University Assessment Committee Meeting

Friday, October 25, 2013
2:00pm – 3:00pm
Stroud 210

Attending: Mary Beth Allen, Fernando Perez, Jonathan Gomez, Margaret Benson, Jaedeock Lee, Sandra Eckard, Jeffrey Weber, Kelly Weaber, Nancy Greenawalt, John Robinson, Paul Creamer, Jennifer White, Christopher Dudley, Sheila Handy, Debra Ballinger, Michael Sachs, Eve Salzberg, Adam McGlynn, Laura Waters, Joann Stryker, Alberto Cardelle, John Elwood

Organization/Structure

Joann opened the meeting with an announcement of new members: Jonathan Gomez (Enrollment Services); Margaret Benson (Education); Eve Salzberg (Undergraduate Representative); and Chris Willis (Secretary).

The UAC is seeking a faculty co-chair beginning spring 2014 and several workgroups are in need of leaders to replace current leaders who are also department chairs.

General Education Assessment

Guest John Elwood (GEC) requested a subcommittee of UAC be formed specifically to assess GE moving forward. He suggested 6 – 7 members dedicated to the following tasks:

- Set measures for all 7 GE student learning outcomes
  - 2-3 measures for each student learning outcomes, at least 2 direct is GEC preference
  - One measure may be able to cover several learning outcomes
- Find steady funding for measures
- Determine cycle for evaluation and reporting

The seven general education student learning outcomes adopted previously will remain in place; however, certain wording changes might occur. The proposed workgroup would work to streamline assessment measures and it would communicate with the university at large as well as with the GEC on appropriateness of measures. The continuing activity of this proposed new workgroup was stressed. John estimated Fall 2016 is the earliest we would see the new GE program in action. It has not been submitted to UWCC yet. Recertification of current GE courses is planned as part of the general education revision.

The target date for measure selection is March 2014. Measure selection and recertification should happen in parallel. This said, the UAC members stated we must determine and select new direct measures as soon as possible to address current assessment needs for the GE program in place now.
Debbie Ballinger suggested combining current UAC members with non-members from the university at large. Committee members would lead, while non-members would function as consultants. Jennifer White suggested pulling 2 members from each current workgroup to form the new group. Chris Dudley stressed the importance of looking at GE at an institutional level, as MSCHE considers GE a “program” unto itself.

Paul Creamer asked about the current state of GE. Per John Elwood, it retains a certain breadth requirement in the Arts and Sciences. The current proposal reduces general education by 9 credits, with First and Second Year Experience requirements added. The FYE course is now 3 credits, it was offered as a 1-credit summer course for the 2013 Early Start program. Cognitive requirements include writing level 1 and level 2; with enrollment caps.

Sandy Eckard, who worked on writing across the curriculum for several years, said she was eager to be a part of this new workgroup.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to form a new GE Assessment Workgroup of the UAC. Jeff Weber expressed an interest in leading this group.

GE Assessment workgroup members should be from UAC, though the workgroup may consult with non-members. Joann Stryker recorded the names of members interested in joining said workgroup.

Debbie Ballinger invited John Elwood to present his GEC work to the University Senate on November 18. Group members interested in seeing his slides can email him for a draft copy.

**Program Assessment Guidebook**

At the end of 2011-12 the Program Workgroup had completed a draft assessment guidebook; during 2012-13 suggested changes were incorporated. Student Affairs added a completely new section. Review the guidebook and send questions and edits to Adam McGlynn.

Motion passed to accept an email vote on the new assessment guidebook if there are no issues raised in the next week.

**Updates**

Accredited undergraduate program and all graduate program annual assessment reports are due December 13. Departments undergoing program evaluation (tier 1 and tier 2 departments) were given due date extensions to December 13th as well. This leaves only a handful of unaccredited, undergraduate programs not having submitted their annual reports. Joann Stryker will be sending a report to the deans on compliance.

MSCHE site team report is available online and a paper copy is attached to today’s handouts. Read it carefully.
Chris Willis, new Academic Assessment Specialist, will begin working on the UAC website. Send recommendations to him. Michael Sachs said he will email his suggestions soon.

Joann gave a brief demonstration of the TracDat program. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment is in the process of preloading previously collected assessment information including student learning outcomes for each program, followed by linking them to related goals and the general education student learning outcomes as well.

