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Elements Of Southeast Missouri State University’s Feedback Report

Welcome to the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report. This report provides AQIP’s official response to an institution’s Systems Portfolio by a team of peer reviewers (the Systems Appraisal Team). After the team independently reviews the institution’s portfolio, it reaches consensus on essential elements of the institutional profile, strengths and opportunities for improvement by AQIP Category, and any significant issues related to accreditation. These are then presented in three sections of the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report: “Strategic Challenges Analysis,” “AQIP Category Feedback,” and “Accreditation Issues Analysis.” These components are interrelated in defining context, evaluating institutional performance, surfacing critical issues or accreditation concerns, and assessing institutional performance. Ahead of these three areas, the team provides a “Reflective Introduction” followed closely by an “Executive Summary.” The appraisal concludes with commentary on the overall quality of the report and advice on using the report. Each of these areas is overviewed below.

It is important to remember that the Systems Appraisal Team has only the institution’s Systems Portfolio to guide its analysis of the institution’s strengths and opportunities for improvement. Consequently, the team’s report may omit important strengths, particularly if discussion or documentation of these areas in the Systems Portfolio were presented minimally. Similarly, the team may point out areas of potential improvement that are already receiving widespread institutional attention. Indeed, it is possible that some areas recommended for potential improvement have since become strengths rather than opportunities through the institution’s ongoing efforts. Recall that the overarching goal of the Systems Appraisal Team is to provide an institution with the best possible advice for ongoing improvement.

The various sections of the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report can be described as follows:

**Reflective Introduction & Executive Summary:** In this first section of the System’s Appraisal Feedback Report, the team provides a summative statement that reflects its broad understanding of the institution and the constituents served (Reflective Introduction), and also the team’s overall judgment regarding the institution’s current performance in relation to the nine AQIP Categories (Executive Summary). In the Executive Summary, the team considers such factors as: robustness of process design; utilization or deployment of processes; the existence of results, trends, and comparative data; the use of results data as feedback; and systematic processes for improvement of the activities that each AQIP
Category covers. Since institutions are complex, maturity levels may vary from one Category to another.

**Strategic Challenges Analysis:** Strategic challenges are those most closely related to an institution’s ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and quality improvement goals. Teams formulate judgments related to strategic challenges and accreditation issues (discussed below) through careful analysis of the Organizational Overview included in the institution’s Systems Portfolio and through the team’s own feedback provided for each AQIP Category. These collected findings offer a framework for future improvement of processes and systems.

**AQIP Category Feedback:** The *Systems Appraisal Feedback Report* addresses each AQIP Category by identifying and coding strengths and opportunities for improvement. An S or SS identifies strengths, with the double letter signifying important achievements or capabilities upon which to build. Opportunities are designated by O, with OO indicating areas where attention may result in more significant improvement. Through comments, which are keyed to the institution’s Systems Portfolio, the team offers brief analysis of each strength and opportunity. Organized by AQIP Category, and presenting the team’s findings in detail, this section is often considered the heart of the *Feedback Report*.

**Accreditation Issues Analysis:** Accreditation issues are areas where an institution may have not yet provided sufficient evidence that it meets the Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation. It is also possible that the evidence provided suggests to the team that the institution may have difficulties, whether at present or in the future, in satisfying the Criteria. As with strategic challenges, teams formulate judgments related to accreditation issues through close analysis of the entire Systems Portfolio, with particular attention given to the evidence that the institution provides for satisfying the various core components of the Criteria. For purposes of consistency, AQIP instructs appraisal teams to identify any accreditation issue as a strategic challenge as well.

**Quality of Report & Its Use:** As with any institutional report, the *Systems Portfolio* should work to enhance the integrity and credibility of the institution by celebrating successes while also stating honestly those opportunities for improvement. The *Systems Portfolio* should therefore be transformational, and it should provide external peer reviewers insight as to how such transformation may occur through processes of continuous improvement. The AQIP Categories and the Criteria for Accreditation serve as the overarching measures for the institution’s current state, as well as its proposed future state. As such, it is imperative
that the Portfolio be fully developed, that it adhere to the prescribed format, and that it be thoroughly vetted for clarity and correctness. Though decisions about specific actions rest with each institution following this review, AQIP expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement and to inform future AQIP processes.

Reflective Introduction and Executive Summary For Southeast Missouri State University

The following consensus statement is from the System Appraisal Team’s review of the institution’s Systems Portfolio Overview and its introductions to the nine AQIP Categories. The purpose of this reflective introduction is to highlight the team’s broad understanding of the institution, its mission, and the constituents that it serves.

Southeast Missouri State University is a regional comprehensive institution with an undergraduate enrollment of 10,755 and a graduate enrollment of 1,162. Originally established as a Normal School, it has been undergoing steady growth and has worked to develop a culture of continuous improvement (completing nine Action Projects since the last portfolio) with special emphasis on assessment in recent years. Currently, the university mission and vision statements are under revision and extensive budget reduction strategies are in place for the future.

The following are summary comments on each of the AQIP Categories crafted by the Appraisal Team to highlight Southeast Missouri State University achievements and to identify challenges yet to be met.

- **Category 1**: Southeast Missouri State University is under transition after completion of an Action Project on student learning outcomes led to development and assessment of SLOs in all courses taught. Data are beginning to be integrated into improvement cycles; most majors feature a senior capstone course; require a high-impact learning course focused on experiential writing; and writing proficiency remains a core component of a Southeast Missouri State University education.

- **Category 2**: Southeast Missouri State University offers a comprehensive list of co-curricular programs and activities with special support programs for first-generation, low-income, and minority students. Further, Southeast Missouri State University provides services to business and start-ups through the Innovation Center.

- **Category 3**: Students and key stakeholder groups look to Southeast Missouri State
University to offer high-quality education at an affordable cost and to be an active partner in the educational, economic, and cultural life of the region. The University currently is focused on student success and has combined careers services with advising, a pattern which reflects the creation of comprehensive service and support systems that are appropriately located and reciprocally supportive.

• **Category 4:** Through the use of a consultant led study and Great Colleges Survey, salary modifications were incorporated into the FY14 budget. Further, various elements of the study are utilized in determining resource placement (such as expertise, student demand, and course load), and all positions include statements on sensitivity to issues affecting women and minorities.

• **Category 5:** The strategic plan guides planning for the institution with other divisions aligned to the larger institutional goals. There is a recognized opportunity to improve institutional communication and professional development for those in various leadership positions.

• **Category 6:** Growth online has been significant of late, and new staff and technology support are being added with technology needs garnering top focus. In addition, a number of services including residential housing, computer support, and maintained facilities are integrated as identified needs and resources allow.

• **Category 7:** The former Office of Institutional Research has been reorganized as the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment in order to organize workflow and increase staff support. Effectiveness is measured by external requirements for federal and state reporting and for institutional and program accreditation, while assessment data is determined through the process overseen by the University Academic Assessment Review Committee.

• **Category 8:** The University has been operating in a system of decreases in state support since 2011 with more cuts planned. This has increased the awareness across campus of the importance of strategic planning and continuous quality improvement, led to expansions in online program offerings, and implementation of winter intersession courses.

• **Category 9:** Southeast Missouri State University encourages both internal and external partnerships as they benefit program and degree opportunities for students. The institution is currently adding new programs, updating all transfer guides, and planning to
add new articulation agreements.

Note: Strategic challenges and accreditation issues are discussed in detail in subsequent sections of the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report.

Strategic Challenges For Southeast Missouri State University

In conducting the Systems Appraisal, the Systems Appraisal Team attempted to identify the broader issues that would seem to present the greatest challenges and opportunities for the institution in the coming years. These areas are ones that the institution should address as it seeks to become the institution it wants to be. From these the institution may discover its immediate priorities, as well as strategies for long-term performance improvement. These items may also serve as the basis for future activities and projects that satisfy other AQIP requirements. The team also considered whether any of these challenges put the institution at risk of not meeting the Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation. That portion of the team’s work is presented later in this report.

Knowing that Southeast Missouri State University will discuss these strategic challenges, give priority to those it concludes are most critical, and take action promptly, the Systems Appraisal Team identified the following:

- Southeast Missouri State University, as it continues in its quality journey, has a continued opportunity to clearly articulate priorities and goals from results and processes. While there are many processes in place and goals set, it is not clear how they are connected, related, or inform each other. Developing processes of integrating goal setting with review of data and results may help Southeast Missouri State University determine more judiciously where as a collective institution it desires to go and the means by which it may get there, advancing student learning along the way. Approaching the quality improvement process as one of integrating and systematizing conversations around data and forward motion for the institution will also allow Southeast Missouri State University to review changes that are made to ensure that they do actually lead to improvements.

- Alignment of measures with goals is critical to effective assessment. Southeast Missouri State University has involved campus groups through committee structure and various means of communication leading to informed consent on decisions and pre-selected
data points. However, it is not clear the extent of the involvement of different groups in the processes outlined including setting goals, managing priorities, and implementing and tracking changes. Engaging various groups in the process of making sense of data may further conversations on outlining meaningful ways to improve. Considering communication and decision making channels that are not just top down but are horizontal in nature and as well as bottom-up may strengthen the entire culture of the institution around continuously improving.

