

Systems Appraisal Feedback Report

Completed in Response to a Systems Portfolio Submitted by

MINNESOTA STATE COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE
HLC ID 1388

August 28, 2017

TEAM CHAIR
LARRY SANDERSON
TEAM MEMBERS
BONNY COPENHAVER
SCOTT EPSTEIN
RENEE HILL
STEVE SIMPSON
ROBERT SPOHR

Higher Learning Commission

Contents

I. Reflective Overview	2
II. Strategic Challenges Analysis	3
III. AQIP Category Feedback	4
IV. Criteria for Accreditation Evidence Screening	6
V. Quality of the Systems Portfolio	8
VI. Using the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report and Team Recommendation	9
APPENDIX A: Stages in Systems Maturity	10
APPENDIX B: AQIP Category Feedback	11
APPENDIX C: Criteria for Accreditation & Core Component Evidence Screening	55

I. Reflective Overview

Upon completing its review of the Institutional Overview and Category Introductions included in the Systems Portfolio, the Systems Appraisal team formulated its understanding of the institution, the institution's mission, and the constituents served. This understanding is conveyed in the following Consensus Reflective Statement. Additional team insights are also summarized here in relation to the six AQIP Pathway categories.

Reflective Overview Statement

M State has been on its AQIP journey for a number of years. The College reports a wide range of efforts and initiatives focused on positive student outcomes. Throughout this period, the College has continued to employ AQIP activities and participation in specialized HLC programs, such as the Persistence and Completion Academy, in support of its' activities. A key question to be answered through the analysis of the current Systems Portfolio is to determine if the College has established strong processes, consistently applies principles of continuous improvement, and documents outcomes sufficiently to allow meaningful analysis.

Category Summary Statements

1. **Helping Students Learn:** M State identifies Common Program and Learning Outcomes as systematic and Academic Program Design, Quality and Integrity as aligned. M State revised its' Common Learning Outcomes in 2013, and an improved assessment process in 2015-16. The College used an Action Plan to improve the program review process, with sixty-three percent of the programs completing the process. M State follows the Academic Program Design requirements of the Minnesota State System. While the College describes a robust and well-implemented assessment and curriculum process with appropriate external benchmarks, the team review will want to ensure that there is evidence in data and associated analysis related to these reported processes.
2. **Meeting Student & Other Key Stakeholder Needs:** A major focus for the College for the past two years has been to improve student success and learning for under-prepared and at-risk students. M State participated in HLC's Persistence and Completion Academy to support work in this Category. To better collect and utilize data, the College has also increased Institutional Research staff and developed a Persistence Team. The College rates its overall maturity level as aligned for this Category.
3. **Valuing Employees:** The College ensures that job descriptions are developed to identify the specific skills, credentials, and knowledge required by faculty, staff, and administrators based

upon input from supervisors across the institution and benchmarking initiatives with other organizations. These requirements are integrated into a defined and documented recruiting and hiring process designed to identify high performing individuals who possess the necessary skills to succeed as candidates for positions that come open.

4. **Planning and Leading:** Limited results are available to demonstrate effectiveness in this Category. Without tracking and understanding performance, the College may miss opportunities for improvement important to realize the mission and vision. No comparative data are presented to demonstrate how the College's effectiveness in Planning and Leading compares with other higher education organizations or those outside higher education.
5. **Knowledge Management & Resource Stewardship:** In their overview, the College cites improvement in this Category based on prior feedback. M State identifies Knowledge and Resource Management as aligned, and Operational Effectiveness as integrated. The College states that Knowledge and Resource Management use thorough and established processes, collaborative decision-making, and continual monitoring, which Operational Effectiveness uses detailed processes, continual monitoring, and strategic decision-making.
6. **Quality Overview:** Although the College encourages employees to enact continuous improvement actions into their daily work, it is not clear how widespread continuous improvement actions are being applied by process owners. Clearly, the College has benefited by the use and application of AQIP Action Projects, however, more systematic use of continuous improvement projects may enhance M State's ability to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness across the institution.

II. Strategic Challenges Analysis

In reviewing the entire Systems Portfolio, the Systems Appraisal team was able to discern what may be several overarching strategic challenges or potential issues that could affect the institution's ability to succeed in reaching its mission, planning, and overall quality improvement goals. These judgments are based exclusively on information available in the Systems Portfolio and thus may be limited. Each item should be revisited in subsequent AQIP Pathway reviews, such as during the comprehensive evaluation in Year 8.

Strategic Challenge: Describing processes and results; The institution consistently rates its' level of maturity in the AQIP Categories as systematic, aligned, and in one case, integrated. The absence of reported data, analysis of results, and irregular descriptions of processes do not support the

College's self-evaluation of its' maturity levels. While it is possible that data and documentation exist to support the College's assessment related to AQIP levels of maturity, the absence of information in the portfolio prevents the team from supporting the College's self-evaluation. Moreover, the team perceives a strategic disconnect in that the College either a) failed to report information supporting their assessment, or b) that data and document is lacking. In either case, the team perceives that M State seems to be unaware of the expectations of AQIP for meaningful documentation of processes and presentation of supporting data.

Strategic Challenge: Focus on continual improvement; Despite the College's assertions to the contrary, the team cannot ignore the apparent lack of applying lessons learned from one review to the next and considers this to be a significant strategic problem for M State. For example, the lack of reported data related to processes and student outcomes is not only an issue for this portfolio but was initially identified in the 2013 portfolio review. In 2013, of 46 results items, 36 of those items were evaluated as an O or OO suggesting the prior review team had identified substantive shortfalls in reporting of results. In 2017, this team has again found significant gaps in reported data.

Strategic Challenge: Reporting of results; M State consistently falls short of presenting meaningful data in the results sections of the categories:

- To the extent that data is reported, the information is frequently of a summative (or count) nature and not indicative of process outcomes.
- The portfolio is almost completely lacking in comparative data save an occasional reference to Minnesota State System data. This is of particular concern given a prior report (in 2013) that the College had joined the National Community College Benchmark Project for the specific reason of developing meaningful comparative information. This suggests that the College recognized its' shortcoming and was taking action to rectify the problem. Yet, in the 2017 portfolio there is not one reference to the NCCBP or information from the comparative data available from the project.

III. AQIP Category Feedback

As the Systems Appraisal team reviewed the Systems Portfolio, it determined the stages of maturity of the institution's processes and results. These stages range from "Reacting" to "Integrated" and are described in Appendix A. Through use of the maturity stages and its analysis of the institution's reported improvements, the team offers below summary feedback for each AQIP Pathway category. This section identifies areas for further improvement and also possible improvement strategies. In addition to the

summary information presented here, Appendix B conveys the team's specific feedback for all Process, Results, and Improvement items included in the institution's Systems Portfolio. The summary feedback below, and the detailed feedback offered in Appendix B, is based only upon evidence conveyed in the Systems Portfolio. It is possible that the institution has additional information on specific processes, results and improvements that was not included in the Systems Portfolio. In such instances, the institution should plan to provide this evidence in a future AQIP Pathway review process.

Category 1: Helping Students Learn

M State's overall maturity in Category One is systematic. While M State articulates most of its' process for Helping Students Learn, many of the descriptions could be more in-depth. M State presents data throughout Category One, but there is a consistent need to establish and leverage internal and external benchmarks as a part of evaluating primary areas of performance. Additionally, M State could benefit from a more sophisticated data analysis presentation. Not all the tables presented are necessarily representative of the process they are shown to represent.

The College does not appear to have designed and implemented a process to help students select programs of study that match their needs, interests, and abilities. Consequently, some students may select programs that they are not suited for, which may hinder the students' abilities to achieve success. It is also not apparent that the College systematically communicates expectations regarding student preparation requirements and student learning objectives. Increased efforts in this area could strengthen student preparation, improve student retention, and perhaps increase the number of applicants.

Category 2: Meeting Student & Other Key Stakeholder Needs

Many of the processes presented in the Category are not fully defined, and the data does not correlate to the processes in an analytical manner. The College does not provide any internal targets or external benchmarks, and often the reflections on the data are not connected to the data and the story the data is painting. M State's strength in this Category is the understanding of working with community partners. The maturity level for Category Two is evaluated as systematic.

Category 3: Valuing Employees

M State describes the focus of professional development opportunities as well as efforts to expand or improve these opportunities. However, there is little or no discussion as to how these processes are evaluated or the outcomes that have been achieved. Limited data and associated analysis makes it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of these efforts. The overall maturity Level in Category Three is systematic.

Category 4: Planning and Leading

Effective strategic planning is a central activity for any institution and of particular importance for an AQIP institution focused on continual improvement. Although the College has engaged in planning activities that have resulted in a set of goals and associated strategies, the processes seem to

hesitate, if not stop, at that point. The lack of clear measures and reported results undermines the College's intent to effectively implement the plan. College responses throughout Category 4 indicate that activities are, in fact, taking place but insufficient information is presented to allow for analysis of the effectiveness of issues related to planning and leading. The overall maturity level in Category Four is reacting.

Category 5: Knowledge Management & Resource Stewardship

The M State portfolio would benefit from clearer articulation of processes. Having clear processes could allow M State to create appropriate metrics, gather relevant data, and show the alignments of improvement practices. The College benefits from participation in the State system of schools and the processes that assist with compliance in the State system. Those process explanations related to participation in the State System are perhaps some of the strongest in the portfolio. There is a seemingly untapped resource in comparative data available through the State, which would be a quick strategy to address the cited need for external benchmarking. Because the College struggles with data collection, data analysis, and the resulting improvement planning, the College remains at the Reacting level despite significant time as an AQIP institution. Developing and implementing a more sophisticated data framework could help the college track, analyze, and share its accomplishments and improvements effectively. The maturity level in Category Five is considered to be reacting.