Our December meeting day and time will be determined via a doodle poll.

Meeting adjourned.
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I. Institutional Overview

East Stroudsburg University (ESU) is a comprehensive public university in northeastern Pennsylvania offering 57 undergraduate and 23 graduate programs, and it is one of the 14 institutions that comprise the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE). Founded in 1893 as a Normal School, ESU has developed into a comprehensive Masters–Large Programs (Carnegie Classification) educational institution. At the beginning of the 2012-13 academic year, there were 6,355 undergraduate and 588 graduate students served by 308 teaching faculty and 534 non-instructional managers, non-teaching faculty, and staff. Currently, all educational programs are housed in one of the five colleges: Arts and Sciences, Business and Management, Education, Health Sciences, and Graduate. All administrative services are housed in one of five areas: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Administration and Finance, Enrollment Management, and Research and Economic Development; except for University Relations which reports directly to the President. The ESU Foundation serves the academic mission of ESU through fundraising efforts which provide scholarships and funding for educational experiences and through support of Alumni Relations.

II. Nature and Conduct of the Visit

To request a monitoring report, due September 1, 2013, documenting further implementation of an organized and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning, in all programs including general education, with evidence that assessment results are used to improve teaching and learning and to inform planning and resource allocation (Standards 2, 12, and 14). To direct a prompt Commission liaison guidance visit to discuss the Commission’s expectations. A small team visit will follow submission of the monitoring report. The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2016-2017.

The visiting team met with the following groups during the consultation:
President Marcia G. Welsh
President’s Council
Executive Provost’s Leadership Team and Assistant Deans
Academic Department Chairs
University Assessment Committee
General Education Committee
Monitoring Report Authoring and Editing Team

The small team also studied the monitoring report and appendices, the PRR, and reader’s reports.

III. Affirmation of Compliance with Requirements of Affiliation Under Review

Based on a review of the monitoring report and appendices, interviews, and other institutional documents, the team affirms that the institution continues to meet the Requirements of Affiliation under review.

IV. Commendations and Summary of Institutional Strengths
In the period since the completion of the most recent Periodic Report, the faculty, staff and administrators of East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania have made important strides in assessment of student learning and in the utilization of assessment results in the improvement of teaching and learning as well as in planning and resource allocation.

In the past year, ESU has shown clear and decisive advances in the curriculum mapping of nearly all of their courses, by academic degree program. Virtually every course has been mapped to indicate which of the General Education Student Learning Outcomes are addressed through the course.

The University also has made progress in its review and modification of the General Education curriculum as manifested through the creation of the Early Start program.

V. Compliance with Accreditation Standard(s) Under Review

Standard Two: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

The visitors’ judgment is that, at this time, the institution appears to be in compliance with this standard.

Summary of Key Evidence and Developments:

While the efforts have been preliminary and the steps halting, there seems to be real progress. In particular East Stroudsburg has used assessment of student learning and other data to make important administrative decisions and to guide resource allocation. In particular the university has supported the creation of new positions in the Department of Academic Enrichment and Learning to support student learning. Data collected by the Summer Session Task Force stimulated the development of an Early Start program for the Fall 2013 semester.

The visiting team has great sympathy for the environment of limited resources in which the University finds itself. This means that planning and resource allocation are even more important to assure that the institution satisfies the standards of excellence.

Recommendation: While the University has made important progress in creating a pervasive and sustainable atmosphere wherein planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal are driven by data and assessment (both institutional assessment and the assessment of student learning), there is more to be done. The University is in an opportune moment to begin to clearly incorporate both institutional assessment and the assessment of student learning into its annual planning and resource allocation cycles.

Standard Twelve: General Education

The visitors’ judgment is that, at this time, the institution appears to be in compliance with this standard.

Summary of Key Evidence and Developments:

East Stroudsburg University has a comprehensive General Education curriculum which responds both to mandates from the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE) and which supports the mission and goals of the campus. Within the last two years,
responding to assessment data and other programmatic information, the campus has begun a revision of the General Education curriculum, under the guidance and leadership of President Welsh.