- Southeast Missouri State University has a disconnect between strong measures that clearly are aligned with and speak to specified goals and objectives. While a variety of data are collected, it is not clear if the information collected addresses questions of interest related to the goals and objectives and if the information provided leads to actionable evidence. Considering a data audit of the types of information collected and how they are or are not aligned with the measures of interest may help Southeast Missouri State University streamline data collection and focus on the most meaningful data elements to inform priorities and targets.

**AQIP Category Feedback**

In the following section, the Systems Appraisal Team delineates institutional strengths along with opportunities for improvement within the nine AQIP Categories. As explained above, the symbols used in this section are SS for outstanding strength, S for strength, O for opportunity for improvement, and OO for outstanding opportunity for improvement. The choice of symbol for each item represents the consensus evaluation of the team members and deserves the institution’s thoughtful consideration. Comments marked SS or OO may need immediate attention, either to ensure the institution preserves and maximizes the value of its greatest strengths, or to devote immediate attention to its greatest opportunities for improvement.

**AQIP Category 1: Helping Students Learn.** This category identifies the shared purpose of all higher education institutions and is accordingly the pivot of any institutional analysis. It focuses on the teaching-learning process within a formal instructional context, yet it also addresses how the entire institution contributes to helping students learn and overall student development. It examines the institution’s processes and systems related to learning objectives, mission-driven student learning and development, intellectual climate, academic programs and courses, student preparation, key issues such as technology and diversity, program and course delivery,
faculty and staff roles, teaching and learning effectiveness, course sequencing and scheduling, learning and co-curricular support, student assessment, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southeast Missouri State University for Category 1.

Southeast Missouri State University is in the process of evaluating the effectiveness and impact of changes made to program review processes, assessment of student learning, and integration of various offices across the institution and sites converging their efforts around improving student learning. Southeast Missouri State University has made progress in its design, deployment, and effectiveness of teaching-learning processes that underlie the organization’s programs and courses, including the processes required to support them. By implementing repetitive and reliable processes to evaluate and improve upon the last Systems Appraisal, the Institution has made strides in demonstrating evidence of quality and effectiveness. Regular examination and reflection on the various data elements related to these processes will help ensure that Southeast Missouri State University continues to improve student learning.

1P1, S. Southeast Missouri State University has determined common learning objectives for all students through the University Studies Program. These learning objectives align with state general education requirements and are reviewed by the University Studies Council.

1P2, O. Southeast Missouri State University has clearly defined student learning objectives for courses that are consistent regardless of media or location and has identified related assessment measures. Student learning objectives are not as clearly defined at the program-level and the program review process is not clearly articulated in the absence of national accreditation. Although Southeast Missouri State University has recently revised its assessment process, the effectiveness of the new process is uncertain. Review of data on assessments and outcomes may enhance the successful transition from assessing student learning to improving student learning.

1P3, S. Southeast Missouri State University engages in institution-level environmental scanning with the aim of identifying new programs and courses. Regular publically shared processes that include the solicitation of input from advisory boards, corporate partners, and other external stakeholders help ensure a thorough inquiry into emerging needs, trends, and markets and enhance constituent confidence in the currency and relevance of academic offerings.

1P6, S. Southeast Missouri State University utilizes a variety of approaches to
communicate with current and prospective students about the expectations of programs. Admissions and the First STEP orientation program play an important role for in-coming students. Publications and online resources help to inform students of requirements. Degree Works helps students learn and understand program requirements and tracks their progress in completing those requirements.

1P7, S. Southeast Missouri State University has a comprehensive array of services for student advising, career counseling, and introduction of programs of study. Professional advisors support students in each college and a comprehensive career and support system is in place for students with undeclared majors.

1P8, S. Southeast Missouri State University uses high school GPA and standardized test scores to assess student readiness for college level work. Students who are not at college level must take the appropriate developmental class to bring up their skills. The institution provides an Academic Enhancement Program for first-year students and tutoring is available through the University Tutorial Services. As noted in the portfolio, all colleges and regional sites practice an intrusive advising process that connects institutional personnel with students to support student success.

1P9, O. Southeast Missouri State University uses a formal learning styles inventory (VARK) for students who want to assess their learning styles, are on academic probation, or deemed at-risk. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning provides faculty development resources and workshops, including information on learning styles. An opportunity exists for the University to collect and report data related to student use of VARK and related professional development opportunities for faculty, regarding the affect the University has on enhancing learning through the recognition of learning style diversity for all students.

1P10, S. Southeast Missouri State University has programs and services that address the needs of special populations of students such as students with disabilities, veterans, and low-income students. The Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) committee does an annual review of these services to assure that support is available for populations the institution serves.

1P11, O. Southeast Missouri State University employs several methods for defining and communicating expectations for effective teaching and learning. The IDEA instrument and related resources are recognized nationally and used to both collect information about faculty instruction as well as assist faculty members to become better teachers.
The established Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning is a data-driven resource for faculty that offers training in a wide variety of areas, from active learning to teaching with technology. However, it is unclear how Southeast Missouri State University defines, documents, and communicates its processes related to effective teaching and learning with the exception of its general education requirements. A more clearly defined process may benefit the University in communicating with all constituents.

1P12, O. Southeast Missouri State University has developed a course delivery process that utilizes various delivery methods to address both students’ needs and the organization’s requirements that is based upon best practices from the National Center on Academic Transformation Practices. The University is a leader in the Missouri Alliance for Collaborative Education, which allows institutions to collaborate on course delivery. Southeast Missouri State University has completed a Course Redesign Action project and implementation of Quality Matters to certify online course quality. However, while a variety of processes have been undertaken, Southeast Missouri State University has an opportunity to review and evaluate these new processes and their efficacy in relation to student learning.

1P13,14 O. Southeast Missouri State University acknowledges implementation of a new program review process that incorporates curriculum review, modification, and elimination of programs, incorporating feedback from various internal and external stakeholders before changing a course or discontinuing a program. Southeast Missouri State University has an opportunity to develop and assess its new program review process and results for program improvement. An additional opportunity exists to use input from advisory committees and other outside sources to determine the relevance of courses, changes that should be made to courses, and which courses should be discontinued.

1P15, O. Southeast Missouri State University discusses the involvement of various internal offices and programs in addressing the learning support needs of students and faculty. However, it is unclear how information is gathered, assessed, and utilized for informed decision-making beyond an ad hoc approach. A clearly defined process can assist the various units in making good decisions regarding new or changed programs and services, and inform the assessment of the value of changes and services.

1P16, S. Southeast Missouri State University describes a variety of ways the academic and student service areas have collaborated to connect co-curricular activities with
learning objectives. The activities range from individual department groups and events to campus-wide speakers or events. The institution has made a commitment to engage students in learning outside the classroom and the various units have worked to collaborate effectively in the best interests of students.

1P17, S. Southeast Missouri State University has developed an institution-wide system for the assessment of student learning. Student learning outcomes are developed at the department and program level by faculty and the responsibility for reporting is shared by faculty and deans. The institution has reviewed and refined the process to help collect the most useful data to inform program change. Several institutional committees and offices are assigned responsibility for collecting, assessing and reporting on data. Funding is made available to help correct areas where issues have been identified.

1P18, O. Southeast Missouri State University has recently revised its Student Learning Outcomes assessment process to increase faculty involvement in designing, conducting, and using the results of assessment and to provide more data useful in identifying changes to promote student learning. An opportunity exists for the University to clarify how the assessment findings are used to impact improvement.

1R1, O. While Southeast Missouri State University presents a wide variety of assessment measures that it collects and analyzes, there are only a few that represent a comprehensive assessment of all students. An opportunity exits to demonstrate how the assessments align with desired outcomes and data are analyzed to improve student learning.

1R2, O. Southeast Missouri State University provided data on the two assessments that are given to all students. There is no clear indication of a comprehensive review and subsequent action related to the English proficiency declines, which occurred in both 2012 and 2013. It is unclear what the research strategy was for engaging with the ETS proficiency profile, as it is unclear what may be done with the results to improve student learning. Southeast Missouri State University may want to consider the questions that drive its assessment selection and outline the types of evidence related to student learning that would inform policy and practice in order to develop strategies for gathering and analyzing appropriate data.

1R3, S. Southeast Missouri State University demonstrated that it uses data to support individual student and program-area assessment in several areas including academic programs as well as co-curricular activities. The institution may consider using the co-
curricular activity process as a model for other areas of the University.

1R4, S. Southeast Missouri State University has evidence of student accomplishment in a number of areas where comparisons on national indicators show its students performing better than the national average.

1R5, O. The performance data for learning support processes seems to be primarily reporting utilization, which does not necessarily equate to satisfaction or student learning. It is not evident how benchmarks are defined or how assessments are selected and utilized. For example, NSSE data was utilized to make some changes to advising; however, subsequent scores did not increase and no defined analysis of related factors was provided. Southeast Missouri State University may want to consider multiple data points, such as identifying data on students not currently making use of these resources, and use this data to improve services.

1R6, O. Southeast Missouri State University collects and evaluates a number of data sources. Establishing internal targets for data sets and locating external benchmarks, in addition to an in-depth inquiry about students’ persistence and completion rates, may yield new actions for improvement.

