, inclusion on University website; insertion in print materials; and placement in the Student Handbook. Colleges, departments, divisions, and units have framed posters of the University's mission on display.

4P1.4 Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution's mission

An established process, posted on the provost's website, guides proposals for new academic programs, program changes or revisions, and program deletions. The process includes the proposed program's academic department, college councils, Academic Council, Graduate Council if necessary, dean of Kent Library, Institutional Research, the Budget Office, the provost, the president, and then ultimately the board of regents. Following board action, proposals are forwarded to the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) for review and consideration. An example of this process can be seen in a review of the minutes from the May 11, 2018 Board of Regents meeting wherein they acted on several academic program items that were then subsequently acted on by the MDHE. If MDHE staff determine that a proposal falls outside of an institution's mission, a comprehensive review of the proposal will take place.

The program review process is a key mechanism for ensuring that programs are consistent with the institution's mission (see 1P3).

4P1.5 Allocating resources to advance the institution's mission and vision, while upholding the institution's values

The mission of Southeast Missouri State University is to provide "student-centered education and experiential learning with a foundation of liberal arts and science, embracing a tradition of access, exceptional teaching, and commitment to student success that significantly contributes to the development of the region and beyond." Examples of Southeast's resource allocation to advance the mission, vision, and values include:

Example 1: Data from Southeast's FY2018 budget show that Southeast expended $92 million in areas that directly impact faculty, student learning and resources, research, special initiatives and other areas that relate back directly to items in the strategic plan. This amount was the equivalent of 79% of the institution's operating budget.

Example 2: Southeast currently awards over $17 million annually in the form of institutional scholarships to students. Institutional scholarships include academic, endowed and participation scholarships.

Example 3: At their December 20, 2015, meeting, the board of regents received the final report and recommendation of the President's Task Force on Diversity Education. Since then, the University has committed resources toward achieving the report's stated goals and objectives, and has regularly updated the President's Task Force on Diversity Education Progress Report to communicate progress to the University community.

The Budget Review Committee (BRC) provides a yearly process to assist in the allocation of resources to support the institution's mission, vision, and general needs (see 5P2).

4P1.6 Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies, and employee satisfaction surveys)

In June 2014, the institution underwent a comprehensive brand study. The University engaged Penson Associates, who recommended Southeast commission a branding study to better identify the institution's unique attributes and refine messaging to deliver the attributes to target audiences in a more engaging, meaningful way. In June 2014, Southeast awarded a contract to Ologie, a higher education branding and marketing firm, to conduct a brand analysis and provide recommendations regarding a new university identity and messaging concept. Between June 2014 and February 2015, Ologie conducted numerous focus groups and interviews with a wide variety of constituents, both on-and-off campus, completed a communications audit of all Southeast marketing/admissions materials, webpages, and other publications, and reviewed the positions of peer institutions. Ologie used this information to guide the creation of a new university identity and messaging concept. The recommendations were developed through collaborative communication with, and feedback from, a number of University constituencies. The board of regents approved the proposed identity and concepts on February 23, 2015.

Other tools include the HERI Survey, conducted in 2017; the Delaware Study, a study on instructional costs and productivity, which is completed annually; annual participation in the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange; the National Survey for Student Engagement, completed every three years; the CIRP Freshman Survey, conducted every two years; the HERI Faculty Survey, which is completed every three years, and last completed in 2016/2017; the annual VSA/College Portrait; and the Great Colleges to Work For survey, which was conducted in spring 2018.

4R1: Results

1. Southeast has implemented several initiatives directed at faculty and staff to demonstrate its commitment to diversity. This work includes the founding of the SEMO Black Faculty and Staff Alliance (SEMO BFSA) and the LGBTQ+ Employee Alliance. Started in fall 2016, the SEMO BFSA was founded to formally recognize the contributions of the University's African-American faculty and staff, who act in an advisory capacity to the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity. The LGBTQ+ Employee Alliance has led to the creation of the LGBTQ+ Resource Center.
2. In the fall 2017 semester, 955 students identified as "Black/African American" and 211 identified as "Hispanic." This represents growth of approximately 23 percent in "Black/African American" enrollment and 65 percent in "Hispanic" enrollment since 2008. Resources and initiatives for students from these and other ethnicities include the TRIO/McNair Scholars Program, TRIO/Student Support Services, and Educational Access Programs. During the same time, Southeast experienced significant growth in its international student population, growing more than double from 314 in fall 2008 to 742 students in fall 2017. Despite this growth the institution experienced a nearly 25 percent decline in international enrollment from fall 2016 to fall 2017. In part, this was due to matters outside of the institution's control such as federal policy and changes to foreign countries' educational programs. For example, Saudi Arabian student enrollment declined from 194 to 146 over the same one year period.
3. In 2014, Southeast engaged Ologie, a brand and marketing firm with experience in higher education, to create and launch a new brand in spring 2015. The "Will to Do" brand was the result. It captured the grit and tenacity of Southeast students and community and launched the university's success in increasing beginning freshmen enrollment and retention rates.

4I1: Improvement

1. The University president has increased purposeful conversations about the mission, vision, values, and strategic plan in interactions with community groups such as the Chamber of Commerce to enhance the community's comprehension of what Southeast is doing and its plans moving forward. When talking with new students and their parents at FirstSTEP orientation events, the president plans to use a visual of the University's mission and values to promote an understanding of both.
2. Ologie returned to campus in fall 2018 with a charge to reexamine effectiveness of the University's brand. The "Will to Do" brand is in the process of being refreshed.
3. Southeast has created a Task Force to lead data collection and the Carnegie application process for community engagement classification.
4. The anticipated MDHE mission review will likely influence Southeast Missouri State University's approach to developing a new strategic plan. As a part of this initiative, the University intends to develop more concise and focused mission, vision, and values statements to facilitate discussion and understanding.

Sources

- C.4.1_AACSB Catapult
- C.4.1_Accreditations
- C.4.1_Best in Midwest STL Meeting
- C.4.1_Black Faculty Staff Alliance
- C.4.1_BRC Membership
- C.4.1_BRC Request for Funds
- C.4.1_Carnegie Application
- C.4.1_Carnegie Task Force
- C.4.1_Catapult 2015
- C.4.1_CBHE MDHE and NCHEMS
- C.4.1_CBHE Mission Responsibility
- C.4.1_Chapter 173 RSMo
- C.4.1_December 19 2014 BOR Minutes
- C.4.1_Diversity Task Force Report
- C.4.1_Diversity Task Force Report Progress Report
- C.4.1_Educational Access Programs
- C.4.1_Fall 2017 Ethnicity Report
- C.4.1_February 2015 BOR Minutes
- C.4.1_Funding for Results
- C.4.1_Funding for Results Call
- C.4.1_FY2018 Budget Charts
- C.4.1_Institutional Scholarships
- C.4.1_June 2014 BOR Minutes
- C.4.1_LQBTQ+
- C.4.1_May 11 2018 BOR Minutes
- C.4.1_May 11 MDHE Program Approvals
- C.4.1_MDHE CBHE Comp Review Process
- C.4.1_MDHE CBHE Mission Review Delay
- C.4.1_MDHE Low Productivity Report
- C.4.1_Mission Values in Print
- C.4.1_Mission Vision on Web
- C.4.1_Mission Vision Student Handbook
- C.4.1_NCHEMS Report and SE Response
- C.4.1_Program Review Procedures
- C.4.1_Provost Process New Academic Programs
- C.4.1_Rust Center for Media
- C.4.1_Scholarship Criteria Terms
- C.4.1_September 2013 BOR Minutes
- C.4.1_Southeast Strategic Plan
- C.4.1_Talent for Tomorrow
- C.4.1_Three Tiered CBHE MDHE Framework
- C.4.1_TRIO McNair
- C.4.1_TRIO Student Support

4.2 - Strategic Planning

Strategic Planning focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 5.B. and 5.C. in this section.

4P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's plans and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning (5.C.3)
- Aligning operations with the institution's mission, vision and values (5.C.2)
- Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency (5.B.3)
- Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats (5.C.4, 5.C.5)
- Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs (5.C.1, 5.C.4)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)

4R2: RESULTS

What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's operational plans? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

4I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 4R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

4P2: Processes

4P2.1 Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning

The Strategic Plan shows the importance of external stakeholder involvement as expressed in Priority 4, Objectives V and VI. External stakeholders such as the Cities of Cape Girardeau, Jackson, Kennett, Sikeston, the Chambers of Commerce, business groups, the hospitals, Boosters, alumni, and donors are included in the strategic planning process by their participation in University boards, councils, and committees, which assists the University in identifying their needs.

Internally and directly, the stakeholder groups of faculty, staff, and students are represented on the strategic planning committee. Other groups, such as Faculty Senate, are asked to review and comment on the strategic plan during development.

4P2.2 Aligning operations with the institution's mission, vision, and values

The University regularly evaluates student programming and seeks out new programs to meet the changing needs of Southeast's students and region. An example includes new academic programming submitted to the board of regents for consideration at its May 11, 2018 meeting. Approval was requested for the Master of Science in Cybersecurity and the Bachelor of Arts in Writing with Options in Creative and Professional Writing.

Another way this is achieved is through the work of the Economic Business and Engagement Center whose mission is to foster business, community, and workforce development and facilitate the process of innovation to enhance the regional economy.

4P2.3 Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency

A recent example of work the University completed to enhance the alignment of efforts across departments and colleges is through major academic restructuring. On October 25, 2017, the provost held an open forum for all Academic Affairs faculty and staff to discuss the University's budget situation and the need to reorganize colleges and departments. From October 2017 through January 2018, several reorganization idea drafts were shared by the provost, with feedback encouraged following the release of each draft. Nearly 80 written statements were received in an email account established specifically for feedback and nearly 100 meetings involving various individuals and groups were conducted. These initial conversations and requests for feedback predated initiation of the formal process for major academic restructuring as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*.

4P2.4 Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats

In addition to the board of regents, the University has over 30 external advisory boards affiliated directly with the various colleges, departments, or academic programs. Advisory board membership usually comprises practitioners, alumni, industry representatives, and community stakeholders. The advisory boards meet regularly and the meeting format usually is a University update and followed by focused discussion.

Following the aftermath of protests that took place in Ferguson, Missouri, Southeast established the President's Task Force on Diversity Education. This 34 member task force comprised students, faculty, and staff whose charge was to devise strategies to strengthen diversity education and enhance the cultural competence of the University community. The task force produced a report in December 2015, which provided recommendations for improving Southeast's environment to create a welcoming, more respectful, and more culturally responsive institution. As a way to continue the task force's work and implement the report's recommendations, a University Equity and Inclusion Committee was established in July 2016 and in fall 2017, the University president named Sonia Rucker to the position of assistant to the president for equity and diversity.

During FY2017 and FY2018 the institution experienced significant reduction in state appropriation, which led to low morale, concerns among faculty and staff about recruitment and retention of personnel, and questions of how Southeast could sustain an environment where all feel welcomed, respected, and appreciated. Following discussions in August 2017 with executive staff and academic leaders, a recommendation was made to put forward a related topic for the November 2017 Strategy Forum. As a result, eight members representing academic and business units across campus attended the Forum in November 2017 (see 6P1).

4P2.5 Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs

Institutional and divisional requests for additional or new funds from the Budget Review Committee (BRC) must include a description, rationale, and statement of relationship to the University's strategic plan. The BRC, guided by the mission and vision statements, plus strategic priorities and objectives, may or may not recommend funding of the proposals. (See 4P1.5 and 5P2 for detailed information on BRC operations.)

The AQIP pathway has provided ongoing opportunities to plan and implement new tools and processes to effectively utilized limited funds and maximize the University's ability to track, assess, and improve strategies implemented (see 6P1).

4P2.6 Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)

Nationally recognized tools are used, such as, the HERI Faculty Survey, the Delaware Study, and Great Colleges to Work For survey.

Another method for tracking and sharing outcomes/measures is the print brochures distributed at the president's annual State of the University Address. The address includes sharing results concerning achievement of goals and accomplishments toward implementation of the University's strategic plan with the University community.