Category 6: Quality Overview

Measures to demonstrate the effectiveness of how M State integrates continuous quality improvement have yet to be established; therefore, there is no evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of the continuous improvement cycle. It does not appear that systematic process management has been established throughout the College. As a result, M State is limited in its ability to make significant strides forward in achieving high performance outcomes. Furthermore, it is not clear how widespread continuous improvement strategies are implemented by the College.

IV. Criteria for Accreditation Evidence Screening

The Systems Appraisal team screened the institution's Systems Portfolio evidence in relation to the Criteria for Accreditation and the Core Components. This step is designed to position the institution for success during its comprehensive evaluation in Year 8. In order to accomplish this task, HLC has established linkages between the Systems Portfolio's Process and Results items and the Criteria's Core Components. Systems Appraisal teams have been trained to conduct a "soft review" of the Criteria and Core Components for Systems Portfolios completed in the third year of the AQIP Pathway cycle and a more robust review for Systems Portfolios completed in the seventh year. The formal review of the Criteria and Core Components for purposes of reaffirming the institution's accreditation occurs only in the eighth year of the cycle and is completed through the comprehensive evaluation, unless serious problems are identified earlier in the cycle. As part of this Systems Appraisal screening process, teams indicate whether each Core Component is "Strong, clear, and well-presented"; "Adequate but could be improved"; or "Unclear or incomplete." When the Criteria and Core Components are reviewed formally for

reaffirmation of accreditation, peer reviewers must determine whether each is “Met,” “Met with concerns,” or “Not met.”

Appendix C of this report documents in detail the Appraisal team’s best judgment as to the current strength of the institution’s evidence for each Core Component and thus for each Criterion. Institutions are encouraged to review Appendix C carefully in order to guide improvement work relative to the Criteria and Core Components. Immediately below, the team provides summary statements that convey broadly its observations regarding the institution’s present ability to satisfy each Criterion, as well as any suggestions for improvement. Again, this feedback is based only upon information contained in the institution’s Systems Portfolio and thus may be limited.

Criterion 1. Mission:

Overall, the team has no serious concerns with regards to Criterion 1 and the Core Components. The College has a clear view of the Mission and Vision and these are effectively articulated to all stakeholders. The issues identified in this Criterion relate mainly to lack of descriptions for some of the key processes as well as a general lack of data related to outcomes of the processes. More thorough description of processes coupled with direct evidence related to the effectiveness of those processes would strengthen the College response to Criterion 1.

Criterion 2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The College responds well to all the Core Components of Criterion 2. The team has determined that the responses in this Criterion are all strong and well presented.

Criterion 3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The review team has determined that the College supports Core Components 3A and 3C with strong, well presented information. However, the team found weakness in the described processes and evidence presented in support of Core Components 3B and 3D. In the case of 3B, the team recognizes the College efforts to improve assessment activities but does not find the kind of detailed explanation of the process as well as the evaluative tools that are being used to document student learning. With regards to 3D, the College falls short of providing meaningful explanation of the processes and activities that are in place to support the expectation of this Core Component.

Criterion 4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

Information presented by the College does not fully address the requirements and expectations of the Core Components in Criterion 4. Specifically, although the College has described new efforts related to assessment of student learning little or no evidence is provided to document the College efforts or to explain how the College is using assessment data to improve teaching and learning. The distinct lack of data in response to the “R” sections of the AQIP Systems Portfolio serves to undermine College assertion that strong processes exist.

Criterion 5. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The College responses for Core Component 5A and 5B are considered to be strong and well presented. However, the team has identified serious concerns with regards to the information presented in support of Core Components 5C and 5D. In both cases, the team believes that there is a distinct lack of evidence and that the College has fallen short of providing sufficient information to permit effective evaluation. The lack of meaningful benchmark or comparative data is a material weakness in the Systems Portfolio. Finally, when these Core Components are evaluated in light of the previous Systems Portfolio Review in 2013, there is concern that the College has not addressed long standing issues related to the presentation of evidence and data.

V. Quality of the Systems Portfolio

While the team appreciates the obvious energy and enthusiasm that infuses the entire Systems Portfolio, serious concerns remain with regards to a substantial lack of well described processes, lack of reported data directly tied to outcomes, and analysis that often does not seem tied to the processes just reported. The team recognizes that there are probably many, many good activities and effective processes at work at M State. Yet, the Systems Portfolio falls short of supporting these assumptions on the part of the team and the team is required to evaluate based on data and information presented. In a number of instances, when a question asks about a particular process, the language of the Systems Portfolio seems to suggest the process exists yet falls short of actually describing the process. Subsequent lack of data presented in the results sections only serves to underscore the lack of described processes. In many cases, the issues that are being raised by the team during this current review do, in fact, echo the concerns cited by the previous team responsible for the 2013 review. The most serious issue found in the current document has to do with a consistent lack of evidence throughout the Portfolio in support of the stated processes and documenting outcomes from these processes.

VI. Using the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report

The Systems Appraisal process is intended to foster action for institutional improvement. Although decisions about specific next steps rest with the institution, HLC expects every institution to use its Feedback Report to stimulate improvement and to inform future processes. If this Appraisal is being completed in the institution's third year in the AQIP Pathway cycle, the results may inform future Action Projects and also provide the focus for the institution's next Strategy Forum. In rare cases, the Appraisal completed in the third year may suggest either to the institution itself or to the Commission the need for a mid-cycle (fourth year) Comprehensive Quality Review. If this Appraisal is being completed in the institution's seventh year in the cycle, again the results may inform future Action Projects and Strategy Forums, but more immediately they should inform institutional preparation for its comprehensive evaluation in the eighth year of the cycle when the institution's continuing accredited status will be determined along with future Pathway eligibility. Institutions are encouraged to contact their staff liaison with questions.

Team Recommendation: Based on the information presented in the responses to the Process, Results, and Improvements prompts, the team has determined that insufficient evidence is presented to support a full and effective evaluation of the College's work meeting the requirements of Criterion 4A, 4B, 4C, 5C, and 5D. Given the number of issues involved and the need for a substantial review of evidence, the team has determined that the best course of action is to ask for a mid-cycle Comprehensive Quality Review. A mid-cycle review, although obviously unexpected and potentially inconvenient, is the best way to address concerns and document that M State is, in fact, in compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. If there are any areas of concern remaining after the mid-cycle CQR then these issues will be fully visible to the College and the HLC and can be addressed in the subsequent AQIP processes.

APPENDIX A
Stages in Systems Maturity: Processes

Reacting	Systematic	Aligned	Integrated
<p>The institution focuses on activities and initiatives that respond to immediate needs or problems rather than anticipating future requirements, capacities, or changes. Goals are implicit and poorly defined. Informal procedures and habits account for all but the most formal aspects of institutional operations.</p>	<p>The institution is beginning to operate via generally understood, repeatable, and often documented processes and is prone to make the goal of most activities explicit, measurable, and subject to improvement. Institutional silos are eroding and signs of coordination and the implementation of effective practices across units are evident. Institutional goals are generally understood.</p>	<p>The institution operates according to processes that are explicit, repeatable and periodically evaluated for improvement. Processes address key goals and strategies, and lessons learned are shared among institutional units. Coordination and communication among units is emphasized so stakeholders relate what they do to institutional goals and strategies.</p>	<p>Operations are characterized by explicit, predictable processes that are repeatable and regularly evaluated for optimum effectiveness. Efficiencies across units are achieved through analysis, transparency, innovation, and sharing. Processes and measures track progress on key strategic and operational goals. Outsiders request permission to visit and study why the institution is so successful.</p>

Stages in Systems Maturity: Results

Reacting	Systematic	Aligned	Integrated
<p>Activities, initiatives, and operational processes may not generate data or the data is not collected, aggregated, or analyzed. Institutional goals lack measures, metrics, and/or benchmarks for evaluating progress. The monitoring of quality of operational practices and procedures may be based on assumptions about quality. Data collected may not be segmented or distributed effectively to inform decision-making.</p>	<p>Data and information are collected and archived for use, available to evaluate progress, and are analyzed at various levels. The results are shared and begin to erode institutional silos and foster improvement initiatives across institutional units. The tracking of performance on institutional goals has begun in a manner that yields trend data and lends itself to comparative measures in some areas.</p>	<p>Measures, metrics and benchmarks are understood and used by all relevant stakeholders. Good performance levels are reported with beneficial trends sustained over time in many areas of importance. Results are segmented and distributed to all responsible institutional units in a manner that supports effective decision-making, planning and collaboration on improvement initiatives. Measures and metrics are designed to enable the aggregation and analysis of results at an institutional level.</p>	<p>Data and information are analyzed and used to optimize operations on an ongoing basis. Performance levels are monitored using appropriate benchmarks. Trend data has been accrued and analyzed for most areas of performance. Results are shared, aggregated, segmented and analyzed in a manner that supports transparency, efficiency, collaboration and progress on organizational goals. Measures and metrics for strategic and operational goals yield results that are used in decision-making and resource allocations.</p>

APPENDIX B

AQIP Category Feedback

Category 1: Helping Students Learn

Category 1 focuses on the design, deployment and effectiveness of teaching-learning processes (and the processes required to support them) that underlie the institution’s credit and non-credit programs and courses.

1.1: Common Learning Outcomes

Common Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities expected of graduates from all programs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P1 Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated common learning outcomes, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Aligning common outcomes to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution	Systematic: M State uses the Minnesota Community College System’s Core Abilities as their college learning outcomes. These college learning outcomes match the Minnesota Transfer curriculum as well as the College’s mission and vision statements. The College updated its’ Core Abilities in 2013, using a process that engaged numerous internal stakeholder groups. M State may benefit from articulating its processes for addressing how it ensures the outcomes meet the stated mission, vision, and degree levels. The College might consider involving students and external stakeholders in the process.
Determining common outcomes	Reacting: The College has a process by which it determined the common outcomes for its general education curriculum and institutional learning outcomes through the College Core Abilities and the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum. M State reviewed the core abilities in 2013 through a collaborative process; however, there is no evidence that the review process is repeated on a regular basis. While outcomes were determined by faculty and staff in academic departments, it is unclear what information is used to determine the knowledge, skills, and abilities students should have upon graduation. The College should articulate a specific process and timeline for reviewing common outcomes. The College may also benefit from explaining how these common learning outcomes apply to non-transfer programs.