1I1, O. Southeast Missouri State University has made a number of improvements in student learning process areas, but it is unclear how these changes led to systematic and comprehensive enhancements in student learning. The University has the opportunity to focus on strengthening key processes and using comparative measures that will enhance the infrastructure by providing data for decision-making in the Category Helping Students Learn.

1I2, S. The leadership at Southeast Missouri State University is clearly supportive of the many committee, council, and task force focused efforts to advance the institution’s quality agenda. The institution presents evidence of being committed to furthering a continuous quality improvement culture.

**AQIP Category 2: Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives.** This category addresses the processes that contribute to the achievement of the institution’s major objectives that complement student learning and fulfill other portions of its mission. Depending on the institution’s character, it examines the institution’s processes and systems related to identification of other distinctive objectives, alignment of other distinctive objectives, faculty and staff roles, assessment and review of objectives, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to
continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Southeast Missouri State University** for Category 2.

**Southeast Missouri State University** has identified several important Distinctive Objectives and uses an established process to identify objectives, there is a lack of concrete data linked to goal attainment and improvements based upon the results of data analysis. Further, there are not clear connections between these distinctive objectives and overall student goals. Outlining how activities relate to the overall mission and goals of the institution and/or meet an identified gap may help **Southeast Missouri State University** target improvement efforts. Expanding specific measures and results from multiple internal and external stakeholders may provide an opportunity to integrate and align culture and infrastructure for specific targeted goals with substantiated results moving towards quality improvement in this category.

2P1, O. The mission, values and goals serve as the foundation for the design and operation of key non-instructional processes. There may be an opportunity to develop a framework that can provide objective criteria for prioritizing activities.

2P2, S. Objectives for non-instructional programs and services are developed, communicated, and assessed through the annual strategic planning review process. This process involves stakeholders throughout the campus as well as external members of the community.

2P3, S. Communication of expectations regarding non-instructional objectives takes place within the Strategic Planning process, at public campus forums, in meetings of the Administrative and Dean’s Councils, at Chair Forums, in letters from the President to the campus community, and on the University website. After review, accomplishments are shared with the campus community at the President’s State of the University address in the fall with copies distributed to all employees.

2P4, O. It appears that the Board of Trustees and Executive Team drive the review and assessment of non-instructional objectives with little evidence of stakeholder involvement in the development of these plans. Additional direct and more frequent feedback, perhaps on a yearly basis from community members and units and departments that manage these objectives on a day-to-day basis could be helpful to the institution as it evaluates these objectives.

2P5, O. In determining faculty needs relative to the education of athletes, there is an opportunity for **Southeast Missouri State University** to draw upon established resources,
such as its Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, student tutors and others. There appears to be a limited scope in the Athletics Committee’s function in this regard; approaching faculty and the president for changes to student athletes’ course schedules and rewarding faculty who adhere to these changes. There is an opportunity to help faculty learn about the special education needs of student athletes as well as a responsibility to help student athletes adhere to the demands of their schedule.

2P6, O. It is not clear how faculty and staff information is used to readjust objectives. The process seems designed to develop goals and activities rather than gather input and feedback. Creating clearer processes for incorporating needs adjustments would provide for regular adjustments consistent with a dynamic improvement process. Records should also be kept that show what input was received and what actions were taken as a result of the input.

2R1, S. Southeast Missouri State University has identified measures for assessing non-instructional programs that are based upon external mandates as well as whether the program can serve as a revenue-generating initiative for the University.

2R2, O. The performance results on student athletes are impressive; the retention and graduation success rates are high, and higher than the average Southeast Missouri State University student rates. There is an opportunity to analyze and report the same comparative results in other areas, such as cumulative GPA, and to keep the reporting consistent for each of the non-instructional objectives. For example, number of athletes with external academic honors might be reported as a percentage to be consistent with the first four measures in the 2R2.1 table.

2R3, O. Southeast Missouri State University identified two outcomes, percent of alumni giving and book and journal titles per staff member as comparison performance measures with other higher education organizations. The University may benefit from identifying additional comparative information measures that could assist in helping to set targets for improvement.

2R4, O. The results for these activities need to be tied back to the overall University goals and mission because it is unclear how these goals fit into the overall mission. It certainly seems plausible that some or all of these Other Distinctive Objectives help students meet the overall undergraduate and graduate goals but no connection is demonstrated in the portfolio.
Southeast Missouri State University uses its annual review of progress on Strategic Planning goals as the primary mechanism for identifying areas to improve and set performance targets in Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives.

**AQIP Category 3: Understanding Students’ and Other Stakeholders’ Needs.** This category examines how your institution works actively to understand student and other stakeholder needs. It examines your institution’s processes and systems related to student and stakeholder identification; student and stakeholder requirements; analysis of student and stakeholder needs; relationship building with students and stakeholders; complaint collection, analysis, and resolution; determining satisfaction of students and stakeholders; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Southeast Missouri State University** for Category 3.

*With its history of continuous improvement and multiple data sources, Southeast Missouri State University has a unique opportunity to be a model for how these various efforts can be more clearly interconnected. Ensuring that goals are measurable as they are developed, identifying what data will be collected at what time to monitor progress, when corrections or improvements will be monitored and how success will be measured would truly complete the loop. A focus on connecting the analysis of performance results with the planning process and implementation of process improvements could benefit the university. Furthermore, developing a systematic process in regards to how employees from different levels and functional areas of the organization participate in this process may be beneficial in improving results in its relations with students and other stakeholders’ needs.*

**3P1, S.** Southeast Missouri State University has a well-developed, mature process for gathering input on student needs that includes incoming assessments, surveys, faculty feedback, advising and more. Southeast Missouri State University solicits direct input on the needs of students through its Student Government Association structure, where a faculty liaison is a member of Student Senate and meets with students and administrators as part of a formal interactive consultative process as well as leadership development (mentoring) opportunities for Student Senate Officers. Goals and gaps have been identified and the University has developed means to close the gaps and meet goals. Student life and event issues might identify different needs than student housing; however, the overarching administration monitors all reports and area improvements. Feedback loops are in place and assessment tools have been identified.
3P2, S. Southeast Missouri State University has worked to develop a culture of inclusion and relationship building. It achieves this through offering small class sizes, intrusive advising and direct interaction with faculty. Entry programs designed to foster engagement; a weeklong extensive orientation program; and opportunities for students to get involved in a variety of co-curricular activities are other ways Southeast Missouri State University attends to its relationship with students.

3P3, S. Southeast Missouri State University administers a variety of surveys to collect information from both internal and external resources. It also relies on a variety of venues for developing and maintaining relationships with key stakeholders. For example, multiple advisory boards have been established to inform the institution in matters pertaining to curriculum and student success. The President also formed the Academic Visioning Committee to work with the Southeast Missouri State University community in conveying recommendations for new or enhanced academic programs.

3P4, S. Southeast Missouri State University recognizes the value of building and maintaining relationships with key stakeholders as evidenced by examples provided. University Advancement development officers use four primary states to build and maintain relationships with donors/stakeholders: 1) identify, 2) cultivate, 3) solicit, and 4) steward. The President and Executive staff are very involved in the community through boards, clubs, and other activities and University Advancement has a strategic approach to building relationships with donors and alumni.

3P5, S. Southeast Missouri State University has a systematic process for identifying new, potential student and stakeholder groups, and all decisions are grounded in its capacity and funding questions. Southeast Missouri State University determines the need to target new audiences through its department and program areas as well as through the Southeast Missouri State University region. This process is clearly delineated and typically begins at the foundational level with the department or external stakeholder making the request and providing the initial data to support the request. The institution has carefully planned for growth in sub-groups like international and online students, and pilots are typically created as the starting point for new initiatives.

3P6, O. Processes for regularly aggregating and analyzing complaint data from all areas and programs would help Southeast Missouri State University proactively identify opportunities for improvement. Current processes could be described as isolated and reactive and not aligned in a way that could yield insights into patterns or trends. It is
unclear whether there is a systematic approach to logging all complaints and assessing regularly to assure that trends are addressed in a timely fashion at the appropriate levels.

3R1, S. Southeast Missouri State University has a clear commitment to collecting data related to student satisfaction. Student and other stakeholder satisfaction is determined with informal and formal interactions, and measures of student and other stakeholder satisfaction are gathered from surveys and institutional data. Southeast Missouri State University’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment collects a variety of data from the NSSE, IRP, IPEDS retention and graduation data, BSSE, HERI, and the Great Colleges Survey – Chronicle Survey to measure student and other stakeholder satisfaction on a regular basis.

3R2, O. While Southeast Missouri State University has collected some student satisfaction measures and those of comparable institutions, it did not collect the Graduating Student Survey in 2013. There does not seem to have been a consistent effort to look at the differences between Southeast Missouri State University data and those of its comparison institutions and why Southeast Missouri State University is below the averages of its peers. There is also an opportunity for Southeast Missouri State University to collect and analyze data on the impact of student satisfaction on changes made in the University’s advising program.