4R2: Results

1. In FY2017, the Economic Business and Engagement Center helped establish twenty businesses, created/retained 153 jobs, formed an Ag-Tech Virtual Incubator, and developed digital badging for non-credit continuing education and workforce development training.
2. Southeast Missouri State University's AY 2017/2018 major academic restructuring process resulted in a new five college configuration and identified $634,000 in Academic Affairs budget reductions, which was necessary as a result of reduced state appropriations.
3. The President's Task Force on Diversity Education released the final Diversity Task Force Report and Recommendations in spring 2016. Each year, results are communicated by the assistant to the president for equity and diversity through updates to the University community. These results are published online.
4. A Fact Book published on the Institutional Research webpage shares completer and retention information. In fall 2017, Southeast achieved a retention rate of 75.1 percent and a graduation rate of 51.9 percent–both the highest rates since Southeast began tracking this data. Data from

the fall 2018 census shows slight declines in both categories. Institutional Research also provides dashboards for colleges, departments, and administration to track enrollment, retention, and completions (see 5P1).

4R2: Improvement

1. Southeast Missouri State University's processes to review and revise its mission, vision, values, and strategic plan will begin once the MDHE's review of the University's mission statement is completed. It is anticipated that the end result of this work will be a more concise, focused mission statement that is more easily understood by students, parents, faculty, staff, and community stakeholders.
2. Technological changes on social media platforms has caused students, alumni, faculty, staff, and prospective students to be less likely to see important news about, and impressive happenings at, Southeast in their social media news feeds. During AY 2018/2019, Southeast launched a new ambassador program, Southeast Superfans. This program allows anyone to share content about Southeast on through social media.

Sources

- C.4.2_2014 Strategic Plan
- C.4.2_2017 2018 Fact Book
- C.4.2_Academic Restructuring 2018 08
- C.4.2_Adv Board Examples and Charge
- C.4.2_Adv Board Sample Meeting Agenda
- C.4.2_Asst to Pres Equity
- C.4.2_BRC Request for Funds
- C.4.2_Diversity Task Force Report
- C.4.2_EBEC
- C.4.2_EBEC Report
- C.4.2_Equity and Inclusion Committee
- C.4.2_ES Admin Council Deans
- C.4.2_ES and BFSA and LGBTQ+
- C.4.2_ES August 2017 Strategy Forum Discussion
- C.4.2_Handbook Restructuring Process
- C.4.2_May 11 2018 BOR agenda
- C.4.2_May 11 2018 BOR Minutes
- C.4.2_May 11 2018 BOR Restructuring
- C.4.2_MDHE Program Approval Notice
- C.4.2_Presidents Task Force on Diversity
- C.4.2_State of Univ 2016 2018 brochures
- C.4.2_Strategy Forum Topic and Members

4.3 - Leadership

Leadership focuses on governance and leadership of the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.C. and 5.B. in this section.

4P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for ensuring sound and effective leadership of the institution, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance (2.C.4)
- Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board (2.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.B.2)
- Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators and academic matters to faculty (2.C.4)
- Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments
- Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards (5.B.3)
- Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders (2.C.1, 2.C.2)
- Developing leaders at all levels within the institution
- Ensuring the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision (2.C.3)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

4R3: RESULTS

What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

4I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 4R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

4P3: Processes

4P3.1 Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance

Pursuant to Missouri law, Chapter 174, RSMo, Southeast Missouri State University is governed by a board of regents. The board has seven members; six voting and one non-voting student representative. All members are appointed by the Governor of Missouri with the advice and consent of the Missouri Senate. As dictated by State statute, and proscribed in its by-laws, the officers of the board of regents are president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer. The University president and the board of regents work closely and collaboratively on procedures and tasks.

4P3.2 Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board

On June 26, 2017, the board of regents adopted official by-laws to govern the board and to assist them in effectively discharging their duties and responsibilities. The by-laws were the product of a board subcommittee, appointed by the board president. This subcommittee solicited feedback from fellow regents and reviewed governance materials from other universities. The result was a document addressing items such as: officer elections and length of officer terms; succession planning; the role of members; communications; board interactions with campus personnel; conflicts of interest; and working as a collective body. Prior to the adoption of these by-laws, the board of regents had no official policies or procedures that governed their work.

4P3.3 Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administration and academic matters to faculty

Missouri statute Chapter 174 outlines five statutory powers granted to the board of regents. Those powers include the ability to sue and be sued; complain and defend in all courts; take, purchase, and hold real estate, and sell and convey or otherwise dispose of the same; condemn and appropriate real estate or other property; and make and use a common seal and to alter the same. Southeast's board of regents by-laws outline additional powers, such as, but not limited to: periodically review and adopt the mission and strategic plan of the University; approve new academic programs; adopt by-laws, rules, and regulations concerning board governance; and approve the annual budget and tuition and fee schedules. The responsibility of the student regent is to attend and participate in the deliberation of all meetings; to be well-informed of matters concerning the University; and to maintain regular formal and informal contact with Student Government and other student organizations to facilitate dialogue and seek student feedback, comment, concern, and suggestions that can then be shared with the board as a whole.

Day-to-day University operations are overseen by the president, in conjunction with the executive staff. Article III, Section 3.7 of the board by-laws outlines a list of powers delegated to the University president. Such matters include, but are not limited to, general superintendence of the institution; hiring decisions and employment/academic appointments; oversight and compliance of National Collegiate Athletic Association matters; accreditation issues; and other management responsibilities. Other groups have critical roles in the execution of University affairs.

Example 1: Academic Council, which reviews academic programs, suggests planning actions, and advises the provost of proposed changes in academic programs;

Example 2: Budget Review Committee, which leads the yearly process to assist in the allocation of resources to support the University's mission, vision, and general needs; and

Example 3: Faculty Senate, which serves as the official representative body of the faculty at Southeast.

4P3.4 Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments

Priority III, Objective III of the strategic plan states that the University will nurture a campus culture that promotes open communication, shared governance, and active collaboration to continue to build trust and mutual respect among faculty, administrators, staff, students, and the public. The University's organizational chart details its administrative structure. Communication moves formally and informally both upwards, downwards, and sideways through the organization. Formal communication happens at departmental, divisional, and unit meetings, Chairpersons Forum, college councils, Council of Deans, Clerical Technical Services Staff Council, Professional Staff Council, Faculty Senate, and Administrative Council. University and Faculty Senate standing committees such as Academic Advising Council, AQIP Steering Committee, Athletics, Budget Review, Compensation, Promotion and Tenure are formal communication conduits.

Communication happens through multiple paths as well, including newletters, routine correspondence, faculty and staff serving on committees outside of their departments and units, campus educational and informational forums, and social gatherings. For example, in fall 2017, the Provost's Office started a newsletter called Academic Hall Connection, which features faculty activities, provides information on professional development opportunities, communicates upcoming events and dates of interest, and presents articles about issues facing the University and the national higher education community. Other examples include the University president's blog, the president's Dear Colleague Letters, the Newswire (online employee newsletter), and monthly radio and television interviews with the University president to discuss issues and events at Southeast and in higher education as a whole.

4P3.5 Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards

Priority I of the Strategic Plan states, "Southeast prepares students by providing comprehensive and diverse experiences including experiential and service learning opportunities, cutting-edge technology, and exceptional instruction that prepares students for civic responsibility and professional careers or advanced graduate education." The plan outlines five objectives to accomplish this. Objective I speaks to continuous evaluation of undergraduate and graduate programs (see 1P3). Additionally, the institution strives to maintain and deliver innovative and relevant academic programs to respond to student demand and industry need. The growth of the undergraduate cybersecurity program has resulted in enrollment exceeding 150 students and the creation of a new Master of Science in Cybersecurity. In spring 2015, the institution launched eight new health related programs, currently enrolling nearly 160 students.

Objective II demonstrates the institution's commitment to accreditation. Academic departments seek accreditation or certification when available and appropriate. Southeast has 34 program-specific accreditations and certifications.

Experiential learning opportunities are the focus of Objective III. Example include Catapult Creative House, the Rust Center for Media, the Center for Speech and Hearing, and the University's partnership with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Objective IV seeks to enhance globalization through expanding study-abroad experiences, engaging international students, and encouraging students on campus and abroad to explore cultural interaction. In spring 2016, the University joined the American Council on Education Internationalization Laboratory Program with the goal of developing a strategic plan to guide

Southeast's international education efforts. At the September 22, 2017, board of regents meeting, a campus International Village was established. The village will collocate international student support to enhance the profile and resources of Southeast's international initiatives.

Objective V calls for the evaluation and enhancement of degree completion through flexible course offerings, program-to-program articulation agreements, inter-institutional programs, competency-based credits, and prior learning assessments. Southeast maintains program specific articulation agreements and transfer guides with five community colleges in Missouri.

In spring 2017, Southeast established the Transfer Mentor Program (see 2P1). In addition, Southeast currently maintains articulation agreements with eleven non-Missouri community colleges. Southeast Online has been offering courses and full undergraduate and graduate degrees completely online for over ten years. Since 2014, Southeast has collaborated with eight employers to design programs that make online education more affordable and accessible for their employees.

4P3.6 Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders

Priority III of the strategic plan serves as the means by which the University strives to provide effective leadership to all of its stakeholders. Currently Southeast employs nearly 1,150 regular faculty and staff. Objective I encourages the continued recruitment of high quality faculty and staff. University search committees are as diverse in gender and ethnicity as possible (see 3P1).

Objective II focuses on fostering faculty and staff innovation and research by providing opportunities for research that will bring recognition to the University and contribute to academic disciplines. The Office of Research and Grant Development supports faculty and staff in their research, creative, service, and other scholarly activity through funding opportunity searches; proposal development, review, approval, and submission; compliance; award negotiation; and non-financial post award activity.

Objective III, central to providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders, is the nurturing of a campus culture that promotes open communication, shared governance, and active collaboration, and that builds trust and mutual respect among faculty, administrators, staff, students, and the public. An example of this is the strategic planning process, in which every stakeholder—both internal and external—has the opportunity to offer input as the plan is developed.

Objective IV is the cultivation of innovative strategies to recognize and reward faculty and staff for activities and services that enhance and expand the student experience (see 3P2).

4P3.7 Developing leaders at all levels within the institution

At Southeast, there are two tiers to leadership development and succession planning: (1) the identification and continuous training of "backup" personnel; and (2) the identification, mentoring, and training of new talent who have the skills and interest to pursue leadership roles. Chairpersons Forum comprises academic departments leaders. Senior chairpersons mentor new department chairpersons. Deans, supervisors, and administrators mentor staff in leadership roles in the colleges, divisions, and units. Mentorship includes regular meetings where deliberate conversations occur and informal discussions as events are unfolding. Employees are encouraged to participate in professional conferences, workshops, and training opportunities (see 3P3).

Faculty receive regular professional development funds managed by the departments and colleges for involvement and leadership in professional organizations. Professional and support staff professional development is funded at the unit level (see 3P3).

Financial support, coupled with approved work leave, creates opportunities for personnel to participate in and lead state, regional, and national conferences and discipline associations and attend conferences such as, the ACE Leadership Academy for Department Chairpersons and Becoming a Provost.

4P3.8 Ensuring the institution's ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision

In alignment with the strategic plan, Southeast developed a number of departmental and internal guidelines, including the Athletics Strategic Plan, the Strategic Enrollment and Management Plan, and the Information Technology Committee Strategic Plan. The Budget Review Committee requires all funding requests "identify the relationship of the request to the University's strategic plan." The application for the University's Funding for Results grants require faculty proposers include "the project's relationship to the unit's or University's strategic plan/priorities or current initiatives." All new academic programs must certify to State higher education agencies that the proposed program is within the University's approved mission.

4P3.9 Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

Southeast utilizes a number of tools to track outcomes, including but not limited to, faculty annual reviews and promotion and tenure processes, annual staff performance evaluations, chairpersons and deans reviews, the Great Colleges Survey–Chronicle Survey, and the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey (see 3P1, 3P2, and 3P3).

In alignment with the *Faculty Handbook*, teaching, scholarly, professional, and service activities of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, department chairpersons, and deans are evaluated regularly and the steps for initiating an extraordinary review is provided. In summer 2018, Human Resources collaborated with Clerical, Technical and Service Staff Council and Professional Staff Council to review Southeast's existing evaluation tools, to determine the timeline, and to create new evaluation forms (see 3P2).

4R3: Results

1. The 2014 President's Task Force on Diversity Education released its final Diversity Task Force Report and Recommendations in spring 2016. Each year, results are communicated from the assistant to the president for equity and diversity via updates to the University community.
2. The HERI Faculty Survey serves as a resource for Southeast to measure issues impacting faculty, including how faculty perceive institutional priorities, how faculty spend their time inside and outside the classroom, and the major sources of stress and satisfaction. After reviewing data from the 2016/2017 HERI survey compared to the 2014 survey, it is clear that Southeast faculty continue to demonstrate a commitment to continuous improvement in their engagement in teaching, research, and service for student success.
3. The 2016/2017 iteration of the HERI Faculty Survey showed improvements in the means across seven of the eleven value constructs measured in both years, including large increases in the areas of student-centered pedagogy, personal development of undergraduate students, civic minded values, and commitment to diversity. The increased value on the personal development of undergraduate students as a central goal of the institution places Southeast more in-line with comparison institutions, whereas the 2014 results showed Southeast significantly lower

compared to peers on this construct. Similarly, the institution's measure on the commitment to diversity construct was significantly below that of peers in 2014, but was found to be not significantly different in 2016/2017 with the increased mean.

