

**Middle States Steering Committee Minutes**  
**Meeting with Middle States Liaison – Dr. Debra Klinman**  
**Wednesday, February 26 2014**  
**10:30-Noon – 201 Eberly**

**Present:** *Italic = substitute*

Laura Delbrugge – Convener - ✓

Hilliary Creely- Convener - ✓

Lynnan Mocek – Note taker -

Terry Appolonia –

Yaw Asamoah - ✓

Bill Balint -

Parimal Bhagat -

Fredalene Bowers -

David Ferguson - ✓

Steve Hovan - ✓

Terrance Hudson -

Michael Husenits -

Melvin Jenkins -

John Kilmarx - ✓

Kate Linder - ✓

Jonathan Mack - ✓

Theresa McDevitt - ✓

Pablo Mendoza - ✓

Melissa Olean -

Michele Papakie -

Barbara Moore - ✓

Kelli Paquette - ✓

David Piper -

David Pistole - ✓

Karen Pizarchik - Note taker - ✓

Ben Rafoth - ✓

Edel Reilly - ✓

Shari Robertson -

Eric Rubenstein -

Tim Runge - ✓

Ramesh Soni - ✓

Cynthia Spielman - ✓

Joan Van Dyke -

Cornelius Wooten -

Bill Zimmerman -

Tim Moerland – Ex Officio -

Mike Driscoll – Ex Officio -

**Action Items indicated in Bold**

Call to order 10:40 am

1. Middle States Commission on Higher Education:

- Each VP at Middle States is assigned a portfolio of institutions.
- Assigned VP will read the Self Study design and makes suggestions.

2. Purpose of visit:

- Learn both from documentation and visit with conversations.
- Get a feel for institution.
- Give feedback about design to make changes if SC feels appropriate.

3. IUP's document is among the best she has read!

- Goal to improve - nothing is a mandate - feedback only.
- Deliberate about changes that will help move the institution forward by clarifying the blueprint of the Self study design.
- Dr. Klinman is not an evaluator - None of this goes into team report.
- Follow up with letter regarding points - very global - no specifics.

4. Congratulations:

- On self study and how early we started the process.
- Communication plan and website excellent.
- Broad based and participatory already a fact on the ground.

5. Debra Klinman met both with the President and Provost - Both commented on level of dedication and how organized.

6. Klinman's discipline is Psych - look at this like research design for thesis.

7. One of the most important piece of the Self Study design:

- Clearly articulating up front where we want to go.
- Allow for assessment of accomplishment.

## 8. Design begins with a section of goals for self study - still feeling unclear what we want to accomplish - needs more clearly articulated.

- Dual audience for self study - Us and Middle States - can add constituents eg parents.
- First audience is internal.
- Secondary audience (that makes recommendation to Middle States) is our site team.

9. Not clear what our goals are.

## 10. Goals suggestions by Dr. Klinman:

- Current goal "Position university for changes etc" - vague - fuzzy and global.
- Need clear statement of what goals are.
- Need bullet points.
- Use to remind people what goals are - work in service of the goals.

## 11. Recommended Goals:

- Demonstrate university to meet or exceed the 14 standards of excellence.
  - i. **Not** number one goal.
- Examining trends in enrollment and funding - position the university for strategic growth.
- Use findings of self study process to make academic decisions in the interest of multiple constituencies.
- Meta level - most important - strategic planning/visioning.
  - i. Happening at same time - now important.
    1. In the end, the self study is for IUP.
    2. Strategic plan is for others.
  - ii. Support the strategic directions now defining through strategic planning process.
    1. Looking for alignment, connections, supports, and synergy - not seen in document.
    2. Then the data actually used to help shape the direction of the strategic direction and plan.

## 12. Considerations:

- Make recommendations for continuous improvement that aligns and supports the strategic direction of the university.
  - i. Goal to move institution forward.
- Make recommendations that are strategic - not in the weeds but more meta level.
  - i. Need followed up in PRR.
  - ii. Must be focused - fit into overarching strategic direction.

## 13. Reactions/comments:

- Looking for growth - but in institution it means multiple things.
  - i. We need to define what the growth is.
    1. Figure out is this numbers eg enrollment and funding or stature.
    2. Advancement vs growth.
      - a. Discussion of the use of the term and why.
- Connection between strategic plan - we need to look forward - charged by Provost.

- Self study process is layered with a reluctance to commit - needs to be usable
  - i. Advice for what we should commit vs going too far.
  - ii. Perceived controlling strategic planning process or growth goals.
    - 1. Need leaders behind the work and goals.
    - 2. Important that the work of the steering committee is not done in a vacuum or work marginalized.
      - a. Important reporting structure.
      - b. Open discussion with leadership and their ideas.
      - c. IUP already has a fluid process with leadership.
- Need to seek middle ground between specific granular goals and nebulous goals - need to be able to communicate meta level goals to site team.
  - i. Can augment with other things found - need to articulate a direction of our self study.
- Use of responsive model of evaluation - sits well with the way middle states is laid out - less prescriptive.
  - i. Middle states mode is not prescriptive.
    - 1. Begins with articulated goals - can be broad and articulated around our mission.
    - 2. We tell what we want to achieve.
    - 3. Then tell Middle States if we got there or not.
- Keep audience in mind!
- MS is not out to get you.
  - i. They are looking at what we want to accomplish .
  - ii. Very collegial.
- Alignment between goals and strategic plan – Jumar metaphor - ascend with one side then the others in rock climbing - use as analogy for the tandem nature of Self Study and Strategic Planning.

#### 14. Research questions:

- When articulate goals for process and make sure Research Questions are connected to goals.

#### 15. Documents inventory:

- Suggestion - tool - on MS website - document road map - accreditation readiness report - gives permission to go back to RQ - then if we have it then don't need to have a RQ for it and use up pages in report.
  - i. Already have it via Confluence.

#### 16. Little comment:

- Whole document repeatedly calls self study as framed in 2013-2015 - team coming in 2016 - go all the way through to 2016.
  - i. Discussion of timeframe of the report - evaluation team coming in 2016 which is the culmination of process - in 2015/16 academic year - final decision will not be rendered until 2016.

#### 17. Current timeline is broad strokes.

- Gives suggested timeline - more detailed - left out steps.
- Given to co-chairs a template/model to structure things better.

18. At end of design - MS ask for profile of visiting team - needs added.
  - A list of peer institutions.
    - i. Who we benchmark against.
    - ii. Who is aspirational.
  - MS has a list of institutions for review - peer list must be from region.
  - Need for creation of team - not everyone but most.
    - i. Think about other systems e.g. SUNY.
  - Faculty members - what are considered flagship academic programs - what lens should the faculty look through.
    - i. Doctoral level programs, what we have a reputation for.
    - ii. Only two faculty members on team.
  - Team is 8-10 people.
  - Goal – suggestion of 20 institutions.
  
19. Will be revising design – Do not stop work - will not change fundamental work subcommittees doing.
  - Must have revision to Debra and she must approve.
  - Will share timeline with co chairs.
  
20. Discussion - desired balance between past and future .
  - Self Study should be **forward looking**.
    - i. Can and should look at periodic review .
      1. PRR should build on Self Study and Self Study should build on PRR.
  - Assessment data should cover full cycle .
  - Self study is a fresh start.
    - i. Institutions change dramatically in ten years.
    - ii. If there is something in history that is a jumping off point - history only to the point as it informs where we are going.
    - iii. Where are we going next.
  
21. This about meaningful self-examination in the interest of continuous improvement.