In the past year, ESU has shown clear and decisive advances in the curriculum mapping of nearly all of their courses, by academic degree program. Virtually every course has been mapped to indicate which of the General Education Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are addressed through the course and acquired by the student. The SLOs include: a) the students’ role as citizens of a diverse, global society; b) critical thinking skills; c) to communicate orally, in writing, and through other formats; d) information literacy and technological skills; e) to apply scientific reasoning to solve problems; f) to create and/or critique various forms of artistic expression; and g) to understand various models for the healthy development of the whole person.

Each ESU course that is identified as instructing students in one or more of the General Education SLOs is then identified as to the level of instruction of the particular SLO(s). The levels of instruction range from the SLO being introduced; emphasized, and the basic knowledge enhanced; reinforced, carrying a strong degree of knowledge; or advanced, which indicates that learning is complex. Faculty were advised to use Bloom’s taxonomy as a guide to assigning a level to each course.

The team met with the General Education Committee, a group that has been in existence at ESU for many years. Recently, their charge has been complex: to revise the General Education program and to assess General Education courses in terms of the seven SLOs in collaboration with the University Assessment Committee and the University-Wide Curriculum Committee.

Although much has been accomplished in the assessment of General Education, the “Analysis of Spring 2013 Undergraduate GE Curriculum Mapping” states that one department still hadn’t submitted its curriculum map. Additionally, ESU found that 72 of 359 courses designated as General Education do not address any of the SLOs. Members of the General Education Committee explained that finding these 72 courses could be due to the difference in instructions given to faculty at different times in the mapping process.

The General Education Committee reported that the current proposal for a “Liberal Arts Core,” ESU’s proposed General Education program, has strong faculty support. The Committee also assured the team that as the Liberal Arts Core is implemented, each course will undergo a recertification to determine whether its content is meeting at least one of the Student Learning Outcomes. This promised intentionality bodes well for the proposed Liberal Arts Core (General Education) program.

Very useful in determining ESU’s compliance with Standard 12 is the General Education Assessment Report, a draft document dated August 4, 2013. ESU has made strides in the assessment of the General Education SLOs. They use a combination of direct and indirect measures, though wider use of direct measures of learning would better inform them. Indirect measures, even those that are normed, are still only indirect measures; they do not measure learning.

At this point, ESU has used three student surveys (ESU’s Graduating Senior Survey, the Department of Movement and Lifetime Fitness Course Survey, and the National Survey of Student Engagement) and two internally-developed faculty surveys (both the open-ended and the Likert surveys); none of the surveys measures learning. Only two of the nine measures used
provide direct measures of learning: ETS's Proficiency Profile and the James Madison University Information Literacy Test. These two direct measures of learning address five of the seven SLOs, though the report states that the General Fitness Content Exam, with revision, could become a direct measure of the seventh SLO. That leaves the first SLO (students demonstrating their role as citizens of a diverse, global society) without a direct measure, though ESU is reviewing the possibility of isolating Social Science data from the ETS Proficiency Profile to provide this measure of learning.

The members of ESU's General Education Committee were aware of the need for additional direct measures of learning. They appear to understand that while revising the program's content, it is equally important to implement multiple, direct measures of learning in the SLO areas.

The General Education Assessment report also offers recommendations and actions based on this round of assessment: 1) the assessment measures are evaluated and recommendations for improvement given; 2) the report recommends ways in which the General Education Program should be revised; and 3) resulting immediate actions are outlined. This is a strong start that needs to be repeated regularly. As the new General Education program is inaugurated, assessment measures should be in place in order to assure compliance with the standard in the future.

In sum, ESU has made advances in the assessment of General Education Student Learning Outcomes, and needs to implement multiple, direct measures of learning for all of the seven SLOs.

**Suggestion:**

As the new General Education Program, the Liberal Arts Core, is fully articulated, it should be a component of any reports prepared for the Middle States Commission.

**Recommendations:**

The team recommends that ESU continue to pursue and implement direct measures of the two Student Learning Outcomes that are currently evaluated only through indirect measures (I and VII).

Furthermore the team recommends that ESU continue to pursue multiple, direct measures for each of the General Education Student Learning Outcomes, and as the new General Education program is inaugurated, assessment measures should be in place in order to assure compliance with the standard in the future.

**Standard Fourteen: Assessment of Student Learning**

The visitors' judgment is that, at this time, the institution appears to be in compliance with this standard.