4. Southeast faculty have continued to focus on improvements in pedagogy and enhancing the student experience. In 2016/2017 there was a 4 percent increase in the proportion of faculty who indicated they had participated in organized activities around enhancing pedagogy and student learning. There has also been an increase in the percentage of full-time undergraduate faculty who feel that research is essential or very important, as well as an increase in the percentage who have engaged in academic research spanning multiple disciplines. There have also been significant increases since 2014 in faculty advising students groups that are involved in service or volunteer work, and engaging undergraduates on research projects.
5. Job satisfaction is one area of potential concern. The two constructs focused on job satisfaction are job satisfaction in the workplace and job satisfaction with compensation. The means on both constructs dropped between 2014 and 2016/2017. Perhaps more importantly, the means on both constructs were found to be significantly below that of the comparison groups in 2016/2017, while they were not significantly different in 2014. Southeast has created task forces focused on employee satisfaction and retaining talent at the institution.

4R3: Improvement

1. While the University will continue to maintain appropriate levels of relationships between University leaders and members of its board of regents, requests will be made that board appointments occurring in the years ahead reflect the demographics of the University's student body. Data from fall 2017's enrollment shows that Southeast's student population is 58 percent female, and the multicultural population is 13 percent. As of September 2018, the current membership of the board includes only two females (28 percent) and only one multicultural representative. University leaders will continue working with Missouri's governor on improving these ratios.
2. Southeast must ensure the University is a place where everyone feels welcomed, respected, and appreciated. While the University has made progress towards the recommendations included in the President's Task Force on Diversity Education report, there is still more to do. Currently, the combined domestic (excluding international) minority percentages for employees is less than 15 percent and for students it's 12 percent. Planning and action must continue so that faculty, staff, and administration reflect the student body demographics. A potential extension of the President's Task Force on Diversity Education may be the implementation of a Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan.
3. During the 2017/2018 academic year, the University administered the Great Colleges to Work For survey. Preliminary data indicates that conversations concerning faculty and staff morale and shared governance may be warranted. University administration will work with Faculty Senate and other employee groups to fully analyze the data and to implement strategies to improve any real or perceived areas of concern.

Sources

- C.4.1_Fall 2017 Ethnicity Report
- C.4.3_2014 HERI Faculty survey results
- C.4.3_2014 Strategic Plan
- C.4.3_2016-2017 HERI Faculty survey results
- C.4.3_Academic Council

- C.4.3_Academic Hall Connection
- C.4.3_Accreditations
- C.4.3_ACE Internationalization Lab
- C.4.3_BOR By Laws
- C.4.3_BOR Officers
- C.4.3_BOR Statutory Powers
- C.4.3_BOR Student Rep
- C.4.3_Catapult 2015
- C.4.3_Center for Speech and Hearing
- C.4.3_CSIS
- C.4.3_CTS Institution Incentive
- C.4.3_Diversity Task Force Report
- C.4.3_HR Evaluation Forms
- C.4.3_HR evaluation timeline
- C.4.3_HR Recruitment Plan template
- C.4.3_Newswire
- C.4.3_Org Chart
- C.4.3_President Blog
- C.4.3_Research and Grants
- C.4.3_Rust Center for Media
- C.4.3_September 2017 BOR Intl Village
- C.4.3_Shout Out Application
- C.4.3_Shout Out News Release
- C.4.3_Shout Out Recipients
- C.4.3_Spring 2015 Health Programs
- C.4.3_Transfer Mentor

4.4 - Integrity

Integrity focuses on how the institution ensures legal and ethical behavior and fulfills its societal responsibilities. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.A. and 2.B. in this section.

4P4: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for developing and communicating legal and ethical standards and monitoring behavior to ensure standards are met. In addition, identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Developing and communicating standards
- Training employees and modeling for ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution
- Operating financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty and staff (2.A.)
- Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents (2.B.)

4R4: RESULTS

What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

4I4: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 4R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

4P4: Processes

4P4.1 Developing and communicating standards

The *Faculty Handbook* serves as the primary resource for communicating policies, standards, processes, and procedures to faculty. The Faculty Senate Documents Committee periodically reviews the *Faculty Handbook* content to ensure consistency with current University policy and practice. If the committee identifies a potential change, revision, or update to the Handbook, and the Faculty Senate approves, the final step for the update is presentation to the board of regents for their action.

For staff and operations at Southeast Missouri State University the *Business Policy and Procedures Manual* serves to communicate the institution's expected standards, policies, and procedures. The *Business Policy and Procedures Manual* is reviewed periodically and revisions are recommended to the board of regents as appropriate.

The Code of Student Conduct and *Responsible Redhawks* Guide serve to communicate expected policies, standards, processes, and procedures to students. The Office of Student Conduct administers the Statement of Student Rights and Code of Student Conduct, which outlines the rights and responsibilities of the student body at Southeast. Like the others, the Code of Student Conduct is reviewed regularly and updated as necessary. Revisions are cataloged on the final page of the Code.

The board of regents by-laws serve to communicate expected standards, processes, policies, and procedures to board members (see 4P3.2).

4P4.2 Training employees and modeling for ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution

Processes for ensuring the ethical practices of faculty and staff are defined in Human Resource documents, the *Faculty Handbook*, and the *Business Policy and Procedures Manual*. The Student Code of Conduct outlines students' rights and responsibilities.

All new employees undergo a criminal background check. The Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity offers sexual harassment prevention training, which is compulsory for all employees. The Office also as oversees the development and dissemination of institutional education materials and training programs that inform University community members of their rights and responsibilities related to equal opportunity, affirmative action, discrimination, and related topics. Any employee who feels that they have been discriminated against on the basis of race, color, gender, national origin, marital status, disability, or veteran status, or feels that they may have been sexually harassed, may arrange for a private and confidential meeting with the either assistant to the president for equity and diversity or the director of human resources.

In September 2018, the University hosted "Integrity Week." Integrity Week is designed to support a shared understanding of integrity and to enhance the ways the University community demonstrates ethical practice (see 1P5).

Additionally, Southeast has guidelines, an Office of Research and Grant Development, and committees that provide effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by faculty, staff, and students (see 1P5).

Students at Southeast are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources several times during their University experience. Entering students take UI100, which serves as the introduction to Southeast's University Studies Program. A primary focus of the course is placed on the ability to locate and gather information, which includes guidance in the ethical use of information resources.

4P4.3 Operating financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board,

administration, faculty, and staff

In addition to the policies and practices described in the preceding section, the institution also replies on support from executive staff members, human resources, legal counsel, and other University personnel to ensure the financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions are operated with integrity and in a fair and ethical way and comply with state and federal laws.

The board of regents' by-laws state that board members are expected to adhere to high standards of ethical conduct and to comply fully with laws relating to conduct of public officials and boards. In addition, all voting members of the board are required by law to file an annual financial disclosure statement as mandated by the Missouri Ethics Commission. The University as a whole—including board of regents meetings, notices, and materials—must comply with the Missouri Sunshine Law.

4P4.4 Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents

FirstSTEP orientation events assist students in understanding the mission of Southeast and the institution's expectations of students. Incoming students and their parents are given information about academic policies, procedures, requirements, and programs. The University's online portal is used to relay information to all members of the University community. The Newswire (online newsletter) and the Arrow (student newspaper) are also conduits for information sharing.

Information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships is readily and clearly available to all constituents through online webpages and resources. Relevant materials are available on webpages dedicated to institutional accreditation and certification; institutional facts; university affordability and costs; consumer information; departmental academic programs; academic degree maps; and others.

4R4: Results

1. The University board of regents adopted a tobacco free campus policy in February 2017. The policy was the result of campus feedback, which included a student survey conducted collected in fall 2016. The survey was sent to all Southeast students, remained open for three days and received 689 responses.
2. Students, faculty, and staff participated in the fall 2018 "Integrity Week" events such as a lecture on fake news, a "How to Avoid Plagiarism" seminar, a painting party for visual representations of personal integrity, and job search honesty. All events were free and open to everyone.
3. The University must comply with the Missouri Sunshine Law as described in 4P4.3. Pursuant to law, all requests, receive an initial reply within three business days. In calendar year 2017, the University responded to over 50 requests from 48 entities. From January 1 to November 27, 2018, the instituion has processed more than 45 requests from 41 entities.
4. Since submission of the June 1, 2014 Systems Portfolio, Southeast has hosted 51 FirstSTEP orientation events. These events have been attended by 7602 students, and 11,209 guests.

4I4: Improvement

1. On December 15, 2017, the board of regents charged University administration to review all areas and documents across the University that contain policy in order to move toward creating a single policy register. The board shared a belief that the many existing documents set-up

conflicts and inconsistencies, necessitating one site where all institutional policies could reside. The policy review and appropriate action has begun and will likely continue over the next 1 to 3 years.

2. Although 2018 was the first year for Integrity Week, it is expected to become a regular campus event.

Sources

- C.4.4_Academic Honesty Policy
- C.4.4_Campus Input Tobacco Free
- C.4.4_Conflict of Interest
- C.4.4_December 2017 BOR Faculty Senate Action
- C.4.4_Equity and Diversity Training
- C.4.4_Faculty Ethics
- C.4.4_February 2017 BOR Action
- C.4.4_Financial Disclosure
- C.4.4_First Step Orientation
- C.4.4_Integrity Week committee
- C.4.4_Integrity Week events
- C.4.4_MO Sunshine Law
- C.4.4_Policy Research Involving Human Subjects
- C.4.4_Policy Scientific Misconduct
- C.4.4_Responsible Redhawks Guide
- C.4.4_SE Faculty Senate Documents Committee
- C.4.4_Student Code of Conduct
- C.4.4_Student Code of Conduct Revisions History

5 - Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship

5.1 - Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management focuses on how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution.

5P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for knowledge management, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement and decision making
- Determining data, information and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively
- Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements
- Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)

5R1: RESULTS

What are the results for determining how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

5I1: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P1: Processes

5P1.1 Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement and decision making

Southeast uses standing committees to provide governance, guide planning activities, and provide recommendations to division executives. Additionally, the University utilizes task force groups as short-term, problem-solving, planning, and implementation teams.

Example 1: During fall 2018, the vice president for enrollment management and student success convened the Subcommittee for Business Process Improvement to identify concerns or obstacles for students related to retention and completion, and to provide recommendations toward planning, process improvement, and decision making. Subcommittee members selected and provided data for each concern or obstacle that was identified and presented these to the other members to review for insights and ideas. The University Task Force for Student Success also shared a list of opportunities for the subcommittee to review.

Example 2: The Budget Review Committee is a standing committee composed of 28 campus-wide representatives. As chair of this committee, the vice president for finance and administration compiles data and financial reports to support the committee members in analyzing and producing budgeting recommendations for the president. Output from this committee is shared in a number of ways with key stakeholders. For example, budget worksheets are provided to the campus community through communication from committee members to their constituents.

Example 3: The Faculty Advisory Committee for Program Review is composed of eight faculty representatives and chaired by the associate provost. This committee oversees the program review process (see 1P3), which elicits data and other input from academic departments to provide recommendations to the provost and president. The first step in the process involves the academic department chairperson and the Institutional Research Office working together to identify relevant key performance indicators and other sources of data.

5P1.2 Determining data, information and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively

The processes for determining data, information, and performance results are influenced by two key factors: 1) internal processes that are carried out by unit and department leaders to decide which data, information, and performance results are relevant; and 2) external processes that are carried out at the state level to inform public institutions which data, information, and performance results are relevant and, in some cases, required.

Internal processes

Although there is no standardized process in place, unit and department leaders generally follow these steps: 1) identification of data needed through discussion and reflection within a unit, department, or team; 2) request by the unit, department, or team for data and information from Institutional Research (IR), Information Technology (IT), or other source; and 3) iterative discussion and reflection on these data and information to assess whether they meet the needs of the department, unit, or team.

