

Meeting Notes
Initial Meeting of the IUP MSCHE Steering Committee
May 7, 2013

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - a. Attendees: Appolonia, Asamoah, Bhagat, Billman, Bowers, Creely, Ferguson, Hudson, Husemits, Jenkins, Kilmarx, Linder, Mack, McDevitt, Mocek, Moore, Papakie, Paquette, Piper, Pistole, Pizarchik (note taker), Rafoth, Reilly, Rubenstein, Runge, Soni, Spielman, Van Dyke, Wooten, Zimmerman
 - b. Absent: Balint
2. Called to Order: 3:04 p.m. by Co-Chairs Hilliary Creely and Laura Delbrugge

Thank you: Karen Rose Cercone – Assessment/Middle States
Denise Wittenrich – GA Assistance
Karen Pizarchik – Administrative Assistance

3. What is Middle States? - 3 year process
 - Open process
 - Equal Voice
 - Binders –
 - o Contact Info sheet – check information
- a. IUP since the last Self-Study (2005) - Power Point presentation
- b. Elements of the 2013-2016 Middle States Self Study process
 - Steering committee will lead
 - Everyone will write parts
 - Ben Rafoth will compile parts, write, and organize the self-study

Goals

1. Earn re-accreditation after a meaningful and participatory review process
2. Address the 14 standard of Excellence as defined by the MSCHE in an IUP context
3. Review analytically, and with balance between positives and negatives
 - a. "Middle States requires us to do this" is NOT what we are doing – It is "Our Assessment"
 - b. Subcommittees: Members – Will come from all over campus
 - i. Every group – committee members will be asked to recruit for these sub committees.
 - ii. IRT – (Informational Resource Team)
 - One stop shop Middle States website
 - University Leadership
 - University community and Indiana Community
 - [note: in lieu of the IRT, Barbe Moore will serve as the information point person and tap relevant experts as needed]

- c. Role of Steering Committee: (PPT Presentation)
 - 1. Provide guidance for entire self-study
 - 2. Help to create Self-Study Research questions for subcommittees
 - 3. Coordinate with IRT
 - 4. Serve as Chairs of Subcommittees
 - 5. Communicate with IUP community
 - 6. Guide Creations of surveys and final report
 - 7. Host visiting MSCHE team

- d. IUP Self-Study draft timeline - In binder, tab 1. (Highlights)
 - 1. Now – Steering Committee (first meeting)
 - 2. Year 2:
 - Data Collection/Analyze data
 - Summer – Ben synthesize/report
 - 3. Year 3:
 - Spring 2016 – Site Visit
 - Summer 2016 – reaccreditation decision by MSCHE and response from IUP

- e. Review of Middle States Commission of Higher Education Standards of Excellence (14)
 - 1. 1-7 – Institutional
 - 2. 8-14 – Educational

- f. Groupings of Standards into subcommittees for IUP's Self-Study
 - 1. Comprehensive Review (vs. Special Topics)
 - 2. 2005 Review had 14 subcommittees
 - 3. Options for grouping Standard (Binder tab V, pgs. 24-25)
 - 4. Co-Chairs' summer planning; communication with Steering Committee

Questions/Statements:

Statement – Good idea to group some of the standards together.

- We will call on those who have experienced the last self-study process.

Question – Not having previous experience – what do you want us to provide?

- Going to take some reading (standards), homework... you are the leaders.

We will need lots of representation

Binder Tab 5 – Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report (Read this one first)

- Roles of the Steering Committee

Binder Tab 6 – Periodic Review Report – Mid program review – prepared by Karen Rose Cercone

Feedback on the timeline will be useful to us. It is currently a draft.

- 4. Remarks by Dr. Driscoll and Dr. Moerland

President Driscoll (Paraphrased)

Thank you for being part of this important part of this process. Leadership is great. You are a highly talented group. You are here because you have a particular expertise or represent an entity of the university. Encourage communication to your particular groups – think of the university as a whole while working.

- IUP is at a great time on a soar path - vs. a glide path – we are soaring upward – we are in great shape – this is an exercise to review and plan to push us ahead.
- Tolerate ambiguity well – in Anchorage – we piloted standards – high tolerance for terror – let’s use this to push the institution ahead! Do great work!

Tim Moreland: (Paraphrased)

Thank you for participating in this process – genuine thanks and sincere appreciation – will guide IUP and move us through years to come. – Have been through an accreditation, it was a checking the box exercise. However, have also experienced how this can make a difference.

Questions: None

-----BREAK----- (3:40 p.m.)

Reconvened: (3:54 p.m.)

1. Open discussion of crucial topics for IUP’s Self-Study - Free flowing discussion on main ideas
2. Generate a list of ideas for co-chairs to utilize to develop themes.
3. Give everyone ideas/objectives to give to sub-committees – report back to steering committee.

Question: What do you feel are the most important questions that we need to be asking about IUP for this self-study? - needs to be more than just an exercise. – floor open

- a. Having not gone through this before, how much do we look back and forward? – Need to strike a balance, negative and positive. - Need to keep in mind when developing research questions.
- b. UPC – thread throughout the entire report last review –
 - i. Address UPC and how it is changing
 - ii. Purpose and how it should operate
 - iii. This committee may identify items right now... MS does not come for three years. When you read the 2005 doc. UPC given a lot of charges. May have recommendations for their change.
- c. Do we do much in response to what was identified in last review and PRR? Yes, but we need to address all standards with fewer subcommittees.
- d. Easier to focus this time due to last study which also included a comprehensive study in addition to the 14 standards.
 - i. What have we done to improve within these standards
 - ii. There are a lot of new things that have changed.