<p>Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of the outcomes</p>	<p>Systematic: The student learning assessment process (College-wide Core Ability assessment) was developed in 2015. Participation in both the Commission’s Assessment Retreat and AQIP have contributed to the development of a systematic process. The College provided evidence of the process for determining common learning outcomes which clearly articulates the assessment process of the College’s student learning cycle to assess learning outcomes and improve student learning. The institution developed the Assessment of Student Learning Handbook which outlines assessment processes. Each learning outcome has multiple indicators; however, the level of achievement that is desired for each outcome is not well-documented. M State has an opportunity to develop achievement targets for each outcome.</p>
<p>Incorporating into the curriculum opportunities for all students to achieve the outcomes</p>	<p>Systematic: M State uses tools and outcomes that are aligned to the AACU Value Rubrics for external benchmarking. Common learning outcomes are aligned with and embedded in the program and course goals of the various curricula, which provide opportunity for both formative and summative assessment of the outcomes. Faculty have the opportunity to adjust instructional methods to meet student learning needs.</p> <p>Although the College Core Abilities are integrated into the general education curriculum, there is no clear explanation of how this is done in a manner that impacts all students. The College speaks more to transfer programs than non-transfer programs; therefore, the College may benefit from addressing how all students have opportunities to achieve the learning outcomes.</p>
<p>Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs</p>	<p>Systematic: M State’s faculty and staff along with several key leadership teams, Academic Affairs and Standards Council (AASC), the Assessment Work Group, and Academic Leadership Team, reviewed and revised the core abilities. M State indicates that advisory committees are used to assure that outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace, and societal needs. While advisory committees are active, there is no indication that the advisory committees have input into common learning outcomes or how common learning outcomes are aligned to occupational programs.</p>
<p>Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning</p>	<p>Reacting: The College provides co-curricular programs that are aligned with the mission and the student experience. Internships, clinicals, student clubs and organizations, programmatic skills competitions,</p>

	<p>athletics, and fine arts opportunities are some of the examples provided.</p> <p>While co-curricular programs are offered, the College has an opportunity to improve the alignment and delivery of co-curricular activities by establishing and documenting a comprehensive and repeatable process to measure which opportunities should be offered, and how effectively each co-curricular activity enhances a student's learning of the common outcomes.</p>
Selecting tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of common learning outcomes	<p>Systematic: The College describes a series of processes used to assess student learning across a variety of academic programs, including within the State, and nationally using The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) tools and benchmarks. Additionally, it is clear that faculty and key academic leaders are engaged in these processes. What is less clear, however, is exactly how specific tools and methods are identified and deployed to assess student learning outcomes. M State could benefit from fully defining the process for selecting tools, methods, and instruments.</p>
Assessing common learning outcomes	<p>Systematic: M State describes a series of processes that are in place to evaluate student learning outcomes at the institutional and program level. Assessment occurs systematically within defined intervals. Although assessment is occurring, the process could be enhanced through a better defined and standardized process.</p>
Other identified processes	

1R1 What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected at each degree level? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	<p>Reacting: The College has collected and shared one year's worth of data covering some of the College Core Abilities and the alignment to the AACU Value Rubrics. As this is a new process the sample is small; there is no trend data, which limits the College. It is expected that this will improve organically as the process continues into the next data collection cycle and more robust data sets are available. In looking at the tables, the</p>

	relationship between benchmarks, milestones, and capstones could be explained better.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: Although M State’s data presentation does demonstrate the alignment between the College Core Abilities and the AACU, it does not provide any comparative benchmarking data, or targets. Additionally, the College cites the alignment to Minnesota System standards, which is a natural point of comparison for like schools in the state that could be included. The College is well positioned to have a robust set of comparative benchmarking data, however it is not presented in this portion of the portfolio.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: The College process is relatively new; therefore, limited trends are reported that indicate achievement of student learning outcomes. The College acknowledges that there are some areas of opportunity and growth as the process matures. M State could benefit from digging more deeply into some of the comparative data sets that already exist. Also, there is no mention of any changes that result from the assessments, which provides an opportunity for M State to close the assessment loop.

111 Based on 1R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
Although the College has developed a range of assessment activities, it is unclear from the information presented how much actionable information is being obtained, how these data are informing instructional decisions, and if the College is, in fact, achieving its identified educational goals. M State may benefit from articulating processes that are in place. There are several processes that are mentioned in the portfolio, but the processes are not fully explained. M State focused on “what” they do, and they may benefit from explaining “how” they ensure compliance with the criteria.

1.2: Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcomes focuses on the knowledge, skills and abilities graduates from particular programs are expected to possess. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.B., 3.E. and 4.B. in this section.

1P2 Describe the processes for determining, communicating and ensuring the stated program learning outcomes and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Aligning program learning outcomes to the mission, educational offerings and degree levels of the institution	Systematic: M State has established multiple processes intended to support alignment of program learning outcomes with student needs. These processes include internal work groups, external accreditation agencies, and advisory groups composed of external experts. The use of the Program Navigator Academic Approval Process in coordination with the internal processes defined in the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) process give the College a process for alignment within the State system. M State refers to many processes that exist but does not describe those processes.
Determining program outcomes	Systematic: Program outcomes are designed and determined through the AASC’s Curriculum Design process, utilization of the Minnesota State system’s program approval tool, program specific accreditation and/or approving agency processes, and program advisory committees. Defining how these processes work together could help these processes become more mature and effective.
Articulating the purposes, content and level of achievement of these outcomes	Systematic: While program advisory boards are used to determine program learning outcomes, it is unclear how these requirements are communicated and repeatedly updated. The table showing the data points used in the CPR was useful; however, more explanation of the evaluation criteria is needed. The College has a process to review program outcomes every three years. Although the processes are articulated, the levels of achievement are unclear from the content provided. Data are being collected; however, the thresholds and evaluation criteria are not defined in the portfolio.
Ensuring the outcomes remain relevant and aligned with student, workplace and societal needs	Systematic: M State’s connections with external accrediting and program agencies help to assure that some program learning objectives remain current and relevant. M State could help this process mature by creating one process that encompasses all programs, regardless of whether or not the program has an external accreditation.
Designing, aligning and delivering cocurricular activities to support learning	Systematic: The College cites numerous examples in a variety of programs that give students opportunities for learning outside of their classroom experiences. While this evidence is presented, there is little presented in terms of specific and clearly defined process of identifying and evaluating cocurricular opportunities for students. Explaining how these opportunities are selected, made available, and encouraged in all

	programs (or as many as possible) would help this process mature.
Selecting tools, methods and instruments used to assess attainment of program learning outcomes	Systematic: M State’s academic departments define outcomes and assessment instruments. Programs are reviewed annually by deans and faculty, and several programs have additional accreditations and/or licensure requirements. Unfortunately, the College does not clearly explain the process for selecting the tools or instruments used during the review process.
Assessing program learning outcomes	Systematic: Faculty track assessment data to evaluate course outcomes, but it is unclear how individual faculty members utilize the data that is gathered to make improvements in the offerings. It is also unclear how M State, as an institution, ensures that quality improvement through assessment is taking place on a regular basis. The College could benefit from articulating a process that ensures that all programs are assessing outcomes and making improvements based on those data.
Other identified processes	

1R2 What are the results for determining if students possess the knowledge, skills and abilities that are expected in programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Overall levels of deployment of the program assessment processes within the institution (i.e., how many programs are/not assessing program goals)	Systematic: Approximately 63 percent of the College’s programs have gone through the comprehensive review process with the remaining programs scheduled for May, 2018. A variety of results are reported to determine if students possess the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are expected in programs. This provides the College with an understanding of performance across academic programs. Whenever possible the College should, use national and state averages in the data presentation. These measures should be complimented by the presentation of data from the institutional assessment process. There are a few examples from the CPR process; however, it is unclear if this occurs in all programs.
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Systematic: The data provided give the reader three-years of performance data, and in some circumstances the appropriate state or national mean scores. Most of the data presented comes from programs with external

	<p>accreditations and/or a licensure exam. Little to no data for other programs was included in the portfolio and what was included was in narrative form. While data are collected to varying degrees at the program level, data are not aggregated at the college level to demonstrate overall achievement of the program learning outcomes. Additionally, employer perspectives on the degree to which students have acquired the knowledge and skills to succeed in the workplace are also not included.</p> <p>The data presented for the cocurricular activities was not tied to any assessment; while the information is positive about student achievement, it does not prove that co-curricular activities help students meet program learning outcomes.</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Systematic: There is evidence that M State is comparing its performance on certification and licensure examinations to state and national averages. The heavy reliance on external measures does not demonstrate how the institution is evaluating performance on its internal benchmarks. The evidence of a larger internal process that affects and guides all or most programs is not seen in the portfolio.</p>
<p>Interpretation of assessment results and insights gained</p>	<p>Systematic: M State provided insights and highlights gained from licensure pass rates assessing student performance and highlights from the comprehensive reviews. The College assessed lower licensure pass rates and made curricular adjustments to improve student performance. A comprehensive program review highlight was the assessment of the Web Design program; the program developed eight-week block courses to increase one-year program completion and added more project based learning in the curriculum, yielding greater opportunities for program outcome achievement. M State has correctly concluded that programs without extra accreditations need an “enhanced assessment” process.</p>

112 Based on 1R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

<p>Evaluation of Improvement Efforts</p>
<p>M State utilized Action Projects to enhance the assessment of student learning, focusing on programs not associated with specialized accreditation agencies. This was an opportunity presented to the College in the last Systems Portfolio. This remains an opportunity for improvement.</p>

1.3: Academic Program Design

Academic Program Design focuses on developing and revising programs to meet stakeholders' needs. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.C. and 4.A. in this section.