Example 1: The University's Strategic Enrollment Committee meets quarterly to review student enrollment and retention goals and progress. The committee identifies the data it needs prior to each meeting, makes a request to IR to provide the data reports (e.g., enrollment trends, enrollment projections for specific populations), and then discusses these data at the meeting for planning purposes (see example of data report). If, during the meeting, a need for additional data arises, the process repeats.

Example 2: The University's Scholarship Committee is responsible for overseeing Southeast's comprehensive merit scholarship program for beginning freshmen and new transfer students. The committee meets regularly to review scholarship metrics such as yield, renewal rates, retention with and without scholarships, and budgeted versus actual awards. Data needs are determined by the chairperson prior to each meeting, and relevant data reports are requested from and provided by IR and the Budget Office. The data reports are discussed by the committee during each meeting (see meeting notes example). These discussions can lead to additional data being requested.

External processes

These processes include state-level reporting of performance funding measures (see 5P2.3), reporting requirements of accrediting bodies (see 1P4), and quality standards for institutional accreditation provided by the Higher Learning Commission.

Example 1: Faculty in educator preparation certification programs evaluate their programs annually using an internally developed process called the Annual Program Evaluation (APE). The APE requires evaluation of standards defined by the state for teachers, school counselors, school administrators, and district administrators. Data used to conduct this evaluation are, for the most part, generated by assessment instruments mandated by the state and included in an overall Annual Performance Report for Educator Preparation Programs. These instruments include certification exams, employer and completer surveys, and performance evaluations.

Example 2: Since 2014, the state of Missouri has used a performance funding model. Performance metrics are determined by the Missouri Coordinating Board of Higher Education. Institutionally, the corresponding data is collected by IR and provided to executive staff and the Budget Review Committee for review (see Meeting Schedule and Agenda for examples). The final report is submitted to the state by IR each November.

5P1.3 Making data, information and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements

Banner ERP is the University's primary platform from which to access data. Employees are provided access to Banner based on their respective roles within the University. Initial Banner navigation training is required of all users before access is granted. Specific training is provided depending on the type of access required by the role (see Training Request Form and Banner training and access information).

In addition to Banner, Southeast uses several commercial applications such as BossCars, BossCops, Recruit, TMA, Degreeworks, the Banner Document Management System, ISSM, RMS, and Starfish. Each of these systems support specific campus operations, provide information management and access, and enhance operational effectiveness.

Units and departments access data from these platforms in different ways. Since Banner's inception, IT has worked with functional areas to develop over 300 database applications to support their data needs. These applications access the data warehouse, which stores data in over 500 different tables.

Example 1: Budget data, data related to unit- and department-level expenditure, and course scheduling data can be accessed from the Banner through the INB/Admin Pages (see entry point and landing page example) or through Self-Service on the employee portal (see entry point and landing page example). When there is a need for a new project or report, requesters can complete a ticket using Web Help Desk. IT evaluates and prioritizes requests based on scope of impact and degree of impact. In addition, priority is given to compliance requirements. Often, the process for accessing data from Banner involves administrative assistants, who are trained to use the Banner tools to carry out routine and requested queries for budget monitoring and class scheduling monitoring (see Newswire announcement and training timetable).

Example 2: The Budget Office provides custom financial information to units and departments. This process involves a unit or department leader making a request by email or telephone to the budget director. The budget director, using data from Banner, provides the requested report by email to the requester. Examples include financial analyses of restructuring scenarios (see example) and financial feasibility reports (Example 1 and Example 2) for new initiatives.

Example 3: Units and departments can use an online form to request data from IR. Custom data reports are usually provided to the requester within two weeks. These data are considered the official institutional data. Often the data are pulled directly from the Banner platform (see example 1 and example 2 of data requests).

Example 4: IR provides data dashboards on the employee portal, which can be accessed by any employee. The dashboards are available through the PowerBI platform, which draws data from multiple sources with Banner and represents data as visualizations and filterable tables. Dashboards represent data related to student enrollment, retention, and completion. See dashboard processes here.

Example 5: IR provides standard data and information on their webpages, including University Enrollment Reports, the annual Fact Book, IPEDS data, and survey data. Other data are provided by this office but are featured on other webpages. For example, the Provost's webpages include key performance indicators (KPIs) for each academic department. The process for making KPIs available to users is documented here.

Example 6: The Office of the Registrar provides data from Banner related to student records and course offerings both on a routine basis and on-demand. One example of routine information provided by this office is the Deans' List, issued to academic colleges each fall and spring semester. One example of an on-demand request for information is a list of students enrolled in a course.

Example 7: The Office of Admissions provides weekly reporting of admitted and enrolled students, which includes comparison data from previous years. The process for making these data reports available involves the Admissions personnel, who draw data from the Ellucian Recruit ERP platform, as well as from Banner and update the reports each week. These reports are sent by email to relevant unit leaders (see example 1; example 2; and example 3).

5P1.4 Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes

Generally speaking, the Office of Information Technology (IT) oversees these processes. However, each Banner module has a functional system administrator and a technical support provider.

Since implementing Banner ERP in 2005, the University has maintained a Banner Management Committee (BMC) composed of the functional system administrators, technical support staff, and a group of power end users who support each Banner module. The committee is chaired by the director of application services and meets twice a month to establish standard data entry rules, review and coordinate calendars for implementing releases and upgrades, and helps to ensure the integrity of the system by discussing any known issues.

The BMC will periodically need to escalate issues or decisions to executive staff through the assistant vice president for IT. These issues typically focus on purchasing decisions which impact long term investments such as the procurement of Ethos/Analytics for data integration and reporting. Occasionally executive staff are asked to advise on procedures which might impact areas outside of Business Services, such as the decision to send text alerts to faculty, staff, and students when personal identifiable information has changed.

IT personnel run system backups daily and storage tapes are moved weekly to another location on campus. These staff also manage various firewalls and security protocols. In October 2017, the University implemented an Information Security Team charged with reviewing IT security policy and procedures, implementing and maintaining a comprehensive IT Security Plan, and making recommendations to executive staff on security planning for campus. In March 2018, the University hired its first information security officer who will chair this team.

Southeast Missouri State University Business Policy 10-7, Information Technology Password Management, outlines the requirements for complex passwords to access campus resources.

Section 10 of *Business Policies and Procedures* lists12 IT policies. These policies were approved by the board of regents in September 2017 and September 2018.

5P1.5 Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)

Example 1: The IT Help Desk provides tools to monitor different data and support requests from across campus. Requests include technology support, requests for data, and telecommunications and programming support. The system helps monitor open and pending tickets by assigned staff and to reassign tickets when appropriate. The ticketing system shows the number or requests over the year for data reports and new programming services. The Asset Management feature helps monitor the age of University equipment such as the following report that show what has been upgraded in classrooms this year (see description of tool and screenshots of tracking features).

Example 2: Educator Preparation Programs (EPP) developed the Redhawk field placement system to collect, analyze, and disseminate data related to field placements. University supervisors can use Redhawk to facilitate formative assessments and initiate improvement plans. The Redhawk system allow users to view and export information and results.

5R1: Results

1. Through the process of reviewing data and discussing anecdotal concerns, the Subcommittee for Business Process Improvement produced a draft list of 30 "process concerns/obstacles/roadblocks" in August 2018. The list describes the problem and outlines a recommendation for each item. Project leads carry out this work and report back to the subcommittee.
2. As a result of the work of the Budget Review Committee, operating and auxiliary budgets are prepared and submitted to the board of regents for approval each year (see 5P2).
3. As a result of the program review process, all academic programs use data provided by IR to produce reports on a five-year cycle (see 1P3).
4. As result of the Strategic Enrollment Committee's work to review data, an annual Strategic Enrollment Plan is produced (see 2P1).
5. As a result of the work carried out by the Scholarship Committee to research and review data as actionable insight, the University has launched a new scholarship program for 2019-2020. This new program provides competitive aid to more students and streamlines the scholarship application, approval, and renewal processes. For example, scholarship program renewal criteria were modified to match initial eligibility criteria after the data indicated that renewal rates were low due to higher GPA requirements at renewal than initial application.

5I1: Improvement

1. The University is currently implementing Ellucian Ethos and Analytics, with a focus on student and Ellucian Recruit data modules. Once complete, the combination of tools should make it easier for decision makers in Enrollment Management and Admissions to consume and analyze data to improve areas like admissions yield and scholarship offers.
2. Currently, IT is working to implement an automated workflow solution, Frevvo, to address the business processes identified by the Business Process Improvement Subcommittee.
3. The University is actively moving toward an upgrade to Banner 9. Training will be provided to support Banner users.
4. Once fully implemented, the University's SupportNET platform for supporting student retention and success, will provide rich data to users and to the institution. As part of the implementation, the University is currently installing the Starfish Analytics component, which will be available to all SupportNET users in fall 2019 (see Category 2 for more on SupportNET).

Sources

- C.5.1_2018 Scholarship Meeting PPT
- C.5.1_Administrative Assistant Training Timetable
- C.5.1_Admissions report for new first time students example
- C.5.1_Admissions report for undergraduate transfer students example
- C.5.1_Admissions reports for online students by college_department example
- C.5.1_AY16 APR-EPP
- C.5.1_Banner Management Committee Charge and Membership 2018-2019
- C.5.1_Banner Student Training Newswire Annoucement
- C.5.1_Banner training and access information
- C.5.1_Board-9-22-17_Open_Session document 1
- C.5.1_board-regents-materials-9-21-18 doc 2
- C.5.1_BPI Items List

- C.5.1_BRC Agenda showing PFM discussion 01-27-2017
- C.5.1_BRC Meeting Schedule 2016-2017 showing topics of discussion
- C.5.1_BRCWorksheetsFY19
- C.5.1_Competitor Scholarship Programs 2018-19
- C.5.1_DHE-PIS 2018_SEMO
- C.5.1_Entry point to access INB_Admin pages for Banner
- C.5.1_Example 2 of financial analysis for feasibility of new initiative
- C.5.1_Example of Ad Hoc Data Request from Registrar
- C.5.1_Example of data provided to SEM_NSSE Results_SEM_11272018
- C.5.1_Example of financial analysis for feasibility of new initiative
- C.5.1_Example of financial analysis for restructuring scenario
- C.5.1_Faculty Advisory Committee for Program Review 2018-2019
- C.5.1_FinAdm_10-07_Policy on password management
- C.5.1_FY18 Projected vs Actual Cost of Scholarships
- C.5.1_FY18 Univ and Auxillary Operating Budget
- C.5.1_FY19 SEM Scholarship Subcommittee Membership Charge Agenda
- C.5.1_FY19 University and Auxiliary Operating Budgets
- C.5.1_FY20 Budget Review Charge and Membership Effective 11-2018
- C.5.1_Guidelines for 2018 Ed Prep Annual Program Evaluation
- C.5.1_Help desk tracking
- C.5.1_INB_Admin page screenshot
- C.5.1_IR_Request Form
- C.5.1_IT Security Team Description
- C.5.1_MDHE Performance Funding Memo 2018
- C.5.1_Program Review flowchart
- C.5.1_Proposed FY17 Operating_Aux Budget
- C.5.1_Redacted example of routine reporting from Registrar_deans list
- C.5.1_Redhawk landing page
- C.5.1_Request for IR data 408
- C.5.1_Request for IR data 409
- C.5.1_Scholarship Subcommittee Meeting Notes 5 2 2018
- C.5.1_Scholarships-Flyer-2019-2020
- C.5.1_Screenshot of budget access point 1 via portal
- C.5.1_Screenshot of budget access via self-service
- C.5.1_Screenshot of employee portal showing location of data dashboards
- C.5.1_Screenshot of Section 10 of the Business Policy Manual
- C.5.1_Screenshot showing web ticketing system for project or report
- C.5.1_SEM Committee Charge AY19
- C.5.1_SEM_BPI Charge FY19
- C.5.1_SEMO_IR_Website Menu
- C.5.1_SEMO_KPIs
- C.5.1_SEMO_KPIs_Provost
- C.5.1_Southeast Dashboards and KPI Processes
- C.5.1_Technical support providers for various Banner modules
- C.5.1_WklyCompDistribGrps_11.27.18
- C.5.2_Banner Training Request Form

5.2 - Resource Management

Resource Management focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P2: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for managing resources, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations (5.A.1)
- Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs (5.A.3)
- Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected (5.A.2)
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

5R2: RESULTS

What are the results for resource management? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

5I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P2: Processes

5P2.1 Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations

Examples of processes to maintain fiscal infrastructure:

Fiscally, the University works to ensure that it has the financial resources available to obtain the capital needed to maintain its operations and technological and physical infrastructures. One process used to achieve this is the monthly review of the University’s cash flow position. The vice president for finance and administration meets with the controller to review cash flow and projected changes to the University's cash position. This process allows Southeast to invest additional funds as available while maintaining satisfactory levels of cash on hand. The review also includes an analysis of investments nearing their maturity date to be released and possibly invested in new opportunities.

