Welcome

Dr. Tracy Schoolcraft welcomed the members of the Middle States Steering Committee and thanked them for their participation.

Update on Resources

Dr. Tracy Schoolcraft distributed copies of a rubric that lists who is responsible for submitting documents for the Workgroups and the due dates for those documents. The rubric is posted on the S drive. The due date for the academic departments was November 27, and the due date for others is January 26. Documents will be posted in each standard’s subfolder. She noted that within each standard’s folder there is a subfolder called “Unit Assessment Plans.” While Workgroups are waiting for documents, Drs. Schoolcraft, Pierce, and Ricardo can assist in identifying what tasks can be completed by Workgroups prior to receiving the documents.

Dr. Schoolcraft reminded Workgroups to reference the University Strategic Plan as it relates to their standards when writing their reports. In addition, as President Carter identifies university goals, Workgroups should reference those as they relate to their standards. On the S drive, in the TracDat folder, Workgroups will find a document labeled “University Strategic Plan Implementation” that provides information on tracking the progress on goals and outcomes; this will assist Workgroups in writing their reports.

Middle States Conference

The 2017 MSCHE Annual Conference is scheduled for December 6 through 8, 2017, in Philadelphia. Shippensburg will be represented by: Dr. James Delle, Ms. Stefanie Elbel, Dr. Karen Johnson, Dr. Gretchen Pierce, Dr. José Ricardo, and Dr. Tracy Schoolcraft. Attendees are scheduled to meet with MS Workgroup Chairs after the conference to share information from the conference.
Recommendations and Suggestions from the Last Periodic Review Report of 2009

Prior to the meeting, Steering Committee members received via email copies of a map of previous recommendations and suggestions since 2009 with the new standards. Workgroups do not need to address any self-recommended items but should address any of MSCHE’s recommendations or suggestions that have not been met.

Workgroup Activity

Workgroups were provided with a list of activities that will assist them in organizing, collecting, and analyzing documents to support writing of their reports. Workgroups were asked to be prepared to give feedback on the second activity (as listed below) after the breakout sessions and to follow up on all of these activities in writing after the meeting by forwarding a handwritten copy or by emailing a copy to Dr. Pierce.

Activities included the following:

- How are you organizing your group’s work? By criteria? Who has which part?

- How does your standard align with the Strategic Plan? How will you address the plan’s strategic directions addressed in your draft report? Provide your current research questions, highlighting any modified or new questions that address our institutional priorities expressed in the Strategic Plan.

- Assess the document road map with your standard in mind. Do you think these documents (plus the rubrics) will be sufficient or are there other documents or types of documents you would like to see?

- Using the master list of committees and people required to fill out rubrics for your standard: are there people you think you may need to interview?

Data Analysis and Interpretation Guide (DAIG)

Dr. José Ricardo provided copies of DAIG to all Steering Committee members via email prior to the meeting. He gave Workgroup Chairs paper copies at the meeting and noted that the document is posted on the S drive. He created DAIG to guide data analysis and interpretation.

His Workgroup pilot tested DAIG prior to the meeting, and they agreed it may be helpful to other Workgroups. Each member of his Workgroup was assigned one criteria. Following DAIG, they considered the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Analysis and Interpretation</th>
<th>Essential Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 be reach out for further discussion on the finding? |
2. 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?

3. 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 be reach out for further inquiry on providing printed or electronic copies of documents?

4. 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 be reach out for further discussion on the findings?

5. Workgroup Reflections What findings were surprise? What are the takeaways? What did the workgroup learn? What are the workgroup’s recommendations?

Dr. Ricardo shared tips on how the document could be used, and he is available in the weeks ahead if Workgroups have any questions. Workgroups are not required to use the document.

Reports by Workgroups

Following breakout sessions, Workgroups were asked to report on their discussion on the following activity: How does your standard align with the Strategic Plan? How will you address the plan’s strategic directions addressed in your draft report? Provide your current research questions, highlighting any modified or new questions that address our institutional priorities expressed in the Strategic Plan.

- Workgroup 1. Mission & Goals: Dr. Liz Fisher for the group reported their standard aligns directly with the University Strategic Plan and Goals.

- Workgroup 2. Ethics & Integrity: Dr. Doug Birsch for the group reported that while academic freedom is not directly referenced in the Strategic Plan it is reflected in other documents. The workgroup is addressing academic freedom, creativity, and innovation for faculty and students.

- Workgroup 3. Design & Delivery of Learning: Dr. Billy Henson for the group reported they are linking each criteria in their standard with the Strategic Plan. Each member has been assigned to work on a criteria.
Workgroup 4. Student Support: Dr. Karen Johnson for the group reported they have analyzed information and have divided and assigned tasks to members. They are continuing to align criteria to the Strategic Plan.

Workgroup 5. Educational Assessment: Dr. Dudley Girard for the group reported they have divided criteria amongst the Workgroup members, are conducting research, are reviewing strategic directions, and will add data to their report.

Workgroup 6. Planning & Improvement: Dr. James Delle for the group reported they have concluded that all operational areas of the university have specific objectives. The Workgroup has discussed interrelationships in the university’s planning processes. The Workgroup will consider how units communicate with one another and the how units inform the university’s planning. If needed, the Workgroup will suggest how the university might improve its planning process.

Workgroup 7. Governance & Administration: Dr. Grove, Chair of the Workgroup, was attending a professional meeting and could not attend today's MS meeting. Via email, she reported that the Workgroup has met and has been compiling information in order to meet their deadline.

Questions and Answers

MS Co-chairs Schoolcraft, Pierce, and Ricardo asked Workgroups to let them know when they will be meeting during the spring 2018 semester so that students can join the Workgroups.

Dr. Pierce will provide Workgroups with friendly email reminders on tasks throughout the spring semester.

Dr. Pierce asked Workgroups to provide her with a copy of their discussions from today's breakout activities by the end of the fall 2017 semester or by the beginning of the spring 2018 semester. Either handwritten reports or reports forwarded via email are fine.

Reminder: drafts of the Workgroup reports are due February 28, 2018. MS Co-chairs noted that some information might be missing from Workgroups’ drafts because it has not yet been submitted to the Workgroups.

Dr. Ricardo is available to meet with Workgroups individually if requested. He asked Workgroups to document how they will do their analyses and how they will divide criteria between members. Also, he asked them to document activities and meetings by saving notes on the S drive.

Dr. Birsch asked if the MS Co-chairs could provide a timetable of what is due and when.

The meeting was adjourned.

Notes recorded by Shirley Smith