Organization/Structure

The minutes from the October 25, 2013 meeting were reviewed and approved following a minor revision in the attendance list.

Nominees for a new UAC co-chair were requested. No new nominations were provided either via the email request or at the meeting. Quorum was reached and Sheila Handy was unanimously approved as the UAC co-chair beginning in Spring 2014.

Workgroup Updates

All four workgroups provided updates to the committee.

Professional Development

The professional development workgroup will be seeking a chair with Sheila moving to UAC co-chair. In their last meeting, the workgroup discussed assessment workshops for Spring 2014, including topics and a potential schedule. Topics include an overview of direct assessment (“What is it?”), rubrics, exemplars on campus, and student learning assessment in larger classes. They are looking to start these seminars early in Spring 2014. UAC members are to let Sheila Handy know of experts within their respective disciplines that may be willing to share what they are doing. Workshops will use on-campus expertise, with outside sources to fill in gaps.

General Education Assessment

They have met twice since the last full UAC meeting. The group is working on piloting a rubric for SLO #1, pertaining to global citizenship, by combining relevant AAC&U VALUE rubrics to meet ESU’s expanded definition. This outcome is a priority because there are currently no direct assessments of it in use. The workgroup would like to reach out to faculty who are teaching GE courses in the Spring 2014 semester to pilot this new rubric. Joann will be reaching out to the College of Arts and Sciences which houses the GE courses as well as the College of Education for assistance with rubric implementation. UAC faculty who are teaching a GE course in Spring 2014 which addresses SLO 1 were asked to consider participating in the rubric pilot. The workgroup is also reaching out to Bloomsburg University to discuss their GE program and their use of VALUE rubrics to assess it. A call is scheduled for Friday, December 13.
Program-Level Assessment

The Program Assessment workgroup has been working on annual assessment report rubric revisions, and they have been using tools gathered from other institutions to do so. The focus is on programs and whether they have clear SLOs, direct or indirect assessments, etc. Group members are also now on TracDat so that they can begin the process of reviewing the 2012-2013 annual reports that have been submitted. These reports are still coming in, with graduate-level and accredited undergraduate program assessment reports due on Friday, December 13. Chris is posting them to TracDat as they are received.

Institutional Workgroup

In the last meeting of the Institutional-Level Workgroup, attendees discussed careers of ESU graduates and how to assess this at an institutional level. Issues like employer satisfaction, job placement, and alumni satisfaction are all to be assessed. This focus is part of the Higher Education Opportunity Act, which will most likely require such reporting in the near future. They acknowledged that determining employer satisfaction will be very difficult, and they stressed that they need faculty help to get the necessary contact information for our alumni.

The workgroup will be monitoring the operational outcomes of ESU’s Early Start program, including retention, grades, graduation rates, and disciplinary cases.

Michael reported the news that ESU has institutional access to the Campus Labs surveying service, allowing academic departments to create and distribute their own surveys with the assistance of Campus Labs personnel. However, this was later determined to NOT be the case. We will be discussing appropriate survey software and support for academic affairs moving forward.

NSSE Pilot

Indiana University will be piloting a mobile application of the National Survey of Student Engagement in the spring semester. In our spring 2013 administration over 20% of our respondents took the NSSE via a mobile device. We were asked to participate in this pilot and have chosen to work with the NSSE team. We must become mobile friendly in our efforts as this is the platform our students have moved to. There is currently very little information available regarding schedules and details. Joann will keep the UAC informed as information becomes available. This will be a good opportunity for ESU to move forward with technology and to get up to speed for our assessment initiatives.

TracDat

All programs (undergraduate and graduate) that have mapped courses as part of the spring 2013 curriculum mapping effort have been entered into the TracDat software and been linked to their
program outcomes. Those program outcomes have also been linked to university student learning outcomes (or graduate themes) where appropriate.

Looking forward, both Nuventis and West Chester University have suggested we identify a faculty assessment coordinator for each program for our implementation. The scope of the faculty assessment coordinator’s responsibilities regarding TracDat will need to be determined and communicated. Implementation of TracDat should start out small. This is appropriate information to take to the department chairs. By giving them examples of what’s going on on campus, they will be empowered to decide who can be in charge of it at the program level, or at least go to their departments for a volunteer. Alternatively, if we know the assessment structure of the university (i.e. – who is charge of it in each department/program), the committee could work with that group specifically for training and implementation.

