

**Middle States Executive Committee Meeting  
December 15, 2017  
Notes**

**Present:** Dr. Karen Johnson, Dr. Gretchen Pierce, Dr. José Ricardo, Dr. Rick Ruth, Dr. Tracy Schoolcraft, Mr. Justin Sentz, and Ms. Shirley Smith

**Spring 2018 Activity Schedule (Appendix A)**

Appendix A was distributed via email prior to the meeting. After discussion, the schedule was revised as follows:

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Party Responsible</b>	<b>Is a Meeting Needed ?</b>
February 1 (previously scheduled for Feb 2)	Follow-Up Meeting from December 15	Executive Committee	Meeting scheduled
February (Weeks one and two)	Data Collection and Analysis Meetings	Workgroup Members as Assigned by the Chair(s)	No meeting
February (Weeks three and four)	Draft Writing	Workgroup Members as assigned by the Chair(s)	No meeting
February 28	<b>Standards First Draft Due</b>	To be submitted by Workgroup Chairs to Drs. Pierce, Ricardo, and Schoolcraft	No meeting
March (Entire Month)	Review of All Drafts	Drs. Pierce, Ricardo, and Schoolcraft	No meeting
April 6	Feedback to Workgroups	Steering Committee	Meeting scheduled
April 9 - May 11	Revising Standards Reports	Workgroup Members as Assigned by the Chair(s)	No meeting
May 18	<b>Standards Final Draft Due</b>	To be submitted by Workgroup Chairs to Executive Committee	No meeting

**Data Analysis and Interpretation Guide (DAIG) (Appendix B)**

Appendix B was distributed via email prior to the meeting.

Dr. Ricardo shared thoughts and recommendations based on Workgroup 5's test pilot of DAIG and their discussions.

It is recommended that each workgroup member be assigned a criterion, who will follow DAIG to collect and analyze data and submit a report to their Workgroup Chair(s). The Chair(s) will summarize information into one document for the workgroup. Next, the Workgroup Chair(s) will

provide feedback at the Steering Committee meeting scheduled for April 6. That feedback and the discussions, guided by the DAIG format, will identify lessons learned while collecting data and gaps in data. Further, aided by the consistency provided by the DAIG format, Drs. Pierce, Ricardo, and Schoolcraft will be able to identify missing information and will write the final draft of our MS report.

At all steps in the process, we need to address the university's Strategic Plan as well as Recommendations and Suggestions from the previous Periodic Review Report (both those that have been met and those that have not). Dr. Pierce will provide more information on these via email. Information on implementation of the university's Strategic Plan is posted on the S drive (Middle States folder and TracDat subfolder). This will become our Evidence Inventory. Dr. James Delle and Ms. Stefanie Elbel can provide additional information about TracDat.

Following the completion of the Middle States Reaccreditation process, our goal will be to conduct annual assessments and make the process part of our university's culture. It was suggested that we have "Accreditation" (or other appropriate wording) listed as a standing item on Forum agendas.

After discussion, the DAIG format was revised as follows: (Dr. Ricardo will revise DAIG and provide instructions.)

### **STEP 1**

- Review each criterion and identify the ones that meet the Target benchmark and the ones that do not.
  - What findings have particular relevance to the Self-Study?
  - For the criteria that do not meet the Target benchmark, is there any narrative regarding an Action Plan?
  - If not, what specific stakeholder/AES Unit should we reach out to for further discussion on the finding?
- By criterion, look across the various rubrics and triangulate the data by comparing and contrasting the information.
  - Are there any contradictory results?
  - When analyzing the data holistically, what do they indicate about the university's performance across the criteria?
  - What do they indicate about the university's performance across the entire standard?
- By criterion, look across the various rubrics and identify any relevant supporting documents.
  - Which documents are mentioned the most across rubrics?
  - Which ones should be part of the official roadmap for the standard that your group is working on?
  - What specific stakeholder/AES Unit should we reach out to for further inquiry on providing printed or electronic copies of documents?

## **STEP 2**

- Use a blank rubric for your standard and in the comments section, draft out a narrative (by criterion) summarizing key findings.
  - What does the summary indicate about the university's performance across the criteria?
  - What does the summary indicate about the university's performance across the entire standard?
  - What specific stakeholder/AES Unit should we reach out to for further discussion on the findings?

## **STEP 3**

- Workgroup Reflections
  - What findings were a surprise?
  - What are the takeaways? What did the workgroup learn?
  - What are the workgroup's recommendations?

### **Writing a Good Chapter Draft (Appendix C)**

Appendix C was distributed via email prior to the meeting. The following recommendations have been adapted from the 2017 Middle State Pre-conference Workshop Notes.

1. The self-study is in fact a research paper not an encyclopedia. Therefore, the narrative of the chapters must be more analytical than descriptive.
2. The chapter must be brief, but substantial: 10-15 pages (single-spaced) not including footnotes, tables, etc. **Required font size is 12.**
3. The chapter must provide **no more than three recommendations** for improvement. How can Shippensburg better attain its institutional priorities? Drs. Pierce, Ricardo, and Schoolcraft will narrow down the recommendations to three in total for the entire university.
4. The chapter must explain how Shippensburg meets the specific standard and the corresponding *Requirements of Affiliations*. In the body of the chapter, appropriate reference to the *Requirement of Affiliations* must be included. The reference should have appropriate supporting evidence (i.e., documents).
5. The chapter must be evidence-driven. It should not make assertions without proper evidence, but a particular piece of evidence should only be used if it is vital to understanding the self-study. In other words, you will need to be selective in which documents you actually reference in the chapter. The examples you select will then be included in the Document Roadmap [or Evidence Inventory]."
6. The chapter should not present data that are too complex to interpret. Tables and charts must be user-friendly. **Requested the use of Excel files.**

7. The chapter should always link key findings to the mission and the strategic plan (i.e., University Priorities).
8. The chapter should always present currently existing assessment information: the more current, the better. **Recommended we use three years of data with an end date of fall 2017.**
9. The chapter must include a table highlighting key use of assessment results. As a suggestion, in a three-column table, data could present:
  - a. The outcomes triggering the need for intervention.
  - b. The intervention strategies.
  - c. The improved outcomes.
10. The rubric used to collect and assess data on the standard can be used as a template to write the chapter. That is, the different criteria are the sub-headings of the chapter.
11. It is worth noting that the final content of the Self-Study may not have all of the content and/or language provided by the workgroups.

### **Scheduling Follow-ups with Key Campus Constituents**

Members discussed the possible need to interview campus constituents if information is missing or if more information is needed. It was noted that the Middle States Reviewers will see gaps in our data and our report that we have not identified. When the Reviewers are on campus, they will want to meet with campus constituents who can supply missing information rather than with the Steering Committee members. Dr. Schoolcraft will provide a list of individuals the Reviewers met with when they were on campus during the last visit.

As part of our preparation for the Reviewers' Visit, Dr. Schoolcraft is planning to meet with campus constituents and provide them with updates on our Middle States process. Also, Workgroup Chairs will want to meet with constituents prior to the Reviewers' Visit to refresh memories on our mission, commonly-used acronyms, and other pertinent information.

### **Closing Remarks**

Dr. Schoolcraft thanked Drs. Ricardo and Pierce for preparing today's agenda, and she expressed her appreciation to all who attended today's meeting. Executive Committee members will receive revised documents discussed today sometime after January 2.

The meeting was adjourned.  
Notes recorded by Shirley Smith