**Summary of Key Evidence and Developments:**

In discussions with various individuals on campus, confusion remains in differentiating Institutional Assessment from the Assessment of Student Learning. On more than one
occasion a person would refer to a data set from Institution Research, such as student credit hours generated, as if it were an indication of the assessment of student learning. The two endeavors are closely related but quite distinct, and are represented by two different standards (Standard 7 versus Standard 14).

ESU’s Monitoring Report of September 1, 2013 discusses renewed assessment processes, and examples of actions taken as a result of the assessment data. It reports that the Program Level Assessment Workgroup of the University Assessment Committee developed a rubric to classify each program’s level of assessment based on the programs’ assessment reports. The rubric assigns assessment activity at three levels: “1) the department is in the early phase of assessment; 2) the department has designed an assessment program and has used evidence collected to improve student learning, though implementation of assessment is inconsistent; and the very broad third category, 3) the department’s assessment program yields “substantial evidence to demonstrate that they are employing assessment measures to improve student learning. The departmental report demonstrates a consistent and significant process for the use of assessment data to improve student learning. The department has created a ‘Culture of Assessment’ to achieve continual improvement of student learning” (Monitoring Report, p. 5).

A fourth level could be added to this rubric, and Level 3 redefined, which might assist ESU faculty in going further to close the loop in the assessment of student learning. Level 3 would signify that the department’s assessment program yields “substantial evidence to demonstrate that they are employing assessment measures to improve student learning” and that its report demonstrates the use of assessment data to improve student learning. Level 4 programs would demonstrate that assessment has become institutionalized in the program and its results are being used continually to improve student learning, creating a true culture of assessment in that department.

The team also reviewed the individual programs’ Student Learning Outcomes Assessment annual reports. As we learned during the visit, the deadline for the reports for the 2012-2013 academic year is the following October; therefore, the reports reviewed represented both the most current year (2012-2013), and the year prior (2011-2012). In a few cases, the report was older still. Thus, at this point it is difficult to get an accurate overview of the programmatic assessment of student learning.

In the College of Education and the College of Health Sciences, faculty have become facile in assessing student learning through continual reporting to external accrediting for professional associations. These faculty are using the results from their assessments to make improvements to course content, sequencing of courses, program requirements, and more. However, in the other colleges, the quality of learning assessment is uneven.

ESU faculty are taking learning assessment seriously, and this single observation paves the way for even stronger assessment of student learning. The administration has made its commitment known to faculty to support the assessment process with resources. At this point, however, additional, continued assessment-related workshops and other supports to assessment are warranted. Ongoing workshops would train new faculty and keep continuing faculty current.

Assessment of student learning outcomes is not the same as the evaluation of student performance in a course or field placement. The most current annual assessment report template that was given to departments is of high quality; programs should allow the template to
guide their report so that their assessment is replicable and comparable across programs and departments.

It is not clear that all programs are “closing the loop” in terms of the assessment process, though several seem to have come close. The programs might try as a first step is to focus predominantly on direct measures or, at the very least, keep direct and indirect measures separate in the template so the distinction between them is not muddied. Indirect measures are incidental, and should only be used as an adjunct to direct measures.

Most programs have identified program-specific student learning outcomes, which is of critical importance. The measures used to assess this program-specific learning are varied. If programs use a capstone or other senior-level course’s project or performance, the evaluation necessitates validation by more than one faculty member. Just as one faculty member evaluating one student’s work is not appropriate for this purpose, so, too, the evaluation of an internship or field experience by a single, external evaluator is inappropriate. At least one department uses a “faculty discussion” to measure assessment; yet this is not replicable, nor is it a valid method of assessment.

Not all assessment needs to be quantitative; much of it can be qualitative. In fact, in some departments, qualitative measures lend themselves better to the subject matter. An exit exam for majors that measures knowledge of key concepts is fine as an assessment tool, but just as reliable is a valid qualitative measure of learning. One example of a valid qualitative measure of learning is a portfolio prepared by the student and evaluated by more than one departmental faculty member. Interviews of faculty indicated that portfolios are being used by at least one department.

The team found that the quality of assessment in some departments could not be determined easily through its reports. In many of the reports, the learning outcome could not be connected to any of the measures, hence, it did not align with the reported results. It might be useful to tie each learning outcome to a measure, a performance goal, and a finding. Then based on an aggregate of the above, the report might discuss interpretation and changes made (if applicable) to both the program and the assessment process.