In addition to reviewing its cash flow, the University continually monitors its fund balance. Southeast maintains an undesignated fund balance that is approximately 10% of its general operating budget as a "rainy-day" fund. One of the ways that Southeast ensures this contingency is position control. The Budget Office is responsible for monitoring every position on campus and tracking salary savings due to vacancies and new hires at lower rates than predecessors. At times, actions can be taken to preserve the contingency fund. For example, the president, in consultation with executive staff, can institute a mandatory hiring delay to provide fiscal resources.

The University also regularly reviews its investment strategies and bond ratings to ensure its likelihood of obtaining the fiscal capital needed to maintain operations infrastructures.The Controller's Office is responsible for all bank reconciliations and bank fraud checking. The Foundation Finance & Audit Committee manages the investments and safeguards the Foundation funds that support the University's mission.

Examples of processes to maintain physical infrastructure:

Facilities Management (FM) is responsible for maintaining the University's physical infrastructures. The FM team consists of custodial technicians, general maintenance technicians, plumbers, electricians, HVAC technicians, boiler plant technicians, and carpenters. The TMA work order management system is used across campus to manage general maintenance requests from faculty, staff, and students for work at any time through FM an webpage. Work orders are reviewed and prioritized based on available resources and the nature of the request. Priority is placed on maintenance items that deal with life safety, building air quality and conditions, and threats to structural integrity.

Once work orders have been evaluated and prioritized, they are allocated to and scheduled by the appropriate teams. Funding is provided by the state, institution, and in some cases, by auxiliary unit funds to maintain the campus. Therefore, general maintenance work orders are not charged to the respective units or departments. However, departmental requests for non-routine maintenance may be chargeable for parts and labor. FM's charge policy, along with the processes used to request academic and administrative remodeling projects, are available on the FM webpages. Due to the cost and or scope of some deferred maintenance work orders (i.e., the repair will cost more than $50,000 or require more labor or expertise than what is available), a work order may become a capital project and be procured through a formal bid process.

Preventive maintenance (PM) work is established based on the equipment requirements, the particular trade involved, and the maintenance schedule prescribed by the equipment manufacturer. PM work orders are reviewed by supervisors using a data dashboard to ensure that FM is not missing more than one preventative maintenance cycle per item.

The director of FM—in consultation with the vice president of finance and administration and the president—outlines the University's highest priority capital needs for campus-wide major renovation and maintenance and repair projects. A detailed statement of both the

University's capital appropriation needs for each fiscal year and its long-range plan requests is submitted annually to the Missouri Department of Higher Education. The director of FM and vice president of finance and administration prepare an annual funding plan for major capital projects and present it to the president for approval. The plan includes projects from all funding sources including general operating, auxiliary funds, bond funds, and state/local funds. A progress report on major capital projects is presented to the board of regents at each meeting.

Examples of processes to maintain technological infrastructure:

The Office of Information Technology (IT) is responsible for maintaining the technological infrastructure of the University (see 5P3.3).

IT regularly reviews the life cycle of the institution's technological infrastructure. Separate budgets are in place to support technology upgrades based on end-of-life, new technologies available, and financial resources. This process involves collaboration with functional end users, functional committees, executive staff, and vendor partners. The following technology solutions have been implemented since 2016: cloud-based Office 365 that provides additional email storage as well as offsite access to files in a secure environment; cloud-based Starfish as the University's retention software solution (i.e. SupportNET); and Skillsoft as the University's training platform.

IT employs virtualization technology, different levels of redundancy, system updates, network management (firewall controls), along with backup processes to protect and ensure system availability. VCenter virtual environment management solution allows monitoring of the use of system resources in the data center and helps to allocate resources dynamically and recover systems more effectively as needed. IT monitors the campus network through the Aerohive Management solution. In addition, a Netflow server alerts IT when specific campus infrastructure fails to respond (see 5R2).

5P2.2 Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs

Annually, divisions are required to set departmental goals which are closely aligned to the University's mission (Example 1; Example 2; Example 3). Each year divisions are required to submit their accomplishments to division executives, who report these to the president (Example 1; Example 2; Example 3). A selection of divisional achievements is mapped to corresponding institutional strategies and published in the annual State of the University booklet (2016, 2017, 2018).

Additionally, the University has standing committees to set goals that are aligned with the institutional mission, resources, and opportunities.

Example 1: The Budget Review Committee (BRC) consists of a cross-section of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The BRC has a responsibility to balance divisional and institutional budget requests with various revenue enhancements within the mission and goals of the institution.

Example 2: As part of the annual budget process, resources are budgeted for use by the Information Technology Committee (ITC), which has representation from all divisions. The ITC is responsible for collecting requests for funding of technological initiatives and determining how to utilize the resources provided to achieve the most benefit for the University. The committee has a formalized process for gathering IT funding requests from all divisions, facilitated through an electronic request format. The request must describe how the scope of the request aligns with the University's strategic plan. Requests must be approved by the respective division executive before being considered by the committee. The committee ranks each proposal. The total score is used to give an initial priority to the proposals. The committee discusses the rankings to determine a final recommendation. Purchases of equipment for approved projects are coordinated by IT.

Example 3: The BRC includes a Benefits Subcommittee that analyzes resources needed to provide a competitive benefits package to employees. The committee, which includes representation from all employee groups, makes recommendations to the BRC Committee each year (Example 1; Example 2; Example 3). The BRC presents recommendations to the president, and president decides whether to implement these changes.

5P2.3 Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected

Example 1: The University maintains a performance funding metric related to the percentage of total education and general expenditures disbursed on the core mission (instruction, research, and public service). In order to meet this performance measure, the percentage expended on the core mission must increase (based on a 3-year rolling average) or be in the top third of benchmark institutions (as defined by the Missouri Department of Higher Education). The percentage is calculated annually by Institutional Research using IPEDS data. The information is submitted to the MDHE and reviewed by executive leadership.

Example 2: The Information Technology Committee (ITC) is budgeted approximately $170,000 each year to help fund technology innovation across campus. The ITC provides opportunities for innovation through its annual IT Funding Request initiative (see 5P2.2).

Example 3: The Budget Review Committee (BRC) provides a representative voice in the allocation of the University's resources. Tuition, program fees, and other campus wide revenue data are presented to the BRC by the committee chairperson for deliberation. Additionally, departments, through their division executive staff, may bring forward revenue enhancement ideas such as increased graduation fees and orientation fees or requests for additional resources (Example 1; Example 2; Example 3). All ideas are put before the committee in a single worksheet. Through open dialogue and discussion, the committee comes to a majority vote on each item brought before the committee until the budget is fully balanced.

Example 4: Maintenance and Repair budgets are reconciled on a monthly basis. This process allows the institution to have information readily available to make decisions to fund emergency maintenance and repair needs as well as how to plan for known needs in the future (see M&R Schedule).

5R2: Results

1. IT monitors the campus network using the Aerohive Management solution. This tool does live monitoring and generates historic reports on wireless users, wireless clients, wireless bandwidth, and applications used over WiFi (see sample reports).

2. The Everbridge Notification Analysis shows all alerts that have been sent to the campus community. Most of the alerts shown here, for example, were from testing the Emergency Communications Team did early in November. The Everbridge Notification Analysis (see Details) is the report from the winter weather delayed start notification, which was sent out November 15, 2018. The report shows the notice was sent to 23,277 delivery paths. That number is higher than the list of contacts because most contacts have multiple contact methods registered. The third view shows how many records (contacts) are uploaded every night. IT carries out a complete replacement of the contact list daily.
3. The University works to maintain a general fund balance of 10% of the general operating budget. This is tracked annually and shared with the president (see fund balance graph).
4. The Foundation Finance & Audit Committee receives portfolio summary reports quarterly which is used to manage the investments of the Foundation funds that support the University's mission (see Merrill Lynch September 2018 quarterly statement).
5. ITC tracks all funding proposals to ensure appropriate use of the approximately $170,000 which it has to allocate annually (see ITC spreadsheets).
6. IT monitors desktop replacements campus wide and works to maintain a five year replacement cycle (see replacement cycle spreadsheet). IT also monitors classroom and open lab computers to ensure proper replacement cycles (see Asset management screenshot).
7. IT monitors network bandwith for capacity planning and utilization (see NetFlow tool from MOREnet screenshot).
8. VCenter allows us to monitor the use of system resources in our data center and both allocate resources dynamically and recover systems more effectively as needed. IT can live monitor, report, and export historic host summary and performance data as well as receive email/text alerts/alarms (see view 1; view 2).
9. FM utilizes the Web TMA dashboard to monitor open work orders and open preventative maintenance requests for resource allocation (see Open Work Orders; Open Work Orders by Trade; Open PMs dashboard examples).
10. The Budget Office monitors position vacancies and provides summary data to the vice president for business and finance so that salary savings can be used to fund various one time needs and initiatives (see FY17; FY18; FY19 reports).
11. Capital budget needs are summarized and discussed with the board of regents (see June 2017 board minutes).

5I2: Improvement

1. The University is currently implementing Ellucian Ethos/Analytics to support campus data-driven decision making (see 5I1).
2. FM is working to improve department functions with further policies and updating PM schedules and equipment data. Equipment data was collected by an outside contractor in October 2018.
3. Over the past two years, the University has been working with the Lawrence Group to establish a Campus Master Plan. Final recommendations will be presented to the board of regent's at the December 2018 board meeting.
4. The University has recently hired Bernhard TME to assist with creating an Integrated Energy Master Plan. This process is expected to be completed within twelve months.
5. The University is in the beginning stages of creating an IT Master Plan.
6. The University is in the middle of completing a two to three year campus wide network upgrade project.

Sources

- C.5.2_2016 SOU Book
- C.5.2_2017 SOU Book
- C.5.2_2018 SOU Book
- C.5.2_Aerohive monitoring
- C.5.2_Approved FM Org Chart Oct 2018
- C.5.2_August 2018 final CIBR request to MDHE
- C.5.2_Benefits Review Subcommittee_charge and membership
- C.5.2_Benefits Subcommittee Proposal to BRC 2016
- C.5.2_Benefits Subcommittee Proposal to BRC 2017
- C.5.2_Benefits Subcommittee Proposal to BRC_Nov 2017
- C.5.2_Board minutes June 2017
- C.5.2_BRCWorksheet_ThreeYear
- C.5.2_BRCWorksheetsFY19
- C.5.2_Cashflow monitoring and meeting minutes_2018
- C.5.2_Chargeable Work Orders - Southeast Missouri State University
- C.5.2_Computer Replacement Cycle Inventory
- C.5.2_DHE-PIS 2018_SEMO
- C.5.2_Ethos Analytics Landing Page
- C.5.2_Everbridge view 1
- C.5.2_Everbridge view 2
- C.5.2_Everbridge view 3
- C.5.2_Example of division achievements_Advancement
- C.5.2_Example of division achievements_Equity and Diversity
- C.5.2_Example of division achievements_Finance and Administration
- C.5.2_Example of division goals and accomplishments_VPEMSS
- C.5.2_Example of division goals_Advancement
- C.5.2_Example of division goals_Equity and Diversity
- C.5.2_Example of division goals_Finance and Administration
- C.5.2_Example of division request to BRC_Academic Affairs FY17
- C.5.2_Example of division request to BRC_Advancement Advancement FY17
- C.5.2_Example of division request to BRC_Athletics FY17
- C.5.2_Example of division request to BRC_EMSS FY17
- C.5.2_Example of division request to BRC_Finance and Administration FY17
- C.5.2_Example of position monitoring
- C.5.2_Example of unit level goals and accomplishments_EMSS sample
- C.5.2_FM Progress Report to BoR - 12-14-2018
- C.5.2_Formal Bid Process
- C.5.2_Foundation Finance Audit Committee Charge and Membership 2018
- C.5.2_Foundation-Merrill Lynch Pgs
- C.5.2_FY17BRCWorksheet
- C.5.2_FY17SalManSavings
- C.5.2_FY18 M R Reconciliation 7-19-18
- C.5.2_FY18 M R Schedule
- C.5.2_FY18SalManSavings
- C.5.2_FY19 Capital Budget 1-17-18
- C.5.2_FY19SalManSavings
- C.5.2_FY20 Budget Review Charge and Membership Effective 11-2018