3R3, O. Southeast Missouri State University provides some direct measures of building relationships with students. Performance results showing trend analysis for building relationships with students are provided from the NSSE, IPEDS, CIRP, and BSSE survey data. However, selective data from a broad set of questions in national surveys may not necessarily represent the voice of the students that are exposed to the services and activities identified in 3P2 as mechanisms to build relationships. The consistent collection of an internal data set could provide the institution with performance results that better indicate Southeast Missouri State University’s level of success with building relationships with its students.

3R4, O. Southeast Missouri State University has recognized its opportunity to engage faculty in terms of job satisfaction, and as noted in the portfolio, the new provost has identified improvement on the job satisfaction scale as a goal with a focus on improving lines of communication between faculty and administration. While the indirect measures from the surveys that are mentioned provide a glimpse of stakeholder satisfaction, it
could benefit the institution to collect data on a broader scale as opposed to focusing on faculty desire with working and staying at Southeast Missouri State University. Additionally, contributions to the foundation are an indirect measure of givers’ satisfaction with the institution.

**3R5, S.** Data collected on community participation in events and services offer an indirect measure of positive stakeholder satisfaction. HERI data show lower ratings than for the comparison group for faculty relationships with administration, and faculty perception of involvement in campus decision-making. Southeast Missouri State University has made a concerted effort to emphasize shared governance and to encourage faculty to take an active part in governance to improve its performance results.

**3R6, S.** The institution collects a variety of survey and interview information to inform change, and several surveys are nationally normed. The institution monitors both its personal goals and its comparative standing when compared to similar institutions of higher education.

**3I1, O.** Southeast Missouri State University collects a large amount of student and stakeholder needs information, and reports improvements in several areas including the addition of several committees, teams, and subcommittees to use the performance data results to invoke change. However, a process to prioritize the needs of student and stakeholders could help to ensure that improvements were attempted through a somewhat systematic method. The University’s position that it has made improvements would be strengthened if it were to describe systematic and comprehensive processes for making, and tracking, such improvements.

**3I2, S.** Southeast Missouri State University presents evidence of being committed to furthering a continuous quality improvement culture - a key theme of being an AQIP institution. Continued commitment to gathering, sharing, and using data to drive decision-making that involves the faculty, student, and staff senates will contribute to the University’s quality journey.

**AQIP Category 4: Valuing People.** This category explores the institution’s commitment to the development of its employees since the efforts of all faculty, staff, and administrators are required for institutional success. It examines the institution’s processes and systems related to
work and job environment; workforce needs; training initiatives; job competencies and
cost attributes; recruitment, hiring, and retention practices; work processes and activities;
training and development; personnel evaluation; recognition, reward, compensation, and
benefits; motivation factors; satisfaction, health and safety, and well-being; measures; analysis
of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team
identified various strengths and opportunities for **Southeast Missouri State University** for
Category 4.

*Southeast Missouri State University has an opportunity to develop and implement systematic
approaches to measuring and responding to all segments of employees' concerns and needs.
The institution describes a limited number of processes to gather information regarding Valuing
People, creating an opportunity to expand its data collection by adopting multiple measures
capable of comparison to other institutions. It is unclear how the HERI survey results have been
used to formalize and align processes for Valuing People with the organization's goals. In future
portfolios, the institution needs to demonstrate how it analyzes results and who and how
decisions are made as to what improvements are needed.*

4P1, S. Southeast Missouri State University has job descriptions that are relevant to the
duties of each position, as defined at the department level. Human Resources
establishes position descriptions and submits support documentation for review of
appropriate classification relative to similar positions nationally and all faculty positions
include a multicultural and awareness of issues affecting women and minorities
statement of commitment. All unique changes to the standard work descriptions are
approved at the Executive level of the university.

4P2, S. Southeast Missouri State University has established specific multi-step
processes for reviewing, interviewing, and hiring on all campuses. Human Resources
oversees the hiring process to make sure that all processes are consistent and
equitable. The evaluation criteria and processes are also reviewed by the Office of
Equity and Diversity Issues to ensure that the institution is seeking diverse, and well-
qualified faculty and staff for each position.

4P3, S. Processes for recruiting, hiring, and retaining employees on all campuses are
specified in the Staff Handbook and the hiring process follows the steps outlined in the
Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Policy. The Center for Scholarship in
Teaching and Learning provides ongoing support to faculty and a Teaching
Enhancement workshop helps new faculty interact with more seasoned co-workers. The
university implemented Neogov, an electronic recruitment and employment software program and the administration annually reviews relevant data on salary and benefit initiatives and employee retention.

**4P5, O.** Southeast Missouri State University’s Strategic Plan includes development of succession plans for recruiting and retaining excellent and diverse faculty and staff due to an increased number of projected retirements. An opportunity exists for the University to develop a comprehensive succession-planning document that includes an examination of current needs, future needs, anticipated vacancies and other longitudinal staffing information. This plan could be linked to both the overall planning and budgeting processes to ensure the long-term success of the University. The plan might also include steps to help develop current employees as well as recruiting people from the outside.

**4P6, O.** While Southeast Missouri State University provides for input from employees at various levels, it is unclear how work processes and activities are designed so that they contribute to the organization’s productivity and employee well-being. Implementation of process maps, workflow processes, preselected measures, and regular assessments for employee productivity and satisfaction may assist Southeast Missouri State University in improving not only employee experiences, but in establishing a culture that focuses on process improvement. Such input, especially if given in anonymity, could be used in conjunction with the HERI and other data to more effectively monitor progress in this area.

**4P7, S.** Southeast Missouri State University has a strong training and support program in place to ensure that faculty, staff, and administrators understand their ethical responsibilities. Southeast Missouri State University also has several HR documents that define high standards of ethical conduct for faculty and staff. Several offices are charged with the responsibility to oversee and enforce these ethical policies and procedures.

**4P9, S.** Southeast Missouri State University offers a wide variety of professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. The Provost Office has recently added training for new chairs and deans and is developing training for professional staff who are interested in progressing to administrative positions. Southeast Missouri State University utilizes its professional development programs as the primary means through which its faculty and staff are encouraged to contribute fully throughout their careers.

**4P10, S.** Faculty evaluations are tied to the strategic planning objectives. Processes are detailed through a variety of resources, and have been developed over time with faculty
and administrative input. The criteria for tenure, promotion, and merit pay reflects a working understanding of the role of faculty as teacher-scholars who serve the University and the community. The university is working to align performance expectations with program objectives for consistency and to ensure equality.

4P11, S. Southeast Missouri State University’s strategic plan is used to assess its objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and the president, through individual and team excellence awards, recognizes services and employee contributions to the institution. These awards and recognition combine to send a very strong message about the high value the institution places on continuous learning. In addition, Southeast Missouri State University has completed a benefit study and market analysis and a compensation equity study to achieve cost savings as well as assure competitive salaries.

4P12, O. While Southeast Missouri State University has informal mechanisms in place to gather employee satisfaction and motivation, and administers two national surveys, it is not clear that there is any systematic approach to reviewing this information and developing strategies to address areas of concern. The HERI appears to be the sole systematic measure employed at Southeast Missouri State University to inquire into employee motivation and satisfaction even though many venues and opportunities exist for all employees to convey concerns and discuss issues. The institution’s development of a communications plan may be supported by engaging all employees in an assessment of campus climate.

4R2, O. Southeast Missouri State University recognizes that its HERI Faculty Survey result data fall below those of peer groups. Opportunities exist to continue to examine trend data and create future targets to make improvements in Valuing People. The University could build on its past success in tracking faculty members’ job satisfaction by extending these measures to staff employees, using an adapted form of the HERI instrument. The Institution might also benefit from examining how subgroups of faculty members respond to the HERI survey.

4R3, S. Southeast Missouri State University has integrated the effectiveness question with the strategic planning process, and the institution’s provost has made a commitment to improve open communication among faculty and staff groups. The University is systematically addressing areas of concern with a focus on quality improvement. Data provided show that faculty, staff and administration are helping the institution achieve
enrollment goals and productivity standards. Southeast Missouri State University is also working to bring external validation through program-specific accreditation.

4R4, O. The University has an opportunity to focus on improvement of processes, set new targets, collect and analyze results, and prioritize to achieve greater success. Southeast Missouri State University reports no direct results for the performance of its processes for Valuing People nor systematic or trend data to indicate the productivity and effectiveness of faculty, staff, and administrators in helping the institution achieve its goals.

4I1, O. Southeast Missouri State University indicated a number of areas of improvement designed to improve communication, yet no concrete data were provided. It is important to tie data and planning to output. Anecdotal input appears to be the methodology utilized for determining initiatives.

4I2, S. This category is a priority for the university as evidenced by the planning process and procedural changes made to incorporate a culture of shared governance. A shared governance action project was completed in 2011 to help address the culture related to valuing employees. It resulted in a number of initiatives and development of permanent practices. Although budget constraints have had an impact, Southeast Missouri State University is working to identify areas where employees can be recognized for good work and where all employee groups have a voice in the decision-making process.

AQIP Category 5: Leading and Communicating. This category addresses how the institution’s leadership and communication structures, networks, and processes guide planning, decision-making, seeking future opportunities, and building and sustaining a learning environment. It examines the institution’s processes and systems related to leading activities, communicating activities, alignment of leadership system practices, institutional values and expectations, direction-setting, use of data, analysis of results, leadership development and sharing, succession planning, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southeast Missouri State University for Category 5.