1P3 Describe the processes for ensuring new and current programs meet the needs of the institution and its diverse stakeholders. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Identifying student stakeholder groups and determining their educational needs	Reacting: A process is in place for program review. A formal review process conducted every 5 years contributes to the identification of new program and responsive programming requirements. A requirement of the Minnesota State System is that submitted program designs must provide evidence that student input was solicited and utilized. Unfortunately, M State does not address how M State identifies student stakeholder groups and their educational needs.
Identifying other key stakeholder groups and determining their needs	Reacting: M State identifies how proposals are considered once they are developed; however, no process for identifying other stakeholder groups was presented. Articulating a process for the identification of stakeholders and then a corresponding process for determining needs would be beneficial.
Developing and improving responsive programming to meet all stakeholders' needs	Systematic: M State is mandated to follow the Minnesota State System's program design process. Within the institution, AASC, which was established through collective bargaining with M State faculty, spearheads the program design process. Unfortunately, parts of the process are unclear. While student groups or other key stakeholders may express a need for a new program, it is not clear what data is used to identify emerging needs. The College could benefit from identifying a process, including data needs, which is followed for all new program requests.
Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess the currency and effectiveness of academic programs	Systematic: The College uses automated tools at the institutional and state level for submitting program designs. The College has automated software for curriculum review and approval that aids the AASC in the two-step review and deliberation process for all curriculum proposals. The software also ensures that program proposals align with the M State's mission and adheres to requirements of the Minnesota State system. The Minnesota State System utilizes Program Navigator technology to ensure all required program design data are inputted and received. The College could benefit from identifying how additional tools, methods, and instruments are selected.

<p>Reviewing the viability of courses and programs and changing or discontinuing when necessary</p>	<p>Reacting: The College describes processes to review the effectiveness of programs, but it is difficult, from the information presented, to determine how effective M State’s efforts are for reviewing the viability of programs. While programs and courses may be periodically adjusted or eliminated, it may not be based on a systematic approach. The College may benefit from describing a process that provides useful and timely information that leads to appropriate or necessary action.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

1R3 What are the results for determining if programs are current and meet the needs of the institution’s diverse stakeholders? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

<p>Results</p>	<p>Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement</p>
<p>Summary results of assessments (including tables and figures when possible)</p>	<p>Reacting: The College presents data documenting that some programs subject to review have been rejected, closed, or suspended, but the nature of the assessment is unclear. The reported results are limited to curriculum design and management. No other results are reported to determine if programs and courses are meeting the needs of the College’s diverse stakeholders.</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Reacting: There was little to no discussion of benchmarking. This is a challenging area for benchmarking; however, the State system could be used for comparative purposes to assess utilization of the comment process, engagement, and total program improvement metrics. Also, no internal targets or external benchmarks have been established for the assessment of the program design processes. M State would benefit from setting internal targets and benchmarks, as well as using the State system for comparative data.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Reacting: The College has accurately identified numerous positive steps that will help with the gaps in the front-end processes for stakeholder and need identification. As these improvements occur, the resulting processes will improve. Insights gained from the results within the Systems Portfolio indicate that a formal exit reporting structure is needed to report out to those who submit program proposals for improvement recommendations.</p>

1I3 Based on 1R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
M State seems to have focused on its current program evaluation but did not address the front-end piece needed to identify new stakeholders and new community needs. The described process almost seems to begin at the end of that initial process as it moves to the evaluation. Taking a step back and focusing on the beginning of the process would be an important step in improving these processes.

1.4: Academic Program Quality

Academic Program Quality focuses on ensuring quality across all programs, modalities and locations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.A. and 4.A. in this section.

1P4 Describe the processes for ensuring quality academic programming. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Determining and communicating the preparation required of students for the specific curricula, programs, courses and learning they will pursue	Systematic: M State describes a process for determining the preparation needed to succeed in a given program. This process involves faculty, external stakeholders, industry input, and feedback from the admissions process. M State could benefit from a thorough explanation of how the College communicates this to students. As students may have varying experiences during their admissions processes, having some clearly articulated points of contact with this information could be beneficial.
Evaluating and ensuring program rigor for all modalities, locations, consortia and dual-credit programs	Systematic: The College details how faculty are identified and prepared to deliver content across all modes of delivery but it is unclear as to how the College evaluates the effectiveness of delivery across modes. M State could benefit from a comprehensive assessment process. This would allow the College to conduct curricular and assessment based comparisons across these various delivery areas to ensure consistency and identify gaps. This is an example of where an assessment process may benefit the College more than the reliance on licensure pass rates as the primary evidence of outcome attainment.
Awarding prior learning and transfer credits	Aligned: The awarding of transfer and prior learning credit follows the Minnesota State System policies.

Selecting, implementing and maintaining specialized accreditation(s)	Systematic: At M State, the process for selecting, implementing, and maintaining specialized accreditation is left to the individual program or determined by state statute. Since specialized accreditations can be costly and in some cases optional, the College could benefit from identifying a process for selecting and approving specialized accreditations.
Assessing the level of outcomes attainment by graduates at all levels	Systematic: The effectiveness of academic programs is monitored through common learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and academic program design, and measures include pass rates on licensure exams and employment data. The College could benefit from the development of its own internal assessments.
Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to assess program rigor across all modalities	Systematic: Academic programs are evaluated by gathering common learning outcomes data, program learning outcomes data, and external measures of pass rates and licensure. The College could benefit from identifying a process for selecting tools, methods, and instruments that are used by all programs.
Other identified processes	Aligned: The College has a process in place to ensure standards are met for dual enrollment students and is nationally accredited by the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships, where the institution exceeded national standards the first year in 2016.

1R4 What are the results for determining the quality of academic programs? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of assessments (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: While outcomes/measures tracked includes placement rates for traditional and online students, efforts to determine quality of academic programs appears limited. The College does present some data and there is evidence of data collection over time. Unfortunately, there are key component missing from the data presentation. The College does not describe or present data for its' process of determining the experience of graduates. Additionally, the data presented is without the context of how this does or does not demonstrate quality or improvement. M State may benefit by tracking other effectiveness measures such as skills attainment rates.

Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: Benchmarking, whether internal or external, continues to be a challenge. There is not extensive evidence of internal or external benchmarking and it is not presented in the results section. The College could benefit from leveraging the data provided by participation in specialized accreditations.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: There is little discussion of specific or planned improvements based on evaluating data. The integration of a data system is a good step. However, this should be included with discussions of specific benefits related to the areas of 1P4 that will be improved through by the use of this system.

114 Based on 1R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Comments
The College is collecting data; however, the data presented do not seem representative of the criteria it supports. There is a need to move to a more sophisticated data collection and analysis system. The discussion of the concurrent program and associated processes was well done and could be used as a model to improve other areas.

1.5: Academic Integrity

Academic Integrity focuses on ethical practices while pursuing knowledge. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.D. and 2.E. in this section.

1P5 Describe the processes for supporting ethical scholarly practices by students and faculty. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Ensuring freedom of expression and the integrity of research and scholarly practice	Aligned: The Board of Trustees' policy and the student handbook clearly identify academic freedom protections for faculty and students. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) supports an open and encouraging environment for exploration and scholarly practice. Additionally, the College established an Institutional Review Board (IRB) process to assist both students and staff in scholarly and ethical research practices, which is an important structural place for policy review and adherence.
Ensuring ethical learning and research practices of students	Aligned: Two policies provide guidance for ethical teaching and learning. The College has an Academic Honesty policy for students; if students violate the policy too many times, the Student Code of Conduct takes

	over. The College’s Intellectual Property policy covers ethical earning practices and ownership rights of intellectual property. The IRB was established to ensure ethical research practices.
Ensuring ethical teaching and research practices of faculty	Aligned: The CBA and student policies support an open and encouraging environment for exploration and scholarly practice. As noted, the IRB is in place to support scholarly and ethical research practices. The College’s Intellectual Property policy also covers ethical teaching practices and provides guidance on academic freedom.
Selecting the tools, methods and instruments used to evaluate the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of supporting academic integrity	Reacting: The college IRB process is responsible for ensuring ethical practices in research on campus. However, it is unclear from the information presented as to how the College evaluates the effectiveness of the processes supporting academic integrity and ethical behavior.
Other identified processes	

1R5 What are the results for determining the quality of academic integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 1P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: The College provides some data related to these areas. For an institution with 8,000 students, so few instances of student conduct issues related to academic integrity seems problematic. Also, virtually no information is offered concerning the College’s judicial processes and the management of ethical behavior complaints. M State could benefit from identifying a complaint submission process including how complaints are resolved.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: No comparative data are available to demonstrate how the College’s academic integrity compares with other higher education organizations.

<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>Reacting: Limited results to determine effectiveness of academic integrity appear to be available. The lack of data limits the College from obtaining a clear understanding of performance as it relates to academic integrity.</p>
--	---

115 Based on 1R6, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

<p>Evaluation of Improvement Efforts</p>
<p>While the college has clearly articulated policies and procedures, the institution has identified future improvements to develop more automated processes for data collection and assessment.</p>

Category 2: Meeting Student and Other Key Stakeholder Needs

Category 2 focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of current and prospective students and other key stakeholders, such as alumni and community partners.

2.1: Current and Prospective Student Need

Current and Prospective Student Need focuses on determining, understanding and meeting the non-academic needs of current and prospective students. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 3.D in this section.