- C.5.2_Information Technology Committee 2018-2019
- C.5.2_Inventories for Lab Computer_Asset Managment tool
- C.5.2_IT Funding Request Form
- C.5.2_ITC proposals_last two years
- C.5.2_ITC ranking table
- C.5.2_MDHE Performance Funding Memo 2018
- C.5.2_Netflow tool for MoreNET
- C.5.2_Office 365 landing page
- C.5.2_Open PMs MEP dashboard
- C.5.2_Open work orders by trade dashboard
- C.5.2_Open Work orders dashboard
- C.5.2_Organizational Chart for Information Technology 050818
- C.5.2_PPT slide deck with overview of investment strategies_Sept 2018
- C.5.2_rptPSSSummary_FY17
- C.5.2_rptPSSSummary_FY18
- C.5.2_rptPSSSummary_FY19
- C.5.2_Screenshot of TMA work order system
- C.5.2_Skillsoft Landing Page
- C.5.2_Supervisor dashboard - PM Schedule-Review
- C.5.2_SupportNET (Starfish) Landing Page
- C.5.2_Technology Review Cycle and Monitoring Tool
- C.5.2_Tuition vs. Net Tuition tracking
- C.5.2_Undesignated funds chart
- C.5.2_VCenter Monitoring
- C.5.2_VCenter Monitoring 2

5.3 - Operational Effectiveness

Operational Effectiveness focuses on how an institution ensures effective management of its operations in the present and plans for continuity of operations into the future. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P3: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for operational effectiveness, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals
- Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets (5.A.5)
- Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly
- Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly
- Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness
- Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

5R3: RESULTS

What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

- Summary results of measures (include tables and figures when possible)
- Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks
- Interpretation of results and insights gained

5I3: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 5R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

5P3: Processes

5P3.1 Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals

The Budget Office compiles balanced general operating and auxiliary budgets annually, which are then approved by the president and presented to the board of regents for approval in June for the following fiscal year (FY17; FY18; FY19). Southeast has traditionally followed an incremental-based budget model in which funding allocations remain consistent from year to year at the department level. Units and departments can move budget dollars as necessary between areas or expense categories. One-time funds can be moved by the department through the Banner Finance system. Requests to move base funds can be submitted throughout the year to the division leader, and, upon approval, these requests are forwarded to the Budget Office for inclusion in the next year's budget document. Any requests for additional base dollars must go through the University's established budget review process.

The budget review process is the mechanism used to make any base changes to the prior year's general operating budget. This includes changes to revenue expectations (e.g., state appropriations, tuition, and overhead), personnel expenses (e.g., benefit changes, equity adjustments, and salary increases), and additional expense needs and requests. This is done through a process of annual budget hearings overseen by the University's Budget Review Committee (BRC) (see 5P2).

Requests for additional funding are made an institutional level or a divisional level (see 5P2). Institutional needs, such as those that are necessary to continue operation of the University, include changes to mandatory retirement rates, insurance premiums, and utilities expenses. These needs are calculated based on known and anticipated changes and are presented by the budget director. Representatives from each employee group are responsible for bringing forward requests for salary increases (see 5P2).

The BRC must balance these requests with any additional revenues that may be available. These revenues include potential increases to state appropriations, changes to tuition rates, increased tuition due to enrollment, and other miscellaneous sources. The Budget Office has a process in which it annually reviews enrollments and discount rates across categories (e.g., undergraduate residents, undergraduate nonresidents, graduate residents, graduate nonresidents) to project potential changes to net tuition following changes in the tuition rate or in enrollments (Evidence 1; Evidence 2; Evidence 3). The Budget Office also has a process in which it annually reviews the calculated overhead rates for the various auxiliaries, such as Residence Life, and the Student Recreation Center.

Ultimately, the recommendation for changes to the annual general operating budget is a process that aligns mission and vision with decision making. Historically, the BRC looked only at the upcoming fiscal year when making decisions. However, due to significant budget challenges which began in 2017, the University expanded the budgeting process from a single-year review to a three-year forecast, which includes estimates of changes in state appropriations, net tuition revenues, and costs of continuing.

As mentioned previously, Southeast also submits annual balanced budgets for its auxiliaries to the board of regents for approval. The Budget Office collaborates with auxiliary unit managers to develop annual balanced budgets for auxiliary operations that provide needed services and to maintain their physical infrastructure. These budgets must incorporate institutional decisions made regarding budget categories such as compensation levels. Auxiliary budgets are also presented to the board of regents for approval (see 5P3.1).

Students are a key component of the process to build budgets to accomplish institutional goals. Student Government's executive staff hold seats on the BRC (see membership list). Student Government also works with the vice president of finance and administration and the BRC every year to pass a resolution of support for any proposed tuition increase. Student Government may also request changes to the General Fee to support specific institutional initiatives that they feel are important, as in 2017, when Student Government opted to reduce the general fee, allowing an increase to the tuition rate to support more need-based institutional aid (Example 1; Example 2; Example 3).

5P3.2 Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets

Southeast uses a process that puts the responsibility of individual expense budgets on the financial manager. The financial manager is designated at the time the budget account's index is created through a new index request form. The financial manager may be changed at any time—due to changes in job responsibilities, retirements, reorganizations—by means of a financial manager change form. Both forms are part of a process to ensure that the responsibility is placed on the right person. Financial managers are required to complete basic Banner financial training online to help them to understand their budgets. They are then given access to view their budgets in real time via the portal in Banner Finance.

The Budget Office has also worked with Information Technology to provide access to more robust reporting through the Budget Data Download application. The Budget Office monitors individual budgets in the general operating fund by expense category (student labor, operations, equipment) and sends deficit notices on a monthly basis to the financial managers. All deficits must be cleared by the end of the fiscal year. Southeast has had a tradition of allowing departmental units to carry forward unused budget dollars from year to year. This allows departmental units to plan for incremental or larger one-time needs.

Monitoring the institutional financial position throughout the fiscal year is the responsibility of the Finance and Administration division. Actual performance within major revenue and expense categories are monitored by various departments, so data is available at the executive level for decisions to adjust budgets, if needed, which can be made during the fiscal year (Example 1; Example 2; Example 3). The Budget Office monitors actual net tuition revenue (gross tuition and fees less scholarships and waivers) on a weekly basis. The Controller's Office monitors investments and bank balances to maximize investment earnings. Facilities Management regularly monitors the utility budget to actual expenditures as well as maintenance and repair budgets. The Budget Office monitors the budgets for all positions at the university—faculty and staff—by tracking base savings and costs for new hires, one time savings for vacant positions, and additional one time costs for temporary hires and overtime.

The general operating fund balance is monitored on a regular basis throughout the year by the Controller's Office and the vice president of finance and administration. As described in 5P2.1, this process helps to ensure a contingency fund is in place. Other funds are designated as available to be used for one-time projects and initiatives of the university.

5P3.3 Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly

Telecommunications supports the campus telephone and fiber-optic networks. Information Technology (IT) manages a centralized computing infrastructure supporting the main campus and two regional campuses. The main campus fiber-optic backbone consists of nearly 200 connections to the network core, which supports over 4,000 office and instructional computers, as well as connections for over 3,400 residential students. In addition, wireless connectivity is provided in over 1,600 separate locations. Network capacity consists of a 3-gigabit connection to the Internet, 10-gigabit connections to buildings and 1-gigabit connections to end-point devices (i.e., computers). Over 130 servers supporting business and academic services are maintained in a centralized data center. Virtualization (i.e., processor, memory, and storage) is employed to enhance the management and availability of campus servers. Desktop computers with a complete suite of productivity software are provided to all faculty members and most staff. A system of departmental and open computer labs gives all students access to discipline-specific and general use applications. Instructional technology packages are installed in all major classrooms. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning provides instructional software and training for online and face-to-face learning.

IT maintains a replacement cycle for campus resources such as desktop computers and lab computers (see 5P2.1). As mentioned in 5P1.4, the assistant vice president for information technology facilitates the University's Banner Management Committee (BMC), a committee of administrative software super users. The BMC is responsible for ensuring consistent use of data, testing and maintenance of the system to ensure that modules are up-to-date to support departmental processes, and advising administration of enhancements/challenges related to the system's capabilities.

IT maintains a web-based work order system for the campus community to report routine maintenance issues. The system provides reporting tools for the department to assign the work order to a staff unit and for providing feedback to the initiator (see work order system and tools description).

5P3.4 Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly

Facilities Management (FM) operates the University's physical plant and maintains a clean and beautiful campus environment. The main campus of the University sits on 400 acres with over 45 residential, classroom, and office buildings. The River Campus houses the Holland College of Arts and Media and state-of-the-art performance venues. An extensive system of parking lots and shuttle buses provides for parking and public transportation throughout the campus and between the main campus and the River Campus. Kent Library, with its Information Commons, provides research and information services for students, faculty, and residents of Missouri.

FM utilizes a web-based work order system (see 5P2 for more detail) for the campus community to report routine maintenance issues, assign work orders, and provide feedback to the initiator of the work order. In addition to FM's 46 maintenance FTE and 67.5 custodial FTE, FM maintains various service contracts (Elevator Maintenance, General Electrical, General Construction, and Life Safety, Inspections and Maintenance) to support the campus. Service contracts are used to supplement university personnel for work that is beyond the ability and scope of staff, such as required external certifications or specialized services. Service contracts are rebid every three to five years in order to ensure competitive pricing and exceptional service.

FM also conducts global risk assessments in coordination with our insurance company, Global Risk Consultants. These assessments include Infrared Thermo-imaging on mechanical and electrical equipment to determine areas of hot spots that need to be addressed to prevent fire risks. Global Risk Consultants also completes spot checks on mechanical rooms to ensure that mechanical rooms are clear of debris that can be a fire risk (Example 2).

Every five years, the University is responsible for submitting a new Part 70 Operating Permit with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (DNR) (Part 1; Part 2; Part 3) to ensure that we can operate the boiler plant that produces steam for heat and hot water to campus buildings. A yearly report (EIQ) is also submitted to the DNR to demonstrate compliance.

5P3.5 Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness

Responsibility for the design and maintenance of support processes related to physical safety and security on all campuses is assigned to the Department of Public Safety. The University's

Emergency Operations Center is responsible for maintenance of the Campus Emergency Preparedness Plan, conducting training, providing educational resources on emergency response to the campus community (Example 1; Example 2; Example 3), and for maintaining systems to alert and inform the campus in the event of an emergency. The president, or his designee, serves as the emergency operations manager for the University and is responsible for analyzing an emergency event, determining appropriate actions, and communicating such actions to the campus community (see Incident Organizational Chart). Incident briefing forms are used as part of this process (Example 1; Example 2).

During FY2018, the University implemented Everbridge, an enhanced emergency communication system. The system integrates multiple mediums used for emergency response into a single administrative platform. From a web-based application—branded SEAlerts—authorized University personnel can transmit an emergency notification simultaneously to the outdoor warning system, indoor warning speakers, University-networked desktop computers, text message, website message, Twitter, Facebook, and other social media. The system also provides a mobile application for University students, faculty, and staff to send and receive messages directly to the Department of Public Safety.

5P3.6 Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools

The Everbridge tool provides tracking reports for the Emergency Operations Center staff.

The Budget Office uses the Banner Budget Development module in combination with an Access database to maintain the University's general operating budget and auxiliary budgets. Also, the Budget Office uses the Banner Position control module in combination with an Access database to maintain university-wide position control.

5R3: Results

1. As a result of monitoring the University's fund balance, the institution is able to designate funds for specific one-time uses and initiatives (see fund balance calculation and designation request).
2. The University's tradition of allowing departments to carry funds forward to the next year has allowed departments to plan for future needs (see carryover report).
3. Financial challenges faced by the University, which include reduced state appropriations, reduced enrollments, and higher than normal benefit cost increases, have resulted in the institution being forced to reduce base operating budgets rather than expand them. Using a similar process as requests for adding to base budgets, budget reductions were identified at the division level, submitted to and reviewed by executive staff, brought to Budget Review Committee, and eventually submitted to and approved by the board of regents.

5I3: Improvement

1. In September 2018, the university hired its first emergency manager.
2. In August of 2017, Facilities Management migrated from the desktop TMA to Web TMA. This has provided expanded capabilities for monitoring and reporting based on work order and project data. As part of this move, FM will be purchasing handheld devices so maintenance personnel can enter labor and material usage directly into the system rather than through the current paper process. This will increase efficiencies and responsiveness to work orders.
3. The University recently changed from one-year budget process to a three-year process which enables the University to make better strategic decisions regarding requested budget adjustments based in part on the forecasted financial health of the institution and on the

connection of each request to institutional goals and priorities.