Southeast Missouri State University is developing a culture of data collection and analysis, yet the process of analysis and review is not yet systematic and fully integrated throughout the organization. Regular analysis of measures that have been predetermined to be reliable performance indicators for its efforts and that are aligned to the institution’s strategic goals may
strengthen data review. Leadership might then align the results that it reports with those pre-selected measures. Especially helpful could be data on the same measures collected over multiple years (permitting trend analysis) and on comparative measures (allowing for external benchmarking). Such a comprehensive approach may allow leaders to be more intentional in planning actions to take aimed at improving both the results reported and the success of the institution in fulfilling its mission. Further, an integrated approach involving flow from upper administration and other constituent groups across the campus may provide further insight into decision-making processes.

**5P1, S.** Southeast Missouri State University’s mission, vision, and values are defined and reviewed through a cyclical strategic-planning process. The Strategic Planning process reviews and modifies, as appropriate, the vision and mission, and establishes goals and objectives for a five-year period. A strategic planning external consultant is used to lead the strategic-planning revision process and is intentionally inclusive using input from faculty, staff, students, and key University Foundation and community leaders for Board of Regents distillation. The institution may want to consider conducting the process on its own eventually, utilizing dedicated staff, and modifying the process to meet Southeast Missouri State University’s evolving needs and priorities.

**5P2, S.** Southeast Missouri State University has well established planning processes in place that involve representation from key stakeholders and all constituent groups. Long-range planning is linked to short-range planning and short-term goals grow out of long-term goals. Progress is regularly monitored and commitment to improvement pervades the entire process. At this point, the University is poised to ensure that all goals are not only measurable but that the measurements to be used are clearly spelled out, and that data are regularly collected, evaluated, and tied to goal attainment. Improvements can then grow out of the data analysis and these improvements can also be monitored.

**5P3, O.** While Southeast Missouri State University has a well-established planning process, much of the information regarding the needs and expectations of students and other stakeholders appears to be anecdotal. Using information gathered from contact with various groups is important but might be strengthened through more formal channels of gathering key data for decision-makers. Southeast Missouri State University could benefit from a clear process that is more responsive to emerging opportunities and the changing needs of its current and potential students and other key stakeholder groups.
5P4, O. The President and members of the Executive Staff use data and data derived from various documents to make decisions. The university seeks new and innovative means to provide courses to students through a variety of delivery modalities. Yet, there appears a strong opportunity for increased work with Student Services and Academic Affairs departments that have more direct contact with students and the faculty who report on learning outcomes as leadership make decisions about future opportunities. While the systems are in place to ensure that administrators are focused on student achievement, an opportunity exists for Southeast Missouri State University to create a fully integrated system.

5P5, O. The University has a large number of committees and councils, most of whom report through the Provost. They are described as recommending groups with final decision-making done at the Trustee level. It is difficult to determine where authority is vested and whether there is a systematic way for decisions to be made and carried out. If a system truly does not exist, a more formal structure that allocates decision-making authority at appropriate levels, would help to involve staff in governance and streamline high-level decision-making.

5P6, O. Southeast Missouri State University has a history of systematically reviewing and evaluating various performance data to inform decision-making processes. Data are available through iDashboards and the revitalized key performance indicators to inform decisions. Faculty positions are allocated based on data such as student credit hour production. An opportunity exists to further enhance this process by incorporating a systematic review of the sources of data collected to ensure that they continue to be the most relevant and meaningful data with respect to specific goals and objectives.

5P7, O. Southeast Missouri State University presumes communication moves both upwards and downwards in its administrative structure through processes such as departmental meetings, college councils, the twice-weekly campus Newswire, and the President’s “Dear Colleague” letters. The Provost facilitates opportunities for faculty and staff to ask questions during meetings instead of following a prepared agenda to enable communication. Yet, these communication channels are examples of information flowing from upper administration, while the processes are less clear regarding how input is sought from important constituent groups. An opportunity exists for Southeast Missouri State University to more clearly outline the communication process and to establish measurements of how well the communication flows.
5P8, O. While Southeast Missouri State University outlines how communication happens within the institution, it does not articulate how the shared mission, vision and values are utilized to deepen and reinforce a high performance organization. The portfolio describes various communication venues for internal communication, but there is an opportunity to detail how these venues are utilized to specifically address shared mission vision and values that would serve to deepen and reinforce the characteristics of high performance institutions. Clearly defining this strategy would help to assure that the institution is pursuing a high performance strategy.

5P10, S. Southeast Missouri State University links leadership development and succession planning to its Strategic Plan’s management of administrative human capital. Southeast Missouri State University has prepared for succession by developing associate leaders who are able to perform interim duties and provide a continuation of institutional knowledge in that specific role while a formal search is conducted. Faculty who aspire to positions in upper administration or who show leadership skills in committee or department positions may be encouraged to enter into an interim position, to be mentored and receive leadership experience.

5R1 O. An opportunity exists to identify and develop performance measures to assess the effectiveness of this category for continuous improvement. This might include personal development plans from all administrators that set measurable goals for enhancing student achievement, responding to emerging opportunities, and working to keep abreast of current and emerging trends. The plans could include how the information learned will be shared with the larger University community. The lessons gleaned from the completion of these development plans can help drive further University improvements.

5R2, O. The majority of the results reported reflect downward trends in performance. An opportunity exists to identify, develop, and link mechanisms to measure the effectiveness of Southeast Missouri State University’s processes and measures. Linking measures to those who set, evaluate, and are accountable for goals could help Southeast Missouri State University evaluate its approach, identify performance gaps, and develop continuous improvement strategies in Leading and Communicating.

5R3, O. As noted, the results in this category do not compare favorably with other educational institutions. Downward trend results support Southeast Missouri State University’s effort to enhance communication and establish leadership as priorities.
through its Strategic Plan. Southeast Missouri State University has an opportunity to provide performance appraisal results of communication and leadership by comparing itself to other institutions. The institution might benefit from further research or more strategic activities related to this comparative information.

5I1, S. The improvements listed are focused on interaction and professional development and both have the potential to provide quality improvement in terms of leading and communication at the university. The response includes descriptions of several successful improvement projects, all reflecting changes in direction based on thoughtful consideration of both relevant local data and information about best practices. Strategies that engage the faculty and staff have the potential to inform change and assist with planning implementation.

5I2 O. While Southeast Missouri State University has made a commitment to shared governance, improved communication, and set up a structure of committees to address key areas of the institution; how these committees determine key data to use for decision-making and how they identify actions to take to improve the institution are not clear. Southeast Missouri State University is working to further identify the infrastructures needed to improve and set targets for performance in Leading and Communicating. Southeast Missouri State University might benefit from putting into place infrastructures that are systematic and all-inclusive.

AQIP Category 6: Supporting Institutional Operations. This category addresses the variety of institutional support processes that help to provide an environment in which learning can thrive. It examines the institution’s processes and systems related to student support, administrative support, identification of needs, contribution to student learning and accomplishing other distinctive objectives, day-to-day operations, use of data, measures, analysis of results, and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southeast Missouri State University for Category 6.

*Southeast Missouri State University identifies instructional support needs by analyzing the results from a variety of measures. Southeast Missouri State University lists units and metrics it uses to gauge progress, yet results were not provided for all measurements in this category. An opportunity exists to develop and present, in greater detail, the processes in place for the institution. If the institution creates systematic and comprehensive processes for prioritizing,
planning and implementing improvements relative to Supporting Institutional Operations overall, the institution could respond more effectively to the opportunities it has identified and will be able to identify additional opportunities for improvement.

6P1, S. The support service needs of students and other key stakeholder groups are identified through processes involving standing committees and teams, organizational units, surveys, advisory boards, and ad hoc work groups charged with assessing stakeholder needs. Southeast Missouri State University provides examples of various processes through which organizational units and groups identify support service needs for key stakeholders in Tables 6P1.1 – 6P1.3.

6P2, O. Southeast Missouri State University collects administrative support service needs information from its employees through a variety of means; however, most are informal in nature. Whether the institution has developed formal data collection methods to ascertain administrative support needs is not clear, and Southeast Missouri State University may be limited in its ability to identify proactively when those needs are changing. The institution may benefit from developing a process that pro-actively and systematically gathers and analyzes data to anticipate changes in administrative support needs and more efficiently deploys the needed improvements.

6P3, S. Southeast Missouri State University staff designs and maintains physical safety and security processes with the help of internal (students, faculty and staff) as well as external (Department of Public Safety) input. In 2009, as part of an Emergency Preparedness Action Project, the university developed an emergency response system. This system and other campus safety information are communicated to the campus community on Southeast Missouri State University’s website as well as via the university’s cable access channel and newspaper.

6P4, O. Southeast Missouri State University’s informal and institutionalized feedback mechanisms address the needs and expectations of its stakeholders through shared governance, special meetings, one-on-one meetings with supervisors, and surveys. Day-to-day activities are managed through the University’s documented policies and procedures which allows for consistency and flexibility. However, it is unclear how the university ensures they are addressing the anticipated needs.