2P1 Describe the processes for serving the non-academic needs of current and prospective students. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
<p>Identifying underprepared and at-risk students, and determining their academic support needs</p>	<p>Systematic: M State uses the at-risk populations identified by the Minnesota State System. The College has tools that help identify at-risk student populations, such as the Early Alert system. However, evidence of a deliberate application of the tools as part of an ongoing process is minimally addressed.</p>
<p>Deploying academic support services to help students select and successfully complete courses and programs</p>	<p>Systematic: M State supports faculty engagement with students through adherence to office contact hours and through faculty participation in non-academic activities. The College provides a lengthy list of academic support services; however, M State may benefit from outlining</p>

	specific methods that demonstrate how the services support student success.
Ensuring faculty are available for student inquiry	Systematic: M State has a process in place to ensure faculty accessibility for students inside and outside of the classroom. M State maintains a 17:1 student to faculty ratio, and all faculty post and maintain office hours to support student access to faculty. The College may benefit from further assessing the process to document its effectiveness.
Determining and addressing the learning support needs (tutoring, advising, library, laboratories, research, etc.) of students and faculty	Reacting: In 2014, M State assessed the effectiveness of its' developmental education program, and followed the recommendations for shortening curricular pathways to college-level course work. M State also improved its early alert system and utilized check-in audits. While all of these activities are commendable, the College could benefit by creating a process for determining and addressing learning support needs so efforts are not duplicated and new needs are uncovered.
Determining new student groups to target for educational offerings and services	Reacting: M State mentions a variety of external and internal data sources to support a process of identifying needs for new student groups and sub-groups of the existing population. However, the process is not well defined nor is it a purposeful activity. The lack of a well-defined process may lead to the College missing opportunities for identifying new student groups.
Meeting changing student needs	Reacting: Although data are collected from a variety of methods, it is not apparent that the information is consistently used across the College to make process changes and/or improve services. Furthermore, there is no indication that data obtained from the variety of collection methods are systematically aggregated and analyzed to understand more systemic patterns and trends that would facilitate improvement.
Identifying and supporting student subgroups with distinctive needs (e.g., seniors, commuters, distance learners, military veterans)	Reacting: Data collected pertaining to identifying and supporting the needs of student subgroups appears limited. While institutional data queries and survey data identify new opportunities, it is unclear if data from other research methods, such as environmental scanning, are used. Without understanding its demographic environment, M State may not always identify new opportunities in a timely manner.

Deploying non-academic support services to help students be successful	Reacting: There is no clear and discernable process to explain how M State deploys non-academic support services.
Ensuring staff members who provide academic and non-academic student support services are qualified, trained and supported	Systematic: M State indicates that hiring qualified staff and professional training/development opportunities of staff are College priorities. The College may benefit from a more detailed explanation of the processes dealing with hiring and supporting staff.
Communicating the availability of non-academic support services	Systematic: The College uses a number of methods to communicate the availability of non-academic services to students; however, evidence of a purposeful process including assessment is less defined. A more defined set of processes may move M State to a more mature level.
Selecting tools, methods and instruments to assess student needs	Reacting: M State has selected several tools to assess student needs: intent survey, GRIT assessment, Student Success Navigator, and an early alert system. Additionally, the College has access to tools and metrics from the state system office. However, connecting the selected tools to how the tools assess student needs is vague.
Assessing the degree to which student needs are met	Reacting: M State does not connect selected tools to an assessment process that indicates how the College evaluates meeting student needs. Providing an overall framework may guide M State toward improved decision-making.
Other identified processes	

2R1 What are the results for determining if current and prospective students’ needs are being met? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: The College presents limited data related to improved retention rates. While these data are encouraging it is unclear how they directly relate to the processes and efforts described in the response. Furthermore, while a financial savings for students is important, the measure does not speak to the more pressing issue of student success in developmental education. Finally, from the information presented, it is

	difficult to understand what the increased “response rate” to early alert suggests. M State may increase their maturity by clearly connecting processes with data so that valid results can guide improvements.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: M State does not report any internal targets or external benchmarks. Correcting this deficiency will help M State move to a higher level of maturity.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: While the College presented some data, there was little in the way of a corresponding analysis. Some of the conclusions drawn did not appear to be from an analysis of the data.

2I1 Based on 2R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
M State appears to struggle presenting clear and precise data driven improvements. A focus on connecting data, data analysis, and initiatives may help M State document its improvements.

2.2: Retention, Persistence and Completion

Retention, Persistence and Completion focuses on the approach to collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion to stakeholders for decision making. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 4.C. in this section.

2P2 Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and distributing data on retention, persistence and completion. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Collecting student retention, persistence and completion data	Reacting: M State summarized changes to the developmental education program and the early alert process as well as changes to retention rates for all first-time-in-college students. While the changes merit recognition, the data collection that supported the changes was weak. M State may benefit from having a purposeful process for collecting and analyzing retention, persistence, and completion data.
Determining targets for student retention, persistence and completion	Reacting: Even though M State says that student success is the most important strategic initiative, the College has not identified performance projections as part of its strategic planning process. Without targets to track progress toward goals, initiative implementation, and the

	effectiveness of those initiatives, M State may be limited in its ability to determine its progress relative to achievement of the strategic plan.
Analyzing information on student retention, persistence and completion	Reacting: M State’s Institutional Research department queries multiple data sources to determine and analyze student retention, persistence, and completion. To mature in this this area, the College needs to describe how often the data are analyzed, disseminated, and used in the decision making process.
Meeting targets for retention, persistence and completion	Reacting: Although M State has worked to increase its capacity for data collection, analysis, and use, few methods appear to be in place for developing strategies to meet retention, persistence, and completion targets.
Selecting tools, methods and instruments to assess retention, persistence and completion	Reacting: M State collects a range of data and has a number of tools available for parsing the data. However, the College does not describe how these tools play a part in the actual evaluation and assessment of the data and its implications for decision-making.
Other identified processes	

2R2 What are the results for student retention, persistence and completion? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: The data provided captures only one year of performance. It is unclear what was done in the other years since the last portfolio evaluation. While there is basic retention and persistence data provided, the somewhat limited analysis does not help explain how the College is measuring success on initiatives.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: M State does not report any internal targets or external benchmarks.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: While the College presented some data, there was little in the way of corresponding analysis. Some of the conclusions drawn did not seem to come from analysis of the data.

2I2 Based on 2R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
Establishing clear connections between goals set and data used to confirm the goals are met may help M State mature in the use of data to guide improvements.

2.3: Key Stakeholder Needs

Key Stakeholder Needs focuses on determining, understanding and meeting needs of key stakeholder groups, including alumni and community partners.

2P3 Describe the processes for serving the needs of key external stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Determining key external stakeholder groups (e.g., alumni, employers, community)	Systematic: M State demonstrates a sound understanding of the importance of identifying key external groups. The College has developed a variety of methods to accomplish this task.
Determining new stakeholders to target for services or partnership	Reacting: The College does not describe a particular process for determining new stakeholders. The process, to the extent that it exists, appears reactive based on feedback and information that may come from existing contacts.
Meeting the changing needs of key stakeholders	Systematic: The College works with all key stakeholders to listen to their input at the institutional, programmatic, and service level. However, there does not appear to be a structure in place to meet the changing needs of key stakeholders.
Selecting tools, methods and instruments to assess key stakeholder needs	Reacting: M State does not present specific tools and methods for the aggregation and analysis of insight gained from its various advisory entities. M State would benefit from a clearly articulated strategy for the collection, organization, and synthesis of feedback garnered during the various advisory meetings.
Assessing the degree to which key stakeholder needs are met	Reacting: No specific program or process is described for assessing the degree to which stakeholder needs are being met. The existing activities appear reactive in nature based on informal feedback from advisory groups. No formal tools or methods are described beyond these communications.
Other identified processes	

2R3 What are the results for determining if key stakeholder needs are being met? The results

presented should be for the processes identified in 2P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: Reporting of participation in activities is a measure of engagement but falls short of providing the kind of actionable data that can come from understanding how and if stakeholder needs are being met.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: M State does not report any internal targets or external benchmarks.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: While the College presented some data, there was little in the way of corresponding analysis. Some of the conclusions drawn did not seem to come from the analysis of the data.

2I3 Based on 2R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
M State appears to have the tools to analyze data, the demonstrating the connection between data, decisions, and actions is not well developed.

2.4: Complaint Processes

Complaint Processes focuses on collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students or key stakeholder groups.

2P4 Describe the processes for collecting, analyzing and responding to complaints from students and stakeholder groups. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Collecting complaint information from students	Systematic: M State has a process for gathering student complains and comments. This process handles issues both formally and informally.

Collecting complaint information from other key stakeholders	Reacting: M State does not describe a method for collecting and responding to external stakeholders but does have a method for collecting information from internal constituents.
Learning from complaint information and determining actions	Reacting: M State describes a process for collecting complaints and to some extent explains how it responds in certain circumstances. The College would benefit from a better articulation of how feedback is gathered, aggregated, and included into the College’s planning processes.
Communicating actions to students and other key stakeholders	Reacting: M State did not present a strategy for responding to other stakeholders. The College did present a student resolution process, but the larger strategy for a transparent collection and resolution process was not clear from the content provided.
Selecting tools, methods and instruments to evaluate complaint resolution	Reacting: M State appears to collect data related to the number of complaints as opposed to categorizing the comments and complaints. The College acknowledges in 214 that it could do a better job of “conducting more regular, formal reviews of student complaint data.”
Other identified processes	

2R4 What are the results for student and key stakeholder complaints? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: The only data reported are the “number of Support Center incidents.” Data reflecting simple counts of incidents falls short of offering the kind of insights and opportunity for analysis that can help the College improve.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: M State does not report any internal targets or external benchmarks.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: While the College presented some data, there was little in the way of corresponding analysis. Some of the conclusions drawn did not seem to come from the analysis of the data.

214 Based on 2R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Comments
The acknowledgement that the analysis of student complaint data is a valid conclusion by M State. Until the College strengthens the progression from process to data collection to analysis, meaningful improvements may be difficult to discern and implement.

2.5: Building Collaborations and Partnerships

Building Collaborations and Partnerships focuses on aligning, building and determining the effectiveness of collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution.