The committee discussed actual data input into TracDat. Initially, TracDat is to support program level assessment reporting and initiatives. There was conversation regarding course level assessment and what is expected. Particular concern was conveyed by education faculty already utilizing Tk20. Particular attention must be paid to areas already working in another system so that this does not become a burden. However, ESU has a need to be able to look at efforts and outcomes institutionally so all programs need to participate.

Moving forward, it was suggested to target one department from each college as a preliminary goal. This way OIRA and UAC members can work with them one on one as a pilot to roll out TracDat. Others suggested a goal of a third of all departments at most, but still one at least from each college (and one from each faculty within CAS). For further training, workshops at the beginning of the semester were floated as an idea. Joann asked UAC faculty members to consider their programs for this TracDat pilot. They would receive one-on-one help and support not just from OIRA, but from Nuventis as well. Joann will reach out to the deans as a first step to see if they have suggestions for pilot programs/departments within their colleges.

To be developed/defined:
- role of program assessment coordinator regarding TracDat,
- department/program flexibility needed within TracDat,
- incentives for piloting TracDat,
- and the development of a TracDat training page for the web.

**MSCHE Accreditation Statement**

In response to our September 2013 monitoring report and site visit, Middle States has reaffirmed ESU’s accreditation. A monitoring report is due September 1, 2014. ESU must continue to demonstrate forward progress on our assessment of student learning. As an institution we must continue to move forward with what we said we were going to do in our monitoring report. Sheila as new UAC co-chair volunteered to present this at the next University Senate meeting.
Announcements

Pam announced that the education programs passed every standard with flying colors in their NCATE assessment. Experts are doing great work on campus, and we need to celebrate this. Congratulations!

Spring Meeting Dates – Mark Your Calendars

Friday, February 21, 3:00pm
Thursday, March 27, 2:00pm
Friday, April 25, 3:00pm

Chris will work on getting workgroup meetings set up for the start of the semester.

Meeting was adjourned.
Agenda

Thursday, December 5, 2013
10:30am to 12:00pm, Stroud 319

1. Minutes from October 25, 2013
2. Co-Chair Discussion
3. Workgroup Updates
   a. Professional Development
   b. General Education Assessment
   c. Program Assessment
   d. Institutional Assessment
4. TracDat
   a. Overview
   b. Implementation Discussion
5. MSCHE Accreditation Statement
6. Updates from Members
7. New Business

Spring Meeting Dates
• Friday, February 21st
• Thursday, March 27th
• Friday, April 25th
STATEMENT OF ACCREDITATION STATUS

EAST STROUDSBURG UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
200 Prospect Street
East Stroudsburg, PA 18301-2999
Phone: (570) 422-3545; Fax: (570) 422-3478
www.esu.edu

Chief Executive Officer:  Dr. Marcia G. Welsh, Ph.D., President
          Mr. Frank Brogan, Chancellor
          Dixon University Center
          Harrisburg, PA 17110
          Phone: (717) 720-4000; Fax: (717) 720-4011

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

Enrollment
(Headcount):  6355 Undergraduate; 588 Graduate
Control:  Public
Affiliation:  Unit of PA System of Higher Education
Carnegie Classification:  Master's - Larger Programs
Degrees Offered:  Associate's, Bachelor's, Master's;
Distance Education Programs:  Yes

Accreditors Approved by U.S. Secretary of Education: American Speech-Language-
Hearing Association, Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-
Language Pathology; Council on Education for Public Health; National Council for
Accreditation of Teacher Education; National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission
Other Accreditors: Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs;
Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration; Computing
Accreditation Commission of ABET; National Recreation and Park Association

Instructional Locations

Branch Campuses: None
Additional Locations: 701 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA; Lehigh Valley Center,
Bethlehem, PA
Other Instructional Sites: Potter County Education Council, Coudersport, PA; Schuylkill
County Education Council, Schuylkill Haven, PA

ACCREDITATION INFORMATION

Status: Member since 1950
Last Reaffirmed: November 15, 2012

Most Recent Commission Action:
November 21, 2013: To accept the monitoring report and to note the visit by the Commission's representatives. To request a monitoring report, due September 1, 2014, 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 12 and 14). The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2016-2017.

Brief History Since Last Comprehensive Evaluation:
November 15, 2012: To accept the Periodic Review Report and to reaffirm accreditation. 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.

March 7, 2013: To note the visit by the Commission's representative and to affirm inclusion of the following additional location within the scope of the institution's accreditation: 60 West Broad Street, Bethlehem, PA, 18018. To remind the institution of the 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.