6P5, O. The university has an opportunity to develop processes that can document support activities to ensure that they are meeting all stakeholders’ needs and which encourage knowledge sharing, innovation and empowerment to foster change.
Southeast Missouri State University could benefit from an intentional means such as process mapping, project documentation, centralized location for documentation storage, and measures which track the effectiveness/impact of its support efforts. Implementing a deliberate method designed not only to release information but also to encourage innovation and empowerment might enable the institution to better meet the support needs of its stakeholders.

6R1, OO. While Southeast Missouri State University lists a number of relevant measures for student and stakeholder support, there are a number of expected indicators (for example, technology support) that are not included in the portfolio descriptions. While the introduction to this section talked about the importance of technological advancement and services for veteran students, neither have representative indicators described. A more comprehensive approach to gathering and utilizing data may provide more consistent and inclusive information to inform decision-making processes.

6R2, O. With the exception of the direct measures of student advising and counseling services, the performance results provided in this category do not provide direct results for student processes related to support services. Many measures, such as NSSE and BSSE surveys provide good information about students and give institutions ideas about student support services that should be provided. However, these instruments provide only correlational data about the quality or success of student support services already in place. Southeast Missouri State University has the opportunity to develop measures aligned to understand its student support services and collect this data regularly in order to inform change and improvements.

6R3, O. Southeast Missouri State University has an opportunity to identify tools to measure and analyze communication satisfaction efforts from the communication Action Project, efforts by the Faculty Senate, and enhanced actions of the Provost to improve communication on campus. How the data provided contributes to a comprehensive improvement plan is not clear. Ensuring that targeted projects are having the desired results is an element of continuous quality improvement. Southeast Missouri State University is encouraged to measure progress on such projects and to share results with employees and other key stakeholders.

6R4, O. Southeast Missouri State University reports that it collects and shares performance results, but it is unclear how retention and grievance data are actually used to plan and implement process improvements and what processes support those
improvement efforts. The institution could benefit from a well-defined process identification and evaluation system by which the appropriate processes are aligned with measures and decision-makers use relevant data to inform improvement. Southeast Missouri State University has a further opportunity to measure and analyze the satisfaction of the one-stop experience reorganization for the offices that provide student support services.

6R5, O. Southeast Missouri State University provides comparison data from the NSSE, HERI, and the Great Colleges Survey-Chronicle Survey for Staff; however it is unclear how these data are used to make decisions or how it contributes to the overall comprehensive improvement plan for the university.

6I1, O. Guided by the University's Strategic Plan, Southeast Missouri State University lists several improvements that have been made through the governance, planning, and budgeting processes; however, it is unclear how or what processes determined the necessity of the particular improvements presented. Opportunities exist to develop a systematic and comprehensive approach for processes and performance results for Supporting Institutional Operations.

6I2, O. While Southeast Missouri State University demonstrates a commitment to continuous quality improvement, collecting relevant data in administrative support processes is crucial to identifying areas for improvement. An opportunity exists for the University to describe how the culture and infrastructure assists in improving and setting targets for improvement throughout these processes. Potential targets and plans to systematize data gathering and analysis for improvement in this area might include targeted analysis of stakeholder satisfaction related to decreasing budgets and increasing enrollment.

**AQIP Category 7: Measuring Effectiveness.** This category examines how the institution collects, analyzes, and uses information to manage itself and to drive performance improvement. It examines the institution's processes and systems related to collection, storage, management, and use of information and data both at the institutional and departmental/unit levels. It considers institutional measures of effectiveness; information and data alignment with institutional needs and directions; comparative information and data; analysis of information and data; effectiveness of information system and processes; measures; analysis of results; and
efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for Southeast Missouri State University for Category 7.

Southeast Missouri State University has processes in place to collect data to measure effectiveness of satisfaction of institutional services. However, these are limited in nature and there is no discussion on how the data are reviewed or assessed to maintain or change action, programs, and services. Southeast Missouri State University might benefit from intentionally selecting, tracking, and reporting its performance on certain strategically selected data points that leaders believe will indicate how well the institution promotes the use and reporting of data in its efforts to measure its effectiveness. Further, tracking changes for effectiveness over time will allow the institution to not just list changes, but identify which changes actually lead to improvements in key areas of interest.

7P1, S. Institutional Research and Academic Assessment (IRAA) responds to state and federal requirements for data reporting, manages data required for internal and external reporting and answers queries from publications. The Office of the Provost, working with the deans, uses a Key Performance Indicators report to monitor performance in key areas. Data is managed through SCT Banner. A University Fact Book has been reviewed and replaced with a Fact List that will allow for dynamic inquiry using iDashboards.

7P2, O. Southeast Missouri State University indicates that programmatic needs for improvement determine the selection, management, and distribution of performance information to support planning and improvement efforts. However, how data are used to determine those needs is unclear. Southeast Missouri State University has an opportunity to establish a process for selecting and managing data and performance information that may help the university maintain its focus on quality and continuous improvement.

7P4, O. While there are notable examples of use of data to make informed decisions, there is significant variability across the campus and no systematic approach to using data even for the most strategic decisions. There appears to be recognition that data is important in the decision-making process, but Southeast Missouri State University would benefit from determining a more integrated, systematic, and comprehensive strategy for gathering, making sense of, and utilizing data for systematic improvement.

7P5, S. Southeast Missouri State University selects comparative data by the intended use of the data, the level of analysis required, the availability of appropriate comparative
data, and as required by external requirements. The university uses its accrediting agencies as a source of comparative data. The VSA requires a specific set of data to be collected and posted with data from other institutions used for comparative purposes. Salary determinations are made using both internal and external (CUPA) data.

7P6, O. The IRAA Office ensures the consistency and accuracy of the data it provides to units and departments of the university; however how Southeast Missouri State University aligns its organizational goals for instructional and non-instructional programs and services is not provided. Further, there appears to be a disconnect between information provided throughout the remainder of the Portfolio. The institution would benefit from practice that follows these statements of policy. The new iDashboard, key performance indicators, and fact book may help with this effort.

7P7, S. Information Technology is the main unit responsible for ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability, and security of information systems and related processes. SCT Banner warehouses raw data and is updated each night. Data is double-checked for accuracy. All data/numbers for the iDashboards are retrieved from the same data source for consistency, and they are cross-checked and reviewed to assure data accuracy when posted to the dashboard.

7R1, O. Information Technology at Southeast Missouri State University collects operational data including bandwidth, portal usage, email traffic, server performance, and network performance. Trend data is measured by IT Live Systems Monitoring, open computer lab usage, technology training satisfaction, and the IRAA Satisfaction Survey. An opportunity exists for the university to track and evaluate overall institutional performance for the systems used in selecting and managing relevant data and performance results.

7R2, O. Southeast Missouri State University provides evidence in Tables 7R2.1-7R2.6 along with data analyzed by the IT staff via real-time viewing, but it is unclear how these data are used as part of a comprehensive improvement process. Southeast Missouri State University has an opportunity to identify data to demonstrate that Southeast Missouri State University is integrating institutional needs systematically in accomplishing its strategic mission and goals.

7R3, OO. Southeast Missouri State University acknowledges it has an opportunity to develop a set of similar institutions where the university can benchmark key data results.
The lack of benchmarks can lead to both under- and over-estimation of challenges and successes.

**711, O.** Southeast Missouri State University lists multiple improvements in the Information Technology area. However, it is not evident how Southeast Missouri State University uses the results from measuring effectiveness to direct improvements or how performance results are used in a systematic and comprehensive method. For example, the institution notes the implementation of a new dashboard system as an improvement; however, the portfolio is not clear regarding how or what performance results were used to identify that the new Dashboard system was needed, or that the system is now used effectively. Establishing a systematic process to use data from the collection system, to identify gaps in performance, and to inform improvements may assist Southeast Missouri State University with gaining a full understanding of how well its processes for measuring effectiveness are operating.

**712, O.** It is unclear how targets for improvement are established and communicated to the university community through the IRAA department. The University could benefit from clearly defining its purpose and target assessments that continuously improve systems, rather than individual functions, and then communicate how those assessments may improve institutional effectiveness. Better clarity, showing which, or how, specific analysis of information drives the pursuit of projects would establish a stronger demonstration of the Southeast Missouri State University’s efforts in continuous quality improvement.

**AQIP Category 8: Planning Continuous Improvement.** This category examines the institution’s planning processes and how strategies and action plans are helping to achieve the institution’s mission and vision. It examines coordination and alignment of strategies and action plans; measures and performance projections; resource needs; faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities; analysis of performance projections and results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Southeast Missouri State University** for Category 8.

*Southeast Missouri State University describes quality improvement processes, such as strategic planning and shared governance, but it does not indicate how these processes support systematic performance improvement. The planning process involves stakeholders throughout the institution in formulating unit and departmental plans. Additional process development may*
be needed to align its plans and strategies, with integrated data and results to inform its planning processes. Furthermore, statewide metrics are available to facilitate comparisons across institutions and enhance efforts to design systems improvements. Yet, the portfolio provided limited evidence of peer comparison of strategies and objectives that inform planning continuous improvement. Opportunities exist to develop mission-driven, institutional-specific comparisons to peer institutions using performance results that relate to all five strategic priorities identified in this category.