2P5 Describe the processes for managing collaborations and partnerships to further the mission of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Selecting partners for collaboration (e.g., other educational institutions, civic organizations, businesses)	Systematic: M State describes a process of using employee input to help identify potential partners. The College goes on to describe a number of partnerships but does not connect the process to the listed partnerships.
Building and maintaining relationships with partners	Systematic: M State describes many partnerships with businesses, schools, universities, and alumni. The College may benefit from documenting a process for building and maintaining relationships so all outcomes are attained.
Selecting tools, methods and instruments to assess partnership effectiveness	Reacting: M State does not describe specific tools or methods that are used to evaluate partnerships.
Evaluating the degree to which collaborations and partnerships are effective	Reacting: Without a clear understanding of the needs of its' partners, M State may be limited in its ability to meet those needs and sustain the partnership. M State may benefit from describing specific tools or methods that are used to evaluate these partnerships.
Other identified processes	

2R5 What are the results for determining the effectiveness of aligning and building collaborations and partnerships? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 2P5. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including	Reacting: M State reports data related to student and client satisfaction with workforce training activities. The

tables and figures when possible)	College also reports increases in financial support from private giving and grant income. However, it is unclear how these figures relate to evaluating partnership satisfaction on a broader level.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: M State does not report any internal targets or external benchmarks.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: While the College presented some data, there was little in the way of corresponding analysis. Some of the conclusions drawn did not seem to come from the analysis of the data.

215 Based on 2R5, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
As previously stated, clear improvements made from thoughtful data analysis needs to more thoroughly presented in order to increase the maturing level in working with and responding to improvements.

Category 3: Valuing Employees

Category 3 explores the institution’s commitment to the hiring, development and evaluation of faculty, staff and administrators.

3.1: Hiring

Hiring focuses on the acquisition of appropriately qualified/credentialed faculty, staff and administrators to ensure that effective, high-quality programs and student support services are provided. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. in this section.

3P1 Describe the process for hiring faculty, staff and administrators. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Recruiting, hiring and orienting processes that result in staff and administrators who possess the required qualification, skills and values	Aligned: M State clearly articulates processes for recruiting, hiring, and orienting staff. All processes follow faculty and staff CBAs and the Minnesota State system credentialing and classification requirements. The processes align with the needs of the College, available resources, and the skills and credentials needed for employment.

Developing and meeting academic credentialing standards for faculty, including those in dual credit, contractual and consortia programs	Systematic: M State has an established hiring process that recognizes the faculty credentialing requirements of both the Higher Learning Commission and the Minnesota State system. The maturity level of this process could be increased if more detail could be provided on how the College ensures contractual and consortia programs meet credentialing standards, how faculty credentialing is monitored and what the credentialing process is for existing faculty for new content areas.
Ensuring the institution has sufficient numbers of faculty to carry out both classroom and non-classroom programs and activities	Systematic: M State evaluates staffing and faculty workload needs using internal and Minnesota State system office data. It is unclear what the process is for analyzing the data. The College discusses reliance on “unlimited faculty” instead of adjuncts; it may be beneficial to provide a clear definition of “unlimited faculty” and demonstrate how this group of employees fits into this discussion.
Ensuring the acquisition of sufficient numbers of staff to provide student support services	Reacting: While M State considers “shifts in student and stakeholder needs” when identifying and filling positions, the College does not describe the sources of data that are used in this analysis or a specific process that determines the need for positions or support.
Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools	Reacting: M State mentions hiring tracking tools but does not describe the tools. There is also no mention of other tools or measures for any processes.
Other identified processes	

3R1 What are the results for determining if recruitment, hiring and orienting practices ensure effective provision for programs and services? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: The College included some data covering staffing ratios, diversity and credentialing percentages, and numbers of unfilled searches over the years. However, M State makes a weak connection between the data provided and the processes discussed.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: The College did not present or discuss internal target or external benchmarks.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: The interpretations presented do not match the processes or limited results. There remains a clear need

	for the College to improve its ability to use data to drive appropriate and relevant improvement strategies.
--	--

3I1 Based on 3R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
M State recognizes the need to improve data usage and analysis. This section of the portfolio provides some comprehensive process examples that can serve as examples for other areas within the College. It is also evident that data utilization, analysis and application remain an issue for the College.

3.2: Evaluation and Recognition

Evaluation and Recognition focuses on the assessment and recognition of faculty, staff and administrators’ contributions to the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 3.C. within this section.

3P2 Describe the processes that assess and recognize faculty, staff and administrators’ contributions to the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Designing performance evaluation systems for all employees	Systematic: M State shared information about performance evaluations for all employees and how they are aligned with expectations from the Minnesota State system and the CBAs. M State does not discuss how the performance evaluation process is evaluated or provide a description of the new performance.
Soliciting input from and communicating expectations to faculty, staff and administrators	Reacting: M State describes how improvements are made based on employee input and feedback, but the process used is not clear, nor is it clear how expectations are communicated to employees.
Aligning the evaluation system with institutional objectives for both instructional and non-instructional programs and services	Reacting: The College states that the evaluation processes are aligned with institutional objectives, but it is not clear how the alignment is achieved or sustained. The lack of clarity makes it difficult to observe any type of alignment.
Utilizing established institutional policies and procedures to regularly	Systematic: The College discusses how the Minnesota State system and Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA) are utilized for

evaluate all faculty, staff and administrators	performance evaluations. However, it is not clear what policies and practices are used for employees not covered by a CBA. While the goals of the new process implemented in 2017 appear to represent a positive change, it is difficult to fully make that determination without a clearly articulated process.
Establishing employee recognition, compensation and benefit systems to promote retention and high performance	Systematic: M State described a well-established employee recognition program. What is missing is how the program promotes retention and high performance. A description of compensation and benefit systems is also not discussed.
Promoting employee satisfaction and engagement	Reacting: While the College has a strong employee recognition program there is no discussion about how the College promotes employee satisfaction and engagement.
Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools	Reacting: M State does not share any tracking outcomes/measures for the related or discussed processes.
Other identified processes	

3R2 What are the results for determining if evaluation processes assess employees’ contributions to the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: The College provided limited data about the number of employees receiving awards. Evaluation data addressing related processes and employee engagement and satisfaction data is missing. There is not enough information to determine the effectiveness of the processes.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: M State did not present a discussion of internal targets or external benchmarks.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: Insights were limited to the need to reconvene the Employee Recognition Committee and the recognition of the need to assess the effectiveness of the new employee evaluation process.

3I2 Based on 3R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the Systems Appraisal Feedback Report Template

next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The College is encouraged to develop more fully its' evaluation processes and provide clear definitions about types of faculty the College employees. Clearly articulating activities and accompanying measures may help M State achieve a higher level of maturity.

3.3: Development

Development focuses on processes for continually training, educating and supporting employees to remain current in their methods and to contribute fully and effectively throughout their careers at the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 3.C. and 5.A. in this section.

3P3 Describe the processes for training, educating and supporting the professional development of employees. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Providing and supporting regular professional development for all employees	Systematic: Based upon the Minnesota State System philosophy of professional development, M State established a process to support professional development. . The process is guided by a committees and is supported by sufficient resources. What is missing is an explanation of how the College meets training needs of employees in areas such as advising, disability services, campus safety, and financial aid.
Ensuring that instructors are current in instructional content in their disciplines and pedagogical processes	Systematic: Based on the CBA M State offers instructors multiple internal and external options for professional development. However, it is unclear how these activities intentionally ensure that faculty remain current in their respective disciplines.
Supporting student support staff members to increase their skills and knowledge in their areas of expertise (e.g. advising, financial aid, etc.)	Reacting: The College shared that it “may allocate” professional development funding for support staff. M State may benefit from providing a more detailed understanding of the process for support staff professional development.
Aligning employee professional development activities with institutional objectives	Reacting: While the College states that it strives to ensure professional development is aligned with institutional objectives, it is unclear how the process intentionally aligns activities

	with institutional objectives and strategic priorities.
Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools	Reacting: M State did not present any tracking outcomes or measures for the processes discussed in this category.
Other identified processes	

3R3 What are the results for determining if employees are assisted and supported in their professional development? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 3P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: M State presents minimal satisfaction data and staff development funding information; however, the data provided is not enough to assess the effectiveness of the development activities or staff/faculty engagement.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: Comparison data was limited to one data point comparing M State to the Minnesota State System.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: Minimal analysis and insights are provided.

3I3 Based on 3R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
While the College reports a number of professional development opportunities and activities, the ability to determine the effectiveness is limited due to the lack of evaluation efforts. M State continues to struggle with providing data and then integrating the data into insights and improvements.

Category 4: Planning and Leading

Category 4 focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision through direction setting, goal development, strategic actions, threat mitigation and capitalizing on opportunities.

4.1: Mission and Vision

Mission and Vision focuses on how the institution develops, communicates and reviews its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 1.A., 1.B. and 1.D. within this section.

4P1 Describe the processes for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision and values, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Developing, deploying, and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision and values	Reacting: Although M State successfully developed a five-year strategic plan in 2012, there is no indication that a systematic process has been established to ensure that strategic planning occurs on a regular basis. As M State described the current process, the College may fail to identify emerging needs and requirements that need to be addressed thus hindering the College’s ability to move toward realization of the vision.
Ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values	Reacting: M State says “the College uses its policies, process, program requirements and service standards to ensure that institutional actions, programs and services remain consistent with our mission, vision and values” (p. 73). This statement does not describe a process for ensuring that institutional actions reflect a commitment to its values.
Communicating the mission, vision and values	Systematic: M State has established formal mission vision and values statements. These are routinely communicated and reinforced to all employees in a variety of ways. These include, but are not limited to, the website, student handbook, and college catalog.
Ensuring that academic programs and services are consistent with the institution’s mission	Reacting: Although M State indicates that academic programs and services are aligned with the mission, vision, and values, it is unclear what processes are used to align these activities.
Allocating resources to advance the institution’s mission and vision, while upholding the institution’s values	Reacting: The College does not describe a process for allocating resources to advance the mission, vision, and values. The College may benefit from a defined process to prioritize goals that are brought forward for budget consideration.
Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. brand studies, focus groups, community forums/studies and employee satisfaction surveys)	Reacting: It is not apparent that data are analyzed to any significant degree or trended to determine if performance is improving over time. Furthermore, the overall breadth of the measurement system in this area is lacking.
Other identified processes	

4R1 What are the results for developing, communicating and reviewing the institution’s mission, vision

and values? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: No results are presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of processes that support the development, communication, and review of the College’s mission, visions, and values.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: No internal targets or external benchmarks are available to demonstrate how the effectiveness of M State’s processes compares with other higher education organizations or those outside of higher education.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	No interpretations or insights are presented.