Taken as whole then, the majority of the evidence provided in the monitoring report, and appendices, along with information gained by the visiting team, indicate that the institution is in compliance with Standard 14. Should the institution not follow through on its plans in the area of assessment of student learning it might no longer be in compliance.

Suggestions:

Refine the rubric to classify each program’s level of assessment based on the programs’ assessment reports to add a level 4. Level 4 programs would be differentiated by their institutionalization of the assessment process, creating a true culture of assessment in that department.

Additional, continued assessment-related workshops and other supports to assessment are warranted. Ongoing workshops would train new faculty, and keep continuing faculty current.

The standard assessment reporting template is useful, and if used by every department for each program, reports would be replicable and easily compared. If a new template is developed, it
should request the same types of information (learning outcomes, measures, performance goals, etc.).

Recommendations:

The visiting team recommends that each program should employ direct measures of student learning, whether they are quantitative or qualitative. Multiple direct measures are preferred, but not required.

Further, the team also recommends that each stated learning outcome should be aligned to a measure, a performance goal, and a finding. Measures can be used to evaluate more than a single learning outcome.

VI. Summary of Compliance

Based on a review of the monitoring report and appendices, interviews, and other documents reviewed during the visit, the team draws the following conclusions.

The institution is in compliance with the standards under consideration in the monitoring report. The campus has made great progress in the assessment of student learning, in both academic programs and in general education, but much more remains to be accomplished. The institution has begun to use the assessment of student learning in its planning and resource allocation process, but is in a position where it can make this far more effective in the future. The institution has plans to continue to proceed in such a manner which will guarantee a sustainable program of assessment of student learning in general education and the programs, and the application of those findings in planning and resource allocation. The visiting team applauds these plans and urges the institution to vigorously and forcefully proceed.
October 18, 2013

TO: Middle States Commission on Higher Education  
3624 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2680  

From: Marcia G. Welsh, President  

RE: Response to Report Prepared by Team Representing the Middle States Commission on Higher Education After Their September 10, 2013 Follow-Up Visit at East Stroudsburg University  

The East Stroudsburg University (ESU) community wishes to thank the team representing the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) that reviewed numerous materials (e.g., monitoring report) and visited our campus on Tuesday, September 10, 2013. We also thank them for their report following the visit, for recognizing the significant improvements that we have made since our submission of a Periodic Review Report in May 2012, and for affirming that ESU continues to meet the Requirements of Affiliation Under Review (Standards 2, 12, and 14).

The following recommendations and suggestions were included in the team report:

- **Standard 2**
  - Recommendation:
    - While the University has made important progress in creating a pervasive and sustainable atmosphere wherein planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal are driven by data and assessment (both institutional assessment and the assessment of student learning), there is more to be done. The University is in an opportune moment to begin to clearly incorporate both institutional assessment and the assessment of student learning into its annual planning and resource allocation cycles.

- **Standard 12**
  - Suggestion:
    - As the new General Education Program, the Liberal Arts Core, is fully articulated, it should be a component of any reports prepared for the Middle States Commission.
  - Recommendations:
    - The team recommends that ESU continue to pursue and implement direct measures of the two Student Learning Outcomes that are currently evaluated only through indirect measures (I and VII).
    - Furthermore the team recommends that ESU continue to pursue *multiple, direct* measures for each of the General Education Student Learning Outcomes, and as the new General Education program is inaugurated, assessment measures should be in place in order to assure compliance with the standard in the future.

- **Standard 14**
  - Suggestions:
    - Refine the rubric to classify each program’s level of assessment based on the programs’ assessment reports to add a level 4. Level 4 programs would be
differentiated by their institutionalization of the assessment process, creating a true culture of assessment in that department.

- Additional, continued assessment-related workshops and other supports to assessment are warranted. Ongoing workshops would train new faculty, and keep continuing faculty current.
- The standard assessment reporting template is useful, and if used by every department for each program, reports would be replicable and easily compared. If a new template is developed, it should request the same types of information (learning outcomes, measures, performance goals, etc.).