Sources

- C.5.3 AST Spreadsheet as of 11_18
- C.5.3_ Example of departmental budget monitoring_Equity and Diversity
- C.5.3_ Incident Briefing form example_Homecoming 2018
- C.5.3_18DesignatedFundsMemo
- C.5.3_Admission report for graduate students example
- C.5.3_Banner Finance Training Requirements
- C.5.3_BRCWorksheet_ThreeYear
- C.5.3_BRCWorksheetsFY19
- C.5.3_BudgetDataDownload_HomeScreen
- C.5.3_BudgetedFTE
- C.5.3_Cert Training Brochure
- C.5.3_Controller_FinancialManagerForm
- C.5.3_Controller-UniversityIndexRequest
- C.5.3_CSTL Workshops to support technology enhanced learning
- C.5.3_Dating Domestic Violence Sexual Assault Brochure
- C.5.3_Discount Rate.EvaluationFY20
- C.5.3_DNR Operating permit - Part 1 of 3
- C.5.3_DNR Operating permit - Part 2 of 3
- C.5.3_DNR Operating permit - Part 3 of 3
- C.5.3_DNR Part 70 Semi Annual Report_SEMO Univ_09-27-18
- C.5.3_dps-emergency-plan
- C.5.3_Elevator Maint
- C.5.3_Emergency Prep Bruchure
- C.5.3_Est GO fund bal 18
- C.5.3_Example of budget deficit notice from Controller
- C.5.3_Example of collaborative budgeting with auxiliary units
- C.5.3_Example of deficit notice from Budget Office
- C.5.3_Example of division request to BRC_Academic Affairs FY17
- C.5.3_Example of division request to BRC_Advancement Advancement FY17
- C.5.3_Example of division request to BRC_Athletics FY17
- C.5.3_Example of division request to BRC_EMSS FY17
- C.5.3_Example of division request to BRC_Finance and Administration FY17
- C.5.3_Example of position monitoring
- C.5.3_Example of request to move base funds
- C.5.3_Example of Revenue_Expense_Summary_Equity and Diversity
- C.5.3_Example of three-year comparison report_Equity and Diversity
- C.5.3_Examples of DPS support activities
- C.5.3_Fire Safey Home Safety Nonstructural Supply List Brochures
- C.5.3_FTECalculation
- C.5.3_FY17 University and Auxiliary Operating
- C.5.3_FY17DesigantedFunds
- C.5.3_FY18 Univ and Auxillary Operating Budget
- C.5.3_FY19 University and Auxiliary Operating Budgets
- C.5.3_FY20 Budget Review Charge and Membership Effective 11-2018
- C.5.3_General Construction

- C.5.3_General Electrical
- C.5.3_Global Risk Assessment Example 1
- C.5.3_Global Risk Assessment Example 2
- C.5.3_IAP 2018 MO State Tornado Drill
- C.5.3_Incident Briefing Form for POTUS visit Nov 2018
- C.5.3_Incident Org Chart
- C.5.3_JCI Contract_Fire - Sprinkler
- C.5.3_Kent Library Reference
- C.5.3_Net Tuition Increase monitoring
- C.5.3_PPT slide deck with overview of investment strategies_Sept 2018
- C.5.3_ResLifeOverhead
- C.5.3_rpt_Carryovers
- C.5.3_Screenshot 1 of Banner Finance
- C.5.3_Screenshot 2 of Banner Finance
- C.5.3_SE Alerts Notifications Report example
- C.5.3_SE Alerts text information
- C.5.3_SG Resolution 1
- C.5.3_SG Resolution 2
- C.5.3_SG Resolution 3
- C.5.3_SG Resolution 4
- C.5.3_SRCBudget
- C.5.3_SRCOverhead
- C.5.3_Tuition and Fee Schedule Board Motion Fall 2016
- C.5.3_Tuition and Fee Schedule Board MotionF2017
- C.5.3_Tuition and Fee Schedule Board MotionF2018
- C.5.3_Urgent Alert Monthly Preparedness Tips
- C.5.3_Utilities Reconciliation FY18
- C.5.3_Web help desk information and screenshots
- C.5.3_Welcome to SE Alerts-email

6 - Quality Overview

6.1 - Quality Improvement Initiatives

Quality Improvement Initiatives focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution.

6P1: PROCESSES

Describe the processes for determining and integrating CQI initiatives, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives
- Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

6R1: RESULTS

What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

6I1

Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

6P1: Processes

6P1.1 Selecting, deploying, and evaluating quality improvement initiatives

As a current participant of the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP), the University has designed and conducted Action Projects on a regular basis. Recently the decision was made by the Higher Learning Commission to “sunset” the AQIP Pathway. In accordance with the guidance provided by the Higher Learning Commission, the University closed and archived all current Action Projects. The Action Projects continue as institutional quality improvement projects and will be monitored by the AQIP Steering Committee. This section outlines the process that was used until recently to select, deploy, and evaluate AQIP Action Projects at Southeast.

Prior to 2018, a Call for Action Project Proposals was distributed electronically (by email and by the University’s Newswire) to all faculty, staff, students, and the wider community in September of each year with a October 31 deadline. Proposals for Action Projects were also generated through the University's participation in AQIP Strategy Forums.

The University's AQIP Steering Committee reviewed proposals and decided which proposals to accept as new Action Projects (see meeting minutes for evidence of decision making). The decision was based on current institutional priorities, themes from the most recent Systems Appraisal, the potential impact of the Action Project on the campus, and the resources needed to carry out the project as planned.

Once the Action Project proposals were approved by the AQIP Steering Committee, the proposer(s) was invited to draft a charter, which was used by the accreditation liaison officer to to initiate the Action Project through the Action Project portal. The accreditation liaison officer informed the project team that they could begin their project, and they were prompted to provide periodic updates to the AQIP Steering Committee. Projects were usually one year in scope, so each October one of the project team was asked to provide a final report to the accreditation liaison officer, who then closed the project through the Action Project portal.

A team from Southeast attended the Higher Learning Commission Strategy Forum. The team was tasked with identifying a topic to explore at the Forum that could lead to a quality improvement initiative. To commence this process, the team reviewed findings and recommendations from its 2014 Systems Appraisal to create a list of possible topics to explore at the Strategy Forum. A theme within the 2014 Systems Appraisal was a lack of processes for using survey data as "actionable insight." An example cited in the Appraisal was that the University administers the HERI Faculty Survey but does not have a process to use the data to make data-informed improvements. By participating in the Forum, the team carried out structured activities to formulate an Action Project charter to address this topic. Once the team arrived back on campus, they presented the Action Project charter to the University's AQIP Steering Committee, who approved the plan to move forward (see process in 6P1.1).

Two additional examples of CQI initiatives are outlined below, but several others are mentioned in other sections of this Portfolio.

> **Example 1:** In 2017, the University convened a Business Process Improvement (BPI) Subcommittee to review current processes that affect student enrollment, admission, retention, and graduation. This committee, led by the vice president for enrollment management and student success, operates as a subcommittee of the Strategic Enrollment Management Committee. The BPI Committee, which includes representatives from across the University, was tasked to create a plan to **identify** and improve several business processes. This task involved discussions at committee meetings, invitations to committee members to identify business processes in their areas, and a collaborative approach to distill these ideas into a feasible plan of action. The resulting **plan** also identifies project leaders to carry out the improvement and report back to the BPI Committee. This is a new process for Southeast. Although the initiatives have been selected and **executed**, there has not been enough time to **review** these efforts.
>
> **Example 2:** In 2018, opportunities to enhance flexible learning opportunities for students were **identified** through discussions with the provost's office and the vice president of enrollment management and student success. The associate provost convened the Flexible Learning Task Force—composed of stakeholders from online programs, dual credit programs, additional locations, faculty development, and faculty—to draft a three-year flexible learning **plan** for Southeast. The plan was presented to the provost and vice

president for enrollment management for approval before it was **executed** in October 2018. A key strategy of the plan is to carry out assessment activities near the end of each phase, so the team can **review** the effectiveness of the plan.

6P1.2 Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums

Until recently, feedback from the Systems Appraisal has provided ideas for action projects and topics to explore at Strategy Forums. For example, the 2013–2015 Action Project to enhance student retention was related to a theme of student retention in the 2014 Systems Appraisal. The 2017 Action Project to understand and enhance employee satisfaction was directly related to feedback in the 2014 Systems Appraisal. Both of these Action Projects emerged from participation in a Strategy Forum. As stated in 6P1.1, when the AQIP Steering Committee reviewed proposals for Action Projects, they did so with the Systems Appraisal in mind.

The Systems Appraisal also provides strategic focus areas for the institution. For example, since the University received the Systems Appraisal in 2014, it has focused on student success and improving student learning assessment (see Institutional Focus Areas in the Introduction and Categories 1 and 2). In these ways, the Systems Portfolio and Appraisal help the University develop focus areas for the next three to four years.

The Comprehensive Quality Review provides impetus for frequent and focused communication about continuous improvement and institutional accreditation. The University's CQR Communication and Readiness Project Plan outlines preparatory activities over a 16-month period. This project is designed to nurture a campus culture of continuous improvement and to ensure we are staying focused on the priorities for enhancement. These activities include Category workshops, CQR information sessions, and email campaigns about institutional accreditation and continuous improvement.

6R1: Results

1. Over the past four years, the University has completed 10 AQIP Action Projects (see the University's AQIP website). Results from these projects have prompted continuous improvement across the University, including areas such as student learning assessment, student retention, graduate outcomes, and faculty load reporting.
2. The Business Process Improvement Subcommittee produced an action plan for addressing a long list of processes that are perceived to present barriers to student success (see 5P1).
3. The Flexible Learning Task Force, as a result of their continuous improvement charge, created a three-year Flexible Learning Strategic Plan for the University (see full presentation).
4. The first year of the pilot project—Enhancing Program Review at Southeast—provided insights that led to a second year pilot process, which is currently being tested with five academic departments. These continuous improvement efforts also led to a pilot project for cocurricular program review of a living learning community at Southeast.
5. The AQIP Steering Committee is currently carrying out the activities in Work Package 1 of the CQR Communication and Readiness Plan. These activities have resulted in multiple updates and training sessions to various campus stakeholder groups; more than 90 participants joining workshops to discuss the Systems Portfolio, and 150 framed mission statement posters distributed and displayed across campus.

6I1: Improvement

1. Several of the recently initiated AQIP Action Projects will continue as internal quality improvement projects, even though they are shown as "completed" in the AQIP Action Project Network. These include the projects to Develop a Data-Informed Process for Understanding and Enhancing Employee Satisfaction and Well-being and to Create a Sustainable Framework to Support Learning Community Programs.
2. The Business Process Improvement Subcommittee continues to meet reqularly to review processes on its action plan.
3. The Flexible Learning Task Force, in accordance with its phased strategic plan, intends to complete Phase I by May 2019.
4. The project to enhance program review at Southeast will continue through the second year of the pilot and the first year of the cocurricular pilot during the current academic year. In fall 2019, a new process will be implemented based on findings from these studies.
5. Although not included in 5R1, the executive staff recently decided to move forward in designing and implementing an institution-wide strategic plan to improve student enrollment.
6. The University looks forward to recommendations from the HLC review team to guide its adoption of a new accreditation pathway. Discussions have begun with various stakeholders, such as the president, interim provost, and AQIP Steering Committee to better understand the differences between the Open and Standard Pathways. Presently, these stakeholders feel most enthused about the Open Pathway, because it provides scope to explore a major institution-wide quality improvement initiative as part of its accreditation cycle.

Sources

- C.6.1_2017_Strategy_Forum_team_roster [highlighted]
- C.6.1_Action Project Team Meeting Agenda 11_1_18
- C.6.1_AQIP website showing completed action projects
- C.6.1_AQIP_Minutes-11_29_17
- C.6.1_AQIP_Steering_Committee_charge_membership_2018
- C.6.1_BPI Items List
- C.6.1_Call for AQIP Action Projects_2017
- C.6.1_Category_Improvement_Worksheet_reference to Systems Appraisal
- C.6.1_Cocurricular program review process_pilot
- C.6.1_CQR_Communication and Readiness Plan
- C.6.1_Draft_Action_Plan_Charter
- C.6.1_Email_call_for_proposals_action_projects_2017
- C.6.1_Enhancing Academic Program Review_Project Plan
- C.6.1_Flexible Learning at Southeast full presentation
- C.6.1_FLTF Agenda 10_08_18 showing membership
- C.6.1_Follow-up notes from Action Project team meetings
- C.6.1_Program review at Southeast_final
- C.6.1_Program Review flowchart for Year 2 of Pilot
- C.6.1_Project charter_Developing_A_Systemic_Approach_to_Retention
- C.6.1_Project_charter_Developing_a_Data-Informed_Process_for_Understanding_and_Enh
- C.6.1_Screenshot_final_report_example_for_action_project
- C.6.1_Screenshot_of_Action_Project_Network
- C.6.1_SEM_BPI Charge FY19
- C.6.1_Strategic Plan for Flexible Learning at Southeast
- C6.2_Screenshot showing call for AQIP action projects_fall 2017

6.2 - Culture of Quality

Culture of Quality focuses on how the institution integrates continuous quality improvement into its culture. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.D. in this section.