8P1, S. Southeast Missouri State University’s key planning is done through its Strategic Plan which is revised and updated every four to five years and directs planning at the divisional, college and unit levels. The academic program review process requires departments to conduct a strategic review of programmatic goals and objectives at least every five years with key departmental indicators reported annually. As part of its planning process, Facilities Management maintains and updates a campus master plan.

8P2, 8 & P3 O. While Southeast Missouri State University indicates that short- and long-term goals are identified and processes are developed within the framework of the strategic plan, it is unclear what the processes are. Creating a more defined and universally understood system might help the institution better utilize its planning tools. Echoing the opportunity in the 2010 Systems Appraisal Feedback Report, Southeast Missouri State University has the opportunity to develop a process of determining how the action is implemented in terms of assignments, communication and timelines.

8P4, O. Southeast Missouri State University’s shared governance culture, manifested through a comprehensive committee system, allows for broad participation for all levels of the University. It is not described how the institution coordinates and aligns planning processes, organizational strategies, and actions plans across the various levels of the institution. The process could indicate who at the various levels is responsible for alignment, collecting results, and acting on those results to improve.

8P6, S. Institutional members at all levels are responsible for selecting strategies and linking them to a strategic goal and objective. The budget review process takes into consideration all strategies and their relevance to the Strategic Plan.

8P7, S. Southeast Missouri State University has defined risks in two significant areas: emergency preparedness and recognition of the current financial environment. The university has a history of dealing with the financial issues posed by enrollment fluctuations and state funding shifts, and the administration has developed strategies to
deal with changing resources while sustaining quality programs. As noted, the institution also recognizes the need to be prepared for environmental and human emergencies, and personnel have adopted clear processes and procedures to deal with a variety of scenarios.

8P8, S. Southeast Missouri State University demonstrates a high level of commitment to developing and nurturing faculty, staff, and administrator capabilities to address changing requirements demanded by internal and external environmental factors. The institution provides professional development funds at the departmental, divisional, and institutional levels; grants, summer workshops, technological training, and mentoring programs for leadership positions. The institution encourages both internal and external involvement and supports faculty and staff in these efforts.

8R1, O. The portfolio suggests that Southeast Missouri State University has identified measures aligned with key objectives that are evaluated and used as the basis to determine the extent to which the institution is successfully achieving its goals. There is an opportunity to put in place a process to further define accountability measures and evaluation of the planning process itself. Doing so might better inform the institution regarding the appropriateness of the processes used specific to overall institutional planning and budgeting endeavors.

8R3, O. Southeast Missouri State University could benefit from determining formalized measures to indicate its planning effectiveness for performance results related to strategies and action plans. Additional details of the priorities established by the institution would provide the reviewers with a greater sense of institutional performance. For example, increasing persistence and completion rates of underrepresented full-time degree-seeking students by 3%, and increasing STEM course enrollment by 2% and the results of these efforts.

8I1, O. Southeast Missouri State University lists some recent improvements but it is not clear how systematic and comprehensive the processes underlying these improvements are or how the results are being measured and linked to determine their effectiveness.

**AQIP Category 9: Building Collaborative Relationships.** This category examines the institution’s relationships – current and potential – to analyze how they contribute to the institution accomplishing its mission. It examines the institution’s processes and systems related
to identification of key internal and external collaborative relationships; alignment of key collaborative relationships; relationship creation, prioritization, and building; needs identification; internal relationships; measures; analysis of results; and efforts to continuously improve these areas. The Systems Appraisal Team identified various strengths and opportunities for **Southeast Missouri State University** for Category 9.

*Southeast Missouri State University is working to align planning with action projects and data collection efforts. The extent to which these improvements are directly connected to enhanced collaborative relationships is unclear. It places a priority on building relationships with stakeholders whenever it is in the best interest of students served, but does not clearly define how a partnership is assessed and determined to best serve students. Southeast Missouri State University has an opportunity to build a process that measures collaborative relationships more consistently and comprehensively. These measurements can then be tied to the strategic plan, strategies; work plans, and produce benchmark measurements that can be used for decision-making purposes and improvements to the institutions curricula and operations.*

9P1, S. Southeast Missouri State University has established relationships with a number of entities including area high schools, community organizations, and external partners. The University has also established relationships with organizations that enable under-represented students to enroll in college.

9P2, O. Although the University has a number of clearly defined relationships at the department level as well as some defined external relationships with area institutions and businesses, there does not seem to be a coordinated process for determining if a new relationship or an existing relationship adds value to the institutional mission and direction or assists students as they move on. Establishing clear criteria and processes could benefit the quality and quantity of collaborative relationships developed by the institution.

9P3, S. Southeast Missouri State University has a defined process for selecting vendors who support student operations for the institution. The shift in the campus bookstore to an external vendor is one example. A structured process is in place for bidding and awarding contracts which is dependent upon student and staff input and final approval by the Board of Regents.

9P4, S. Southeast Missouri State University appears to have strong relationships with other organizations and suppliers in its operation region. For example, statutes require the institution to solicit bids for long-term contracts that contain options which allow for
extensions when appropriate, which help to build and sustain relationships. A strong emphasis is placed upon the involvement of leaders within the division and their direct connections with various stakeholder groups. When feasible, input from the University community is included in the process.

9P5, S. Southeast Missouri State University creates and builds relationships with stakeholders through workforce development, articulation agreements, Foundation, grants, an advancement department, alumni outreach campaign, and a long list of goodwill activities that the institution participates in or hosts within the community. Southeast Missouri State University has spearheaded the coordination of MACE, a regional partnership of higher education institutions. As a member of this partnership, Southeast Missouri State University is developing further articulation agreements with regional community colleges. As a result of this effort, students’ transfer will be more seamless. In addition, students wanting to “reverse transfer” to an area community college and use Southeast Missouri State University credits to apply toward an associate’s degree can do so.

9P7, O. Southeast Missouri State University employs a variety of internal committees and activities as the method to ensure communication between and among institutional constituencies. What is not clear is how they assure integration and communication across these multiple relationships.

9R1, O. Southeast Missouri State University collects and measures performance results for building internal and external collaborative relationships through a variety of measures. However, the measures are mostly measures of quantity and an opportunity exists for Southeast Missouri State University to identify additional measures related to the quality of these relationships to further assess its effectiveness in building collaborative relationships.

9R2, O. The quantitative results relevant to faculty interaction from the HERI survey remain below those of the comparison group, signifying an opportunity exists to continue to improve campus communication efforts.

9R3, O. Southeast Missouri State University provides trend analysis to evaluate the majority of data in this category and indicates a lack of comparative performance data for building collaborative relationships. The development of a process to compare performance results with other higher education institutions or organizations outside of
higher education would enable the University to determine the success of current collaborations and set goals to achieve its mission and vision objectives.

**911, S.** Southeast Missouri State University has developed a service-delivery model that focuses on collaboration, engagement, and regional stewardship. This provides the foundation for a systematic and comprehensive approach for building relationships inside and outside of the University. Using data to define strategic initiatives and plans for improvement will move the University forward significantly in terms of process improvement, and as noted in the portfolio.

**912, O.** Southeast Missouri State University is building an infrastructure with the capacity to select specific processes to improve and set targets for improved performance regarding Building Collaborative Relationships. Opportunities exist to develop systematic processes to centralize data collection efforts and further support data-driven decision making.

**Accreditation Evidence Southeast Missouri State University**

The following section identifies any areas in the judgment of the Systems Appraisal Team where the institution either has not provided sufficient evidence that it currently meets the Commission’s Criteria for Accreditation and Core Components, or that it may face difficulty in meeting the Criteria and Core Components in the future. Identification of any such deficiencies as part of the Systems Appraisal process affords the institution the opportunity to remedy the problem prior to Reaffirmation of Accreditation.

No evidence issues noted by the team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 1: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio</th>
<th>Core Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong, clear, and well-presented.</td>
<td>1A 1B 1C 1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate but could be improved.</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear or incomplete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion 2: Evidence found in the Systems Portfolio</th>
<th>Core Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong, clear, and well-presented.</td>
<td>2A 2B 2C 2D 2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate but could be improved.</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear or incomplete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1A. Southeast Missouri State University provides evidence that it is focused on fulfilling its mission. The public, as well as the University community, is involved in the setting and evaluation of the mission, vision, and goals. The budgeting process is fully aligned with the mission, vision and goals.

1B. The mission of the university is publically available in multiple documents, the university website, and in the fact book. The institution aligns the mission with the Strategic Plan, which is updated every four to five years. Within the strategic plan, Southeast Missouri State University outlines the role of research at the institution as student-centered and the vision statements focuses on the regional location of students served.

1C. Objective 5 of the University Studies program calls on students to demonstrate an understanding of various cultures and their interrelationships. To promote this understanding, the University has increased its international student population from 512 to 951 since 2010 and supports a vibrant study-abroad program. Southeast Missouri State University’s concerted effort to recruit and retain students of color has resulted in a population increase from 871 to 1,045 since 2010. A committee has recently been appointed to look into issues affecting the LGBT community. Academic programs are developed and include needs based on expected employment opportunities and student demand. Career Proficiency Program provides support to the development of academic programs on campus and helps to ensure that appropriate career development occurs.
1D. Southeast Missouri State University’s mission states that they emphasize student-centered and experiential learning through an approach which collaborates with other entities, focused on exposing students to a diverse world. As a state-funded institution, Southeast Missouri State University does not have additional external interests, which require support. Southeast Missouri State University engages with the surrounding community through enrichment opportunities and various activities including the Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship, memberships to campus facilities, youth programs, and community cooperative ventures.