  Recommendations:
  
  - The visiting team recommends that each program should employ direct measures of student learning, whether they are quantitative or qualitative. Multiple direct measures are preferred, but not required.
  - Further, the team also recommends that each stated learning outcome should be aligned to a measure, a performance goal, and a finding. Measures can be used to evaluate more than a single learning outcome.

We appreciate and embrace the recommendations, suggestions and advice provided by the team. We are committed to stronger planning processes and will put significant effort into linking budget, enrollment, and facilities planning. The team’s report will indeed guide and help us to infuse energy into our efforts to deepen the culture of assessment and further enhance the use of assessment results to improve student learning. We have already begun to leverage the team’s report to accomplish this. Some examples include:

- The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost & VPAA) at the September 19, 2013 Office of Academic Affairs Department Chairs Meeting (chaired by the Provost & VPAA) discussed early feedback from the MSCHE team, and a thorough handout was provided and discussed providing examples of evidence of student learning, and examples of direct vs. indirect measures of student learning at the course, program, and institutional levels.
- Annual assessment reports required of all academic programs (undergraduate, graduate, accredited, non-accredited) will now be required to follow the same report format.
- The Chair of ESU’s General Education Committee presented and discussed a proposal for a new General Education program that would ensure full coverage and assessment of all seven university-wide undergraduate student learning outcomes at the October 17, 2013 Office of Academic Affairs Department Chairs Meeting.
- The Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) provided handouts and discussed direct measures of student learning, VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) Rubrics, and provided the Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric as an example from the Association of American Colleges and Universities at the October 17, 2013 Office of Academic Affairs Department Chairs Meeting.
- OIRA hired a permanent Academic Assessment Specialist that started on Oct. 21, 2013 to help manage the academic assessment process university wide. The President’s Council approved retaining the temporary Academic Assessment Specialist for a few overlapping weeks to continue setting up TracDat software for the 2013-14 student learning assessment cycle, to finish administering the freshman proficiency profile, and to transfer knowledge to the permanent Specialist.
  
  - OIRA is preloading all student learning assessment information collected prior to this academic year into TracDat and will be rolling out its use during 2013-14 (with a pilot group of programs).
  - The Academic Assessment Specialist will begin arranging faculty workshops focused on direct measures of student learning. These will augment other current and planned
activities to provide professional development for faculty regarding direct measures.

- The Administration and the University Assessment Committee are planning two learning assessment workshops for 2013-14, one to be facilitated by an external expert and the other to be campus led.
- The Provost is planning for a team of faculty and staff from the University Assessment Committee, the Academic Assessment Specialist along with the Director of OIRA, and the Associate Provost and Dean of University College to attend the December 2013 MSCHE Conference in Philadelphia.
- As we finalize the 2014-15 budget plan, the President’s Council is setting aside funds to strategically support the assessment of student learning linked to the Strategic Plan, which will be concluded during Spring 2014.

We look forward to sharing our progress and successes with the Commission in our next decennial review.
To the ESU Community:
In a letter dated November 16, 2012, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) reaffirmed East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania’s accreditation while requesting a monitoring report due September 1, 2013. The letter also stated a small team of MSCHE representatives would visit ESU following the submission of the report. ESU submitted the monitoring report on August 21, 2013 ahead of schedule and was visited by the MSCHE team on September 10, 2013.

Once again, I wish to thank all the faculty, staff, and administration that did a remarkable amount of work in response to the November 16th letter from MSCHE and in completing the monitoring report. ESU has made tremendous progress in using and documenting assessment-based decisions. However, it is made clear by the MSCHE team report that ESU must do better at institutional, programmatic, and general education levels.

The MSCHE team report and ESU’s response are now available through the following ESU webpage: http://www4.esu.edu/faculty_staff/oai/e/monitoring_report.cfm

Please remember, the MSCHE team report is a recommendation only and will not reflect the final MSCHE decision. An MSCHE committee is scheduled to meet in November to consider all materials submitted by ESU and the MSCHE team report. ESU should receive official communication from the MSCHE in early December. All final reports and official communications from the MSCHE will continue to be made available through the following ESU webpage: http://www4.esu.edu/faculty_staff/oai/e/middle_states_commission.cfm

Marcia G. Welsh, Ph.D. ? President
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
200 Prospect Street ?East Stroudsburg, PA 18301
570-422-3546?Fax 570-422-3478?mwelsh@esu.edu
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