6P2: PROCESSES

Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

- Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality
- Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations (5.D.1)
- Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives (5.D.2)
- Reviewing, reaffirming and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution

6R2: RESULTS

What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P2. All data presented should include the population studied, the response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

6I2: IMPROVEMENT

Based on 6R2, what process improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Responses

6P2: Processes

6P2.1 Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality

A central process that supports the institution's quality infrastructure involves the work of the AQIP Steering Committee (ASC). The ASC is a representative standing committee that includes 15 faculty, staff, and students. The ASC is charged with "coordinating the University's accreditation process under the AQIP guidelines of the Higher Learning Commission." Until recently, the ASC approved and oversaw AQIP Action Projects, and it currently reviews reports related to Strategy Forum outputs, informs the processes to compile the Systems Portfolio, and supports activities related to the Comprehensive Quality Review. The ASC maintains the University's AQIP webpage and composes email updates to the campus community, which are sent from the president's office and dean of students (see 6P2.2 and 6P2.3).

The Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) is charged with "establishing, coordinating, monitoring implementation, overseeing, and annually evaluating the continuous improvement and assessment processes for academic programs." The Faculty Advisory Committee for Program Review (FACPR) is charged with "assisting the provost with the university's academic program review process." (See Category 1 for more detail on both committees.)

In June 2017, the University allocated resources to hire an associate provost for academic effectiveness and student success. This new position provides dedicated support for institutional accreditation, academic assessment, and program review. The associate provost serves as the accreditation liaison officer to the Higher Learning Commission and as chairperson for the ASC, AAC, and FACPR.

Members of these three committees carry out specific professional development activities each year to stay informed of best practices across the higher education sector.

> **Example 1:** The AAC organized an Assessment Speaker Series in Fall 2018 to provide insights into best practices for aligning and assessing program learning outcomes, adopting ePortfolio for general education assessment, and developing projects around learning improvement.
>
> **Example 2:** The subcommittee of the AAC for general education assessment sent a group to attend the HLC Workshop on General Education Assessment in February 2018. Another group from this subcommittee joined the General Education Assessment Workshop at Missouri State University in May 2018. These activities provided important insights into creating a new approach for general education assessment at Southeast.
>
> **Example 3:** In March 2018, the AAC hosted an assessment coach from the National Institute for Learning Outcomes and Assessment to facilitate two on-site workshops for faculty and staff at Southeast.

Less explicit, although important, are processes that are embedded in decentralized practices across the Institution. Examples include program accreditation processes, which are overseen by academic departments (see Section 1.4); health and safety compliance processes, which are overseen by facilities management (see Section 5.2); and standard operating procedures, which are codified in University policy (e.g., Business Policy and Procedure; Faculty Handbook; Human Resources Policies).

6P2.2 Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations

> **Example 1:** Institution-wide communication provides the campus community with important information about quality improvement initiatives. The University's Newswire serves as the central communication source for all campus stakeholders. The Newswire publishes regular, biweekly communiques, which are disseminated by email to campus employees and made available on the University website. Although the Newswire content covers diverse topics, ranging from awards, achievements, professional development opportunities, required activities for personnel, sports events, and theatre productions, the Newswire is also the principal source for communicating outcomes from Board of Regents' meetings, key messages from the President's Office, and updates on quality improvement initiatives. Regarding the latter, specific examples include the annual call for Funding for Results grant proposals, the annual call for HLC AQIP Action Project proposals,

information about assessment workshops, and outcomes from HLC Strategy Forum participation.

Example 2: The University's strategic plan is available on the president's webpage. The annual State of the University Address is the key mechanism for communicating achievements and progress toward the strategic plan to the campus community. The process for gathering and communicating this information involves unit-level updates to division leaders who then provide division-level updates to the president's office. The president's office decides which updates to include in the State of the University Address. This information is provided to University Marketing, who creates a printed booklet. These booklets are distributed to attendees during the State of the University Address and are used year-round by the president's office to share information with internal and external stakeholders, such as campus visitors.

Example 3: Key university-wide initiatives are displayed in various places on the University website. The president's webpages include a section called Presidential Initiatives, which displays information about quality improvements initiatives such as the ACE Internationalization initiative and the President's Task Force on Diversity Education. As mentioned previously, the AQIP webpage includes a listing of AQIP Action Projects and links to project charters. In some cases, key information is also made available on the employee portal as a way to enhance awareness. One example of this is the recent quality improvement project to "understand and enhance employee satisfaction and well-being." The results of the employee satisfaction survey are available on the employee portal.

Example 4: Campus-wide reporting of progress and outputs from quality improvement initiatives support awareness and understanding of impact. For example, faculty and staff who receive Funding for Results grants for enhancing aspects of teaching and learning are asked to provide interim and final reports to the Funding for Results Committee within two years of their award. The AQIP Steering Committee has, historically, requested updates on AQIP Action Projects, and the chairperson coordinates the final reporting and project closure activities with the HLC (see 6P2.1).

6P2.3 Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives

Example 1: After hosting the first annual Integrity Week, the planning team organized a Debrief Luncheon to reflect on the event and to outline improvements for next year's event.

Example 2: In August 2018, the University launched a 16-month CQR Communication and Readiness Plan to prepare for the upcoming Comprehensive Quality Review. Objective 5 of the plan is to "Use insights and lessons learned from the CQR experience to inform continuous improvement activities." This objective will be addressed through a corresponding work package of activities that include reflection with key stakeholders, discussion about the next HLC pathway, and integration of lessons learned into strategic planning for institutional effectiveness.

Example 3: The Closing the Loop Luncheon in November 2018 was designed to prompt reflection on general education assessment data and to outline ideas toward future learning improvement.

Example 4: Following the U.S. Department of Education's site visit in July 2018, the University made updates to the policies and procedures for documenting the commencement of attendance for students. Enhancements were also made to the way in which we communicate information to students, faculty, and staff regarding Department of Public Safety information (see initial DOE report).

Example 5: The Master Template Studio pilot project was designed to test a process for creating course templates for adjuncts to teach high-demand online courses. Year 1 of the pilot project provided important insights in factors needed to support the sustainability of this initiative.

6P2.4 Reviewing, reaffirming, and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution

During Years 6 and 7 of the AQIP Cycle, the AQIP Steering Committee (ASC) was charged with designing a CQR Communication and Readiness Plan to help the campus prepare for the Comprehensive Quality Review (CQR), which is scheduled for September 2019. The process for creating this plan included a discussion at an ASC meeting in April 2018 and email consultation on drafts of the plan. The process was facilitated by the associate provost and the dean of Kent Library, as the co-chairpersons of this committee. The plan includes practical and logistical measures for preparing for the CQR, but also it includes activities "to nurture a culture of continuous improvement across the campus community" (see Work Packages 1 and 5 of plan). Once the draft was approved by the ASC, it was presented to the president for approval. The plan was implemented in August 2018.

As part of this work, the ASC developed a separate plan to construct the Systems Portfolio. This plan is designed over five phases and utilizes the internal expertise of the ASC and the group of HLC-trained peer reviewers who work at Southeast. This process involved team meetings and larger workshops to involve key stakeholders in dialogue about the AQIP criteria.

6R2: Results

1. Through the work of the ASC, activities have been been carried out. These include the Systems Portfolio Project Plan; CQR Communication and Readiness Plan; the closing and archiving of AQIP Action Projects; attendance at two Strategy Forums; and a Multi-Location Visit for two additional locations.
2. As a result of the AAC, several initiatives have been implemented in the past four years. These include: the AQIP Action Project to develop and assess formalized course learning outcomes; the AQIP Action Project to develop and assess program learning outcomes; the Three-Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment; and the General Education Assessment Plan.
3. As a result of the FACPR, new processes for academic and cocurricular program review are currently being piloted.
4. Professional development activities hosted or undertaken by members of these committees have led to more informed planning at Southeast. For example, the Assessment Speaker Series led to adopting the Learning Improvement Reports; and the HLC Workshop for General Education Assessment led to adopting the General Education Assessment Plan.
5. Academic accreditation activities continue to lead to curricular enhancements (see 1R3). Feedback from external bodies for facilities compliance lead to improvements to the campus infrastructure (see 5R2).
6. Following the initial report from the U.S. Department of Education, student financial services team moved the practice of faculty reporting students who did not commence attendance for a course from a passive process to a required active process. This allows the institution to confirm which students did not begin attendance in courses much earlier than the previous method

which helps both on the student success side as the university is able to reach out sooner to students who do not begin attending, and the Student Financial Services side because of the ability to adjust aid as necessary earlier than the previous method may have allowed.
7. After the first year of the Master Template Studio pilot, the team made key changes to the process for the second year. Namely, the evaluation indicated that a different funding model and higher number of outputs would need to be included in the plan in order for the project to create the anticipated and sustained impact.

6I2: Improvement

1. The ASC looks forward to the Comprehensive Quality Review in September 2019 and the opportunity to learn from the reviewers' feedback.
2. The AAC intends to continue implementing the Three-Year Roadmap for Academic Assessment and the General Education Assessment Plan (see 1P1).
3. The FACPR will evaluate Year 2 of the program review pilot and Year 1 of the cocurricular program review pilot for full implementation of new processes in fall 2019.
4. Integrity Week will become an annual event at Southeast, most likely occurring each September.
5. In December 2018, the AAC plans to distribute its first General Education Assessment Report, which will become an annual update on learning improvement to the campus community.

Sources

- C.6.2_AAC Minutes 11-28-17 showing continuous improvement discussion
- C.6.2_Academic Assessment Committee Charge and Membership 2018_2019
- C.6.2_AQIP_Minutes_March_29_2016_showing discussion of action projects
- C.6.2_AQIP_Steering_Committee_charge_membership_2018
- C.6.2_Closing the Loop Luncheon 2018 slide deck
- C.6.2_Cocurricular Program Review flowchart pilot year 1
- C.6.2_CQR_Communication and Readiness Plan
- C.6.2_DOE Program Review Report
- C.6.2_Email advertising Assessment Speaker Series
- C.6.2_Email advertising NILOA assessment workshops
- C.6.2_Email advertising University Studies Information Sessions Jan-Feb2018
- C.6.2_Email from HLC showing group attending HLC Assessment Workshop_Feb 2018
- C.6.2_Email information about general education assessment workshops_Nov 2018
- C.6.2_Email showing team going to Missouri State University Assessment Workshop
- C.6.2_Enhancing Academic Program Review_Project Plan
- C.6.2_Example of Dear Colleagues letter
- C.6.2_Faculty Advisory Committee for Program Review Charge and Membership 2018-2019
- C.6.2_FFR call for proposals 2018-2019
- C.6.2_Funding for Results Committee 2018-2019
- C.6.2_Integrity Week 2018 Follow Up Report
- C.6.2_Landing page for AQIP website
- C.6.2_Landing page for Business Policies and Procedures
- C.6.2_Landing page for HR policies and processes
- C.6.2_Landing page for Presidential Initiatives_Presidents webpage
- C.6.2_MTS Flyer
- C.6.2_MTS Logic Model to inform Pilot project

- C.6.2_Newswire excerpt showing call for FFR proposals
- C.6.2_Newswire showing Closing the Loop session
- C.6.2_Newswire showing Vargas update to board
- C.6.2_Newswire story about Strategy Forum
- C.6.2_Pres_Strategic_Plan_final_12-09-14
- C.6.2_president-SOUPresentation2018
- C.6.2_Program Review flowchart
- C.6.2_Program Review flowchart for Year 2 of Pilot
- C.6.2_Sample FFR Final Report
- C.6.2_Sample slide deck for CATEGORY 2 workshop_Feb 2018
- C.6.2_Screenshot of employee portal showing Great College data reports
- C.6.2_Systems Portfolio Project Plan_2017-2019
- C.6.2_Thrive in 5 2018 Reflection
- C6.2_Screenshot showing call for AQIP action projects_fall 2017