4I1 Based on 4R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
While the College indicated there are opportunities for improvement in this area, there is no description of potential strategies to improve.

4.2: Strategic Planning

Strategic Planning focuses on how the institution achieves its mission and vision. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 5.B. and 5.C. in this section.

4P2 Describe the processes for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution’s plans and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Engaging internal and external stakeholders in strategic planning	Systematic: The 2011-12 strategic planning process involved gathering input from hundreds of internal and external stakeholders. The College mentions an opportunity to improve this process, but no method is established for how this will be accomplished. Consequently, there may be a variance within the processes used

	<p>resulting in some departments or campuses not fully participating in the process. Without a more defined approach to ensuring the involvement of the departments and campuses in developing strategic initiatives, there may also be a risk that misalignment in plan implementation will occur.</p>
<p>Aligning operations with the institution's mission, vision and values</p>	<p>Systematic: The President's Cabinet initiates the annual selection of the top fiscal priorities. The Cabinet ensures the selected goals align with the mission, vision, and values.</p>
<p>Aligning efforts across departments, divisions and colleges for optimum effectiveness and efficiency</p>	<p>Systematic: Although M State aligns its' academic and enrollment plans, it is unclear how the College aligns other areas. M State has an opportunity to describe more fully these process.</p>
<p>Capitalizing on opportunities and institutional strengths and countering the impact of institutional weaknesses and potential threats</p>	<p>Reacting: Although the College has developed strategic and operating planning processes, it is unclear how strengths and weaknesses are identified and included in the strategic planning process. The College may benefit from a defined process that links documented strengths and weaknesses to strategic initiatives.</p>
<p>Creating and implementing strategies and action plans that maximize current resources and meet future needs</p>	<p>Reacting: While M State relies on its strategic planning process to leverage opportunities and address weaknesses, it is unclear how this process creates action plans. Additionally, no systematic process for assessing risks of action plans is described that demonstrates how the College manages and responds to risks associated with action plan implementation.</p>
<p>Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (e.g. achievement of goals and/or satisfaction with process)</p>	<p>Reacting: It is not apparent that data are analyzed to any significant degree or trended over time to determine if performance is improving. Furthermore, the overall breadth of the measurement system in this area is lacking.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

4R2 What are the results for communicating, planning, implementing and reviewing the institution's operational plans? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: M State presents limited results for retention, persistence, workforce development, and collaborative programming and no results for strategic planning processes are presented.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: No internal targets or external benchmarks are available to demonstrate how the effectiveness of M State's strategic planning process compares with other higher education organizations.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	No interpretations or insights are presented.

4I2 Based on 4R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
Although the strategic planning process has produced goals and strategies, a comprehensive set of measures to check an understanding of progress against the strategy is not evident. Without measures aligned with the strategy, M State may not gain an understanding if whether or not its' actions are producing the desired results and if the College is moving toward the realization of its mission.

4.3: Leadership

Leadership focuses on governance and leadership of the institution. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.C. and 5.B. in this section.

4P3 Describe the processes for ensuring sound and effective leadership of the institution, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Establishing appropriate relationship between the institution and its governing board to support leadership and governance	Aligned: The Minnesota State System provides a mandatory structure that defines the relationship between the governing board and the institution.
Establishing oversight responsibilities and policies of the governing board	Aligned: The Governor appoints the Minnesota State System's 15-member Board of Trustees. The Board has policy responsibility for system planning, academic programs, fiscal management, personnel, admissions requirements, tuition and fees, and rules and regulations.

Maintaining board oversight, while delegating management responsibilities to administrators and academic matters to faculty	Systematic: The Strategic Framework Performance Measures/Accountability Dashboard includes 30 specific metrics that cover a wide variety of services and mandated outcomes. These metrics define performance outcomes for all areas of the College.
Ensuring open communication between and among all colleges, divisions and departments	Systematic: While M State uses committees, meetings, open forums, , a newsletter, and annual in-service days to facilitate communication, it is unclear if a recognized process exists to facilitate formal communications.
Collaborating across all units to ensure the maintenance of high academic standards	Reacting: While M State uses a variety of committees to support shared governance and participatory leadership, the College may benefit from a more detailed description of the process used to link the committee work with shared governance.
Providing effective leadership to all institutional stakeholders	Systematic: College leaders actively seek opportunities for leadership development by using team or committee leadership, initiative leadership, special projects, and unique professional development experiences. Describing a process for systematically choosing leadership development activities could help M State better allocate resources.
Developing leaders at all levels within the institution	Systematic: While there are leadership development activities available to employees, there does not appear to be a defined approach for succession planning that ensures M State adequately identifies and prepares those who have the potential for advancement so they are ready to move into available higher level positions.
Ensuring the institution’s ability to act in accordance with its mission and vision	Systematic: While the College maintains a commitment to communicating across operating lines and to encouraging employee participation, detailed processes that support employee communication and participation do not appear to exist.
Tracking outcomes/measure utilizing appropriate tools	Reacting: Other than questions on the Personal Assessment of the College Environment Survey, measures to determine leadership effectiveness do not appear to have been developed. Therefore, it appears that little data collection and analysis are being conducted.
Other identified processes	

4R3 What are the results for ensuring long-term effective leadership of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the

results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: Minimal data is provided from the Personal Assessment of the College Environment Survey. M State may benefit from a more detailed explanation of survey results including the number of surveys completed each year.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: No internal targets or external benchmarks are available to demonstrate how M State’s leadership effectiveness compares with other higher education organizations or those outside of higher education.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	M State did not present any results or insights gained.

4I3 Based on 4R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
The College’s top priorities for fiscal years 2015 – 2017 started M State down a path of proactively seeking greater success in the future, but the methods used to focus on opportunities available to them and identify challenges that lie ahead may be strengthened by a reliance on data gathering and analysis to verify the opportunities.

4.4: Integrity

Integrity focuses on how the institution ensures legal and ethical behavior and fulfills its societal responsibilities. The institution should provide evidence for Core Components 2.A. and 2.B. in this section.

4P4 Describe the processes for developing and communicating legal and ethical standards and monitoring behavior to ensure standards are met. In addition, identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Developing and communicating standards	Systematic: Although M State has established a range of standards across the College in support of ethical conduct and integrity, it is unclear how these are developed and communicated to employees.
Training employees for and modeling ethical and legal behavior across all levels of the institution	Systematic: The College routinely and continuously trains employees in issues of ethical behavior and legal standards beginning with the onboarding processes and continuing with other scheduled events.

<p>Operating financial, academic, personnel and auxiliary functions with integrity, including following fair and ethical policies and adhering to processes for the governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.</p>	<p>Systematic: In order to ensure that its' operations comply with laws and policies, M State participates in required state audits as well as declaring that it adheres to all state and federal policies for all applicable College functions. A description of how the College follows fair and ethical processes is not provided.</p>
<p>Making information about programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships readily and clearly available to all constituents</p>	<p>Reacting: Methods for making program requirements, faculty and staff, costs, and accreditation information available and accessible are not described.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

4R4 What are the results for ensuring institutional integrity? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 4P4. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)</p>	<p>Reacting: Results to demonstrate the effectiveness of methods that support operating with integrity are lacking. Without measures, the College is limited in its ability to learn and improve its performance.</p>
<p>Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks</p>	<p>Reacting: No internal targets and external benchmarks are available to demonstrate how the effectiveness of ensuring institutional integrity compares with other organizations.</p>
<p>Interpretation of results and insights gained</p>	<p>No interpretations or insights gained were presented.</p>

4I4 Based on 4R4, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts

Although the College reports a number of activities and planning processes, it is not readily evident that these efforts are coordinated and structured in manner to allow for effective implementation, analysis of results, and continual improvement. The almost consistent lack of data or results is a material weakness in effective planning and serves to undermine the College’s work in this area.

Category 5: Knowledge Management and Resource Stewardship

Category 5 addresses management of the fiscal, physical, technological and information infrastructures designed to provide an environment in which learning can thrive.

5.1: Knowledge Management

Knowledge Management focuses on how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution.

5P1 Describe the processes for knowledge management, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Selecting, organizing, analyzing and sharing data and performance information to support planning, process improvement, and decision making	Reacting: M State has increased the capabilities and capacity of the institutional research function. The College identified several key performance indicators and used these as a foundation for additional data reporting. While there are increased capabilities and the beginnings of a system, the College could benefit from a clear articulation of the associated processes. This is especially true of processes directly related to the collection and use of data for decision-making and process improvement.
Determining data, information, and performance results that units and departments need to plan and manage effectively	Reacting: M State identifies a multitude of data sources, key performance indicators, and strategic priorities aligned with the Minnesota State system key performance indicators. What is not evident from the information offered is the process through which these data points are used at the unit and departmental level. An explanation of how these data points are used as part of the management of individual units within the College may help the College mature.
Making data, information, and performance results readily and reliably available to the units and departments that depend upon this information for operational effectiveness, planning and improvements	Systematic: M State demonstrates the capacity and willingness to make data and information available. The extent to which this information is gathered and used at the departmental level needs more explanation. Having more information about how stakeholders submit requests could strengthen this area. Including the process for how the College ensures the reliability of the information shared may also increase the maturity level.