2A. The institution has established codes for various groups on campus including IR, students, faculty, and financial and administrative procedures. These cores are publically available. In addition, Southeast Missouri State University is in alignment with the Missouri statues on roles and responsibilities.

2B. Southeast Missouri State University is focused on transparency in its communications with students and the public regarding programs, costs, faculty, control and accreditations. Key information is made available through the website, catalogs, and departmental communications. In addition, Southeast Missouri State University has clearly published standards and goals. The Mission and Goals are well developed and continually assessed for relevance. Results of assessment are public and accessible.

2C. The mission of the board of regents is to preserve and enhance educational quality. Members are appointed to six-year terms by the governor with Senate consent and various requirements for eligibility in place. The roles and responsibilities of the board is outlined in Missouri statutes and operations are overseen by the President and executive staff. An academic council reviews the administration of academic programs and make suggestions about operations and administration to the president.

2D. Southeast Missouri State University encourages faculty sharing of assessment and teaching techniques with its peers through the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning. Expectations for faculty and students are defined and available in multiple places with processes established to enforce policies. The institution provides through the faculty handbook, the expectations of teaching, learning, and ethics. New faculty are mentored and the Teaching and Learning Center conducts faculty development activities and faculty are evaluated with a nationally normed instrument every academic year.

2E. Southeast Missouri State University has a comprehensive process for defining, documenting and communicating expectations for effective teaching and learning. Departmental promotion, tenure, and merit criteria define effective teaching at the departmental level. Faculty
members applying for promotion, tenure, merit, or post-professional promotion make a case for effective teaching and learning in their papers. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning delivers workshops promoting effective teaching and learning throughout the year, including the Teaching Enhancement Workshop, a week-long program for new faculty held every year before the fall semester.

3A. Courses have specific learning outcomes and expectation levels for students enrolled in jointly graduate and undergraduate courses. Online and blended courses are effective with students and student learning outcomes are measured similarly regardless of mode of delivery. Students complete internships and licensure or external examinations as evidence that programs are aligned with required levels of performance as seen by employers and the institutional faculty.

3B. Southeast Missouri State University’s mission to provide professional education grounded in the liberal arts and sciences and in practice experience is supported by the University Studies program. The program is driven by nine objectives and is consistent with state-level general education requirements. The first three objectives of the program, which is a component of every undergraduate degree, provide students with basic skills in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information. Further work on the major provides opportunities for students to master modes of inquiry or creative work and to develop skills adaptable to changing environments. Professional growth in the appropriate discipline – as demonstrated by scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge – is required for tenure, promotion, and merit for faculty. Students have opportunities to demonstrate their accomplishments internally through the Student Research Conference.

3C. Southeast Missouri State University invests significant time and resources to ensure the proper selection, orientation, training, and evaluation of faculty and staff dedicated to providing effective, high-quality programs and student services. New services, training opportunities and evaluation tools are regularly adopted to meet identified needs.

3D. Southeast Missouri State University advisors and faculty interact with prospective students to help determine programs and courses of interest. Faculty and professional advisors provide degree maps to guide admission requirements and match student interests and abilities to select programs. Southeast Missouri State University provides appropriate academic facilities to support student learning, Southeast Missouri State University uses multifaceted tools and mechanisms to assist students in pursuing academic programs that align and meet with their needs, interest, and abilities. Southeast Missouri State University has a two-program process by
which co-curricular activities align with curricular learning goals and determines the learning support needs of students. Southeast Missouri State University provides clear evidence for how learning support needs for faculty are determined and addressed to support student learning, development, and assessment processes.

**3E.** The connection between the University’s academic goal and the co-curricular efforts is rooted in the first Priority of the University’s Strategic Plan. While many student organizations may not be part of an organized learning objective process, many of their goals and activities align with the objectives of the University Studies program and with the elements of the University Wellness program. Other student-run organizations are aligned with an academic department or other campus office. These programs and organizations, while often led by students, are advised by members of the Southeast Missouri State University faculty and staff, and include direct connection to either the University Studies Objectives or the learning objectives of an academic department.

**4A.** The Career Proficiency Program provides support to the development of academic programs on campus and helps to ensure that appropriate career development occurs. Advisory committees at the program level have input from employers on, and provide insight into, the employment market. In addition, many programs require or strongly encourage students to do internships; interaction with internship supervisors provides another opportunity to interact with employers. All programs must be reviewed at least once every five years. The effectiveness of programs is determined by multiple measures, and recommendations are made for program enhancement or elimination.

**4B.** Southeast Missouri State University has clearly articulated general education program objectives that are regularly reviewed and updated that feed student learning outcome goals for courses and programs. All have defined measures of assessment. Non-academic areas such as enrollment management and student success also have clearly defined and measurable goals. The student learning outcomes assessment model has been updated to include more faculty involvement in defining and assessing goals and assuring that best practices are considered in the process. Southeast Missouri State University has established learning objectives for each course and non-teaching areas have developed systems to systematically assess programs and services. Data are utilized at the individual and departmental level. The university is working on a more comprehensive approach to assessing at the program and institutional levels.

**4C.** The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment collects and processes various data on students and shares information online. Data are reviewed by the Strategic Enrollment
Management committee on a regular basis. Data analytics and predict modeling are being employed to improve student success. Southeast Missouri State University has goals for retention and graduation as well as external mandates for retention rates. The retention rate for first time full time degree seeking students fell from 2009 to 2010, and a retention subcommittee was established. Since then the retention rate has increased steadily and is near the internal 75% goal. Further efforts to recruit and retain students of color have results in population increases.

5A. Southeast Missouri State University aligns budget with its strategic planning efforts. It assures that the academic functions of the university are supported. Departments, leadership and the budget review committee work together to monitor and guide the budgeting process. The institution has appropriate financial, human, and technological resources to accomplish its mission and goals to facilitate the advancement of its quality journey. Employee numbers are appropriately distributed and aligned for success. The university is realistic in its approach to planning and new initiatives and works to position the institution for future success.

5B. Southeast Missouri State University has an established history of shared governance through various committee and council structures. A recent Action Project led to a revision of the faculty handbook with input from various campus groups. The Academic Council reviews academic programs, makes programming and budget suggestions, and involves both faculty and administrators. Departments are responsible for curriculum development and review. The Board of Regents provides oversight for financial and academic policies through such considerations as room and board rates, capital projects, maintenance repair, incubator projects, and academic program changes.

5C. A Budget Review Committee annually conducts budget hearings and reviews budget requests, plans, proposals, and helps to set priorities. The priorities are aligned with the Strategic Plan of the institution and are considered in light of relevant regulations and funding sources available. Funding for Results links processes for assessment of student learning, planning and budgeting. Funded projects must be aligned with the strategic plan and faculty proposes projects to address student learning issues. Various opportunities exist for different constituents to be involved in the process through committee structures.

5D. Southeast Missouri State University participates in state, regional and national required reporting as well as that required for program-level accreditation. Southeast Missouri State University utilizes information from piloted programs to make decisions on mainstreaming a program. Data on student success are utilized to help improve selected programs.
Quality of Systems Portfolio For Southeast Missouri State University

Because it stands as a reflection of the institution, the Systems Portfolio should be complete and coherent, and it should provide an open and honest self-analysis on the strengths and challenges facing the organization. In this section, the Systems Appraisal Team provides Southeast Missouri State University with constructive feedback on the overall quality of the portfolio, along with suggestions for improvement of future portfolio submissions.

*It may be beneficial to consider an approach to preparing the portfolio that coordinates writing efforts across the categories for consistency and clarity of processes. Since much of the writing for a Systems Portfolio is technical in nature, requiring a clear description of processes that link to intentional outcomes and results, the University may benefit from a single editor that can assist with consistency and continuity in language. Further, Southeast includes many measures for results, but often the results for those measures not included in the actual results section. Clearly articulating measures of performance in the first results question followed by consistent charts that show baseline, trend, comparative, and targeted results would greatly enhance the University’s ability to demonstrate a commitment to measuring performance.*

Using the Feedback Report

The AQIP Systems Appraisal process is intended to initiate action for institutional improvement. Though decisions about specific actions rest with each institution, the Commission expects every institution to use its feedback to stimulate cycles of continual improvement and to inform future AQIP processes.

Some key questions that may arise in careful examination of this report may include: How do the team’s findings challenge our assumptions about ourselves? Given our mission and goals, which issues should we focus on? How will we employ results to innovate, grow, and encourage a positive culture of improvement? How will we incorporate lessons learned from this review in our planning and operational processes? How will we revise the Systems Portfolio to reflect what we have learned? How an organization interprets, communicates, and uses its feedback for improvement ought to support AQIP’s core values, encouraging involvement, learning, collaboration, and integrity.
The Commission’s goal is to help an institution clarify the strategic issues most vital to its success, and then to support the institution as it addresses these priorities in ways that will make a difference in institutional performance.