Next Self-Study Evaluation: 2016 - 2017

Next Periodic Review Report: 2022

Date Printed: December 4, 2013

DEFINITIONS

Branch Campus - A location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus of the institution. The location is independent if the location: offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential; has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; and has its own budgetary and hiring authority.
**Additional Location** - A location, other than a branch campus, that is geographically apart from the main campus and at which the institution offers at least 50 percent of an educational program. **ANYA** ("Approved but Not Yet Active") indicates that the location is included within the scope of accreditation but has not yet begun to offer courses. This designation is removed after the Commission receives notification that courses have begun at this location.

**Other Instructional Sites** - A location, other than a branch campus or additional location, at which the institution offers one or more courses for credit.

**Distance Education Programs** - Yes or No indicates whether or not the institution has been approved to offer one or more degree or certificate/diploma programs for which students could meet 50% or more of their requirements by taking distance education courses.

---

**EXPLANATION OF COMMISSION ACTIONS**

An institution’s accreditation continues unless it is explicitly suspended or removed. In addition to reviewing the institution’s accreditation status at least every 5 years, actions are taken for substantive changes (such as a new degree or geographic site, or a change of ownership) or when other events occur that require review for continued compliance. Any type of report or visit required by the Commission is reviewed and voted on by the Commission after it is completed.

In increasing order of seriousness, a report by an institution to the Commission may be accepted, acknowledged, or rejected.

**Levels of Actions:**

- **Grant or Re-Affirm Accreditation without follow-up**

- **Defer a decision on initial accreditation:** The institution shows promise but the evaluation team has identified issues of concern and recommends that the institution be given a specified time period to address those concerns.

- **Postpone a decision on (reaffirmation of) accreditation:** The Commission has determined that there is insufficient information to substantiate institutional compliance with one or more standards.

- **Continue accreditation:** A delay of up to one year may be granted to ensure a current and accurate representation of the institution or in the event of circumstances beyond the institution’s control (natural disaster, U.S. State Department travel warnings, etc.)

- **Recommendations to be addressed in the next Periodic Review Report:** Suggestions for improvement are given, but no follow-up is needed for compliance.

- **Supplemental Information Report:** This is required when a decision is postponed and are intended only to allow the institution to provide further information, not to give the institution time to formulate plans or initiate remedial action.

- **Progress report:** The Commission needs assurance that the institution is carrying out activities that were planned or were being implemented at the time of a report or on-site visit.

- **Monitoring report:** There is a potential for the institution to become non-compliant with MSCHE standards; issues are more complex or more numerous; or issues require a substantive, detailed report. A visit may or may not be required.

**Warning:** The Commission acts to Warn an institution that its accreditation may be in jeopardy when the institution is not in compliance with one or more Commission standards and a follow-up report, called a monitoring report, is required to demonstrate that the institution has made appropriate improvements to bring itself into compliance. Warning indicates that the Commission believes that, although the institution is out of compliance, the institution has the capacity to make appropriate improvements within a reasonable period of time and the institution has the capacity to sustain itself in the long term.

**Probation:** The Commission places an institution on Probation when, in the Commission’s judgment, the institution is not in compliance with one or more Commission standards and that the non-compliance is sufficiently serious, extensive, or acute that it raises concern about one or more of the following:
1. the adequacy of the education provided by the institution;
2. the institution's capacity to make appropriate improvements in a timely fashion; or
3. the institution's capacity to sustain itself in the long term.

Probation is often, but need not always be, preceded by an action of Warning or Postponement. If the Commission had previously postponed a decision or placed the institution on Warning, the Commission may place the institution on Probation if it determines that the institution has failed to address satisfactorily the Commission's concerns in the prior action of postponement or warning regarding compliance with Commission standards. This action is accompanied by a request for a monitoring report, and a special visit follows. Probation may, but need not always, precede an action of Show Cause.

**Suspend accreditation:** Accreditation has been Continued for one year and an appropriate evaluation is not possible. This is a procedural action that would result in Removal of Accreditation if accreditation cannot be reaffirmed within the period of suspension.

**Show cause why the institution's accreditation should not be removed:** The institution is required to present its case for accreditation by means of a substantive report and/or an on-site evaluation. A "Public Disclosure Statement" is issued by the Commission.

**Remove accreditation:** If the institution appeals this action, its accreditation remains in effect until the appeal is completed.

Other actions are described in the Commission policy, "Range of Commission Actions on Accreditation."