- e. What courses or programs can remain in the university and what can be eliminated/changed - Middle States process is to look at everything that we do. If we look at this to eliminate programs, it may be too specific. Could be that we look at how do we evaluate programs and how do we assess it? How do we define quality?
 - f. 5 year review – not a rubric – Procedures, how are things done.
 - g. Student admissions retention – Internship
 - i. Advising components
 - h. Enrollment management – demographic and high school seniors
 - i. How are we going to maintain?
 - ii. How can we refine our institutional offerings
 - iii. How adaptable have we been to the larger PASSHE system - How much are we IUP or the other 14
 - i. Are values across programs – are we doing who we say we are and are we doing what we say we do.
4. Periodic Review Report (PRR) – fairly low key project – What are ways that can work that can optimize the participation rate outside of the steering committee?
 - a. The way to make lasting change is to involve people now.
 - b. Make this live, now – participatory process.
 - c. Last time over 200 participants on subcommittees
 - i. We can have less committees but maintain approx. the same # of participants
 - d. If we frame the questions properly with the subcommittees, then we will ...
 - e. Are we taking a critical look?
 5. Technology will be the key –
 - a. IUP Daily
 - b. Qualtrics surveys
 - c. Marketing what we have done
 6. Is IUP brutally honest with itself?
 7. Strategic Plan – One main area was development of strategic plan
 - a. Many of divisions have their own strategic plan
 - b. Strategic plan has expired, creating new one while MSCHE review is going on
 8. Exhaustion – Karen Rose Cercone reported to AAC – really helpful if we spent more time reflecting more time on what we find instead of looking for more things.
 - a. Debates – resolve things.
 - b. Pull many people in to grow, resolve items, move in a better direction
 - c. Open forums
 - d. Feedback

- e. Communication Plan
 - i. Online open forums
 - ii. Public forums
 - Entire community in the draft stage
9. Strategic visioning: Michele Papakie (student participation in classes)
 - a. What makes IUP distinctive?
 - b. What would you like to be? Middle States assessing this.
 10. To get the IUP community involved –need to communicate with departments that this is important.
 11. We need to define “Why” we do this process.
 12. Departmental evaluation – 5 yr. self-study
 - a. Use information to articulate what we have to do
 13. How do we make this process matter?
 - a. Follow-up
 - i. Goals set
 - ii. Everyone is going to have a place to hang their hat?
 - Everyone is going to want to see themselves in the assessment.
 - b. Logistics – 2005 – Subcommittee reports are included. (first half synthesis, second half of self study)
 - i. Summarization In the beginning
 - Read them!
 - Everyone needs to show ownership
 - ii. Do we want to do the same process?
 14. Everyone is looking for direction – where is the university going?
 - a. Mission
 - b. Common goal
 - c. Be on the train...
 - i. On it?
 - ii. Hit by it?
 15. Performance indicators by PASSHE – why can’t we align everything?
 - a. Some return on investment
 - b. Some focus
 16. Themes – pg. 34 (2005)
 - a. Helped the group focus
 17. Do things keep coming back to you?

18. How do we want to sell it? (How it “roles” out is key)

- a. Ours is a democratic campus
 - i. Vocal
 - ii. Time we want to chart vision
 - iii. Analogy of train very important!
 - Come fall, the train is leaving the station!
- b. Themes:
 - i. It is hard to get people to “buy in”
 - Challenge of IUP
 - Not sure of how much “Unity” there is here.
 - a. Participation of faculty beyond department level?
 - b. Support staff
 - c. Administrators
 - d. Students
- c. This is really a unique situation:
 - i. New president
 - ii. New provost
 - iii. Middle states

19. IUP Daily

- i. Sections – Middle States bulletins and frequent progress reports

20. Be careful that you do not have repetition of data requests!

21. Let the Provost and President make their case as to the importance of MSCHE process

- a. There has to be something that will make the faculty members “buy” in.

22. President – High tolerance for terror – sense of humor, but was that a challenge or what kind of challenge would that be?

- a. Believe he means...
 - i. He was giving us a challenge to think creatively in additions of the 14 standards.
 - ii. Don’t procrastinate if there are hard decisions or issues, let’s look at them now
 - iii. Make the process a little lighter.
 - iv. Encouraging us to take risks
 - They chose to do a comprehensive report so that we could look at everything, especially while visioning is going on.
 - They are engaged.

23. Look at all stakeholders and map them.

- a. Assessment: faculty/students/
 - i. Example: Academic Excellence – AAC Retreat
 - For whom would it be most relevant

24. Make sure subcommittee’s have representation for each area.

- a. Recommendations – talk to them, get on board – not random picks

25. Next Steps

- a. Summer planning (Co-Chairs)
 - i. Hilliary/Laura
 - Subcommittee groupings
 - a. Send feedback to co-chairs within next couple of weeks
 - b. Look at pamphlet (Pink Self-Study)
- b. Fall meeting dates:
 - i. Survey
 - ii. Monthly meetings
 - iii. Creating, working with, and discussing research questions
 - Will have things to discuss
 - Research questions form proposal.
 - Please check email this summer
 - Please email Laura or Hilliary
 - How are you going to decide?
 - a. There are models?
 - i. Do the standards go together?
 - ii. Good feedback
 - iii. Not overburden the committee members
 - iv. Some standards are lighter than others.
 - b. Next two weeks – send recommendation of groupings.
 - We will be in touch through email over the summer.

26. Adjournment: 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully prepared and submitted by Karen Pizarchik