Ensuring the timeliness, accuracy, reliability and security of the institution's knowledge management system(s) and related processes.	Reacting: Even though M State has established clear processes for managing the security of institutional data, the College does not describe the assurance process for the timeliness and accuracy of data. Sharing the strategies and processes for determining data reliability may bring the process into clearer focus. M State follows Minnesota State system requirements for the preparation of data; however, internal processes are not clearly defined.
Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools (including software platforms and/or contracted services)	Reacting: The College identifies and has software that is used for tracking purposes including TK20, a CRM tool, and the Oracle Service Cloud. The College does not state the process for using these tools for tracking and analyzing performance nor does the College identify outcomes and measures.
Other identified processes	

5R1 What are the results for determining how data, information and performance results are used in decision-making processes at all levels and in all parts of the institution? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: M State does not present data specifically oriented to the processes described. The presentation of appropriate and relevant data sets remains an area of opportunity for M State.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: M State does not provide appropriate comparative data sets or analyses. M State presents some data, but the analytical process and relevant evidence are not included. M State could benefit from the identification of internal performance targets and some form of external benchmarking strategy.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: The College speaks of reaching an Integrated level of maturity yet has consistently fallen short in providing specific data related to outcomes and results in a variety of operational areas.

5I1 Based on 5R1, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
--

The improvements section of the portfolio should demonstrate an alignment between process, data collection, and data analysis. The improvements cited by the College need to show a clear link back to insights gained in the results analysis. Complimenting internal analysis with comparative analysis and benchmarking could improve aspects of the improvements and results sections. While the College does cite some improvements, it is important to show the connection between process, data collection, data analysis, and planning. Working to develop a more sophisticated data analysis and collection process may assist the College with reporting relevant data for the College’s efforts on CQI initiatives. By extension, this could also help the College clearly showcase M State’s achievements in the AQIP journey.

5.2: Resource Management

Resource Management focuses on how the resource base of an institution supports and improves its educational programs and operations. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P2 Describe the processes for managing resources, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Maintaining fiscal, physical and technological infrastructures sufficient to support operations.	Systematic: M State prepares an annual operating budget that is guided by the Minnesota State System policies. Using the system defined practice, the College demonstrates the process by which it provides the appropriate infrastructure needed for the defined scope of work and operations. Clarifying local processes and illustrating how units participate in the budget process may move the College to a more mature level.
Setting goals aligned with the institutional mission, resources, opportunities and emerging needs.	Reacting: Although M State has implemented a new planning and budgeting process that requires divisions and departments work with the Chief Information Officer and Director of Physical Plant, it is unclear what information is used to identify strategic priorities and emerging needs.
Allocating and assigning resources to achieve organizational goals, while ensuring that educational purposes are not adversely affected.	Reacting: M State uses a zero-based budgeting system. How this process supports the educational purpose needs more explanation. The successful articulation of the relationship of the budgeting process to the execution of the educational mission and organizational goals may increase the College’s maturity.
Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools	Reacting: M State does not discuss the tracking methods or outcome measures it uses to assess the processes in this category. The College provides minimal information for those measures cited in this segment.
Other identified processes	

5R2 What are the results for resource management? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P2. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: M State reports data concerning the financial condition yet falls short in showing how these data are related to institutional and educational effectiveness. A more holistic summary of data demonstrative of key areas of campus operations may benefit the College and increase the maturity level.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: The College does not provide appropriate and relevant analysis of comparative data for internal targets and external benchmarks.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: The insights provided in this section are limited in scope and seemingly disconnected from the processes and data discussed. M State would benefit from a clear process of data analysis tying their processes, data collection methodologies, and results together with their continuous improvement strategies. The disconnect between the data and process coupled with rudimentary analysis methodologies makes understanding relevant insights and effective improvement planning a consistent challenge.

5I2 Based on 5R2, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
As stated above, there remains a disconnect between the stated improvements and the insights gathered from the processes and results section. M State could benefit from a focus on aligning insights to data gathered from the evaluation of their defined processes.

5.3: Operational Effectiveness

Operational Effectiveness focuses on how an institution ensures effective management of its operations in the present and plans for continuity of operations into the future. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.A. in this section.

5P3 Describe the processes for operational effectiveness, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Building budgets to accomplish institutional goals	Systematic: The College utilizes a zero-based budgeting system to construct operating budgets. This process allows flexibility to adapt operations to meet changing needs. More explanation of how this budgeting strategy is used to accomplish institutional goals may benefit the College.
Monitoring financial position and adjusting budgets	Reacting: M State has tools in place to monitor its financial position. The processes used to adjust to changes in financial position are not explained. The process budget managers use to respond to changes either within the entire College or within individual functional areas needs further clarification.
Maintaining a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly	Systematic: M State has a strong infrastructure of technology supported by trained staff. The IT team meets frequently to evaluate ongoing operations and emerging needs. The College could benefit from a more detailed explanation of the process for determining end user satisfaction. There is mention of a pending assessment, but M State provides only limited information.
Maintaining a physical infrastructure that is reliable, secure and user-friendly	Systematic: M State describes a process for maintaining the physical infrastructure. For example, M State follows facilities plans for each campus, and a ticket system to address unanticipated problems that arise during normal operations. The College could benefit from additional explanations of how it assesses security and user-friendly experiences.
Managing risks to ensure operational stability, including emergency preparedness	Systematic: M State follows a risk management plan and holds yearly drills to support emergency preparedness. Additionally, M State contracts with outside agencies to provide training and development to key personnel in these areas. The College may consider sharing a more holistic understanding of risk management with a long term risk assessment in order to develop more fully the processes in this area. .
Tracking outcomes/measures utilizing appropriate tools	Reacting: It is not apparent that M State has identified outcomes or performance indicators in this area nor has it identified appropriate and relevant data tools or strategies.
Other identified processes	

5R3 What are the results for ensuring effective management of operations on an ongoing basis and for the future? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 5P3. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared. These results might include:

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
Summary results of measures (including tables and figures when possible)	Reacting: While M State shows evidence of performance in its' maintenance system, a comprehensive analysis of appropriate data sets is missing. The data provided in the summary is not representative of major processes discussed above.
Comparison of results with internal targets and external benchmarks	Reacting: Comparative analysis remains a challenge and appropriate and representative data and analyses are not presented.
Interpretation of results and insights gained	Reacting: Given the processes and data in this section, it is difficult to see how M State's next steps relate to something learned from assessing its process and gathering data.

5I3 Based on 5R3, what process improvements have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
This is an area where M State has shown improvement in defining the processes related to the budget model, risk management procedures, and providing appropriate infrastructure. M State continues to struggle to provide data analysis showing how the College makes strategic decisions that support a CQI process. The College has cited improvements but the improvements do not show a clear connection to the data. The absence of external benchmarks and internal goals makes it difficult for the College to demonstrate how it comprehensively evaluates itself and makes data-informed improvement decisions.

Category 6: Quality Overview

Category 6 focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement culture and infrastructure of the institution. This category gives the institution a chance to reflect on all its quality improvement initiatives, how they are integrated and how they contribute to improvement of the institution.

6.1: Quality Improvement Initiatives

Quality Improvement Initiatives focuses on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) initiatives the institution is engaged in and how they work together within the institution.

6P1 Describe the processes for determining and integrating CQI initiatives, and identify who is involved in those processes. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
---------	--

<p>Selecting, deploying and evaluating quality improvement initiatives.</p>	<p>Systematic: At M State, quality improvement initiatives can come from any employee. The AQIP Steering Committee reviews possible AQIP Action Projects and forwards their recommendations to the President’s Cabinet. The President’s Cabinet reviews the recommendations for alignment with institutional and system priorities and makes the final selections A liaison from the AQIP Steering Committee works with the proper people/department to deploy the approved project. M State could help this process mature by documenting and/or describing the process the AQIP Steering Committee uses to approve/deny projects, and how quality improvement initiatives are evaluated.</p>
<p>Aligning the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums</p>	<p>Systematic: The College AQIP Steering Committee is charged with ensuring that AQIP activities are coordinated with other, ongoing quality improvement efforts at the College. The College uses feedback from the Systems Portfolio, Action Projects, Comprehensive Quality Review and Strategy Forums to drive participation in the Assessment Academy and the Persistence and Completion Academy.</p>
<p>Other identified processes</p>	

6R1 What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P1. All data presented should include the population studied, response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
<p>What are the results for continuous quality improvement initiatives?</p>	<p>Reactive: Measures to demonstrate the effectiveness of processes and systems were not included; therefore, evidence demonstrating how effective the system for continuous improvement is at M State is not explained.</p>

6I1 Based on 6R1, what quality improvement initiatives have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
<p>While quality improvement initiatives can come from any employee, it is not apparent that any risk analysis is performed on each proposal so that a clear understanding of the full scope of the project is understood prior to implementation. Because a defined prioritization process for projects was not explained, understanding how projects are not chosen lacks specificity.</p>

6.2: Culture of Quality

Culture of Quality focuses on how the institution integrates continuous quality improvement into its culture. The institution should provide evidence for Core Component 5.D. in this section.

6P2 Describe how a culture of quality is ensured within the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, descriptions of key processes for the following:

Process	Comments on Process Maturity and Improvement
Developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality	Reacting: The College appears limited in its' approaches to integrating continuous improvement into its culture. While there are mentions of experiences for specific employees, a repeatable process for developing an infrastructure and providing resources to support a culture of quality are not described. Creating a larger strategy to aimed at influencing institutional culture may benefit the College.
Ensuring continuous quality improvement is making an evident and widely understood impact on institutional culture and operations	Reacting: While various councils, teams, and work groups are responsible for monitoring quality initiatives at the institution State, it is unclear how process improvement initiatives are monitored and performance is tracked against an established standard.
Ensuring the institution learns from its experiences with CQI initiatives	Reacting: It does not appear that a standard approach for process improvement has been established. Without a sound method to design its processes and services, M-State risks implementing initiatives without an understanding of all factors that impact the project's opportunity for success The College may not uncover problems or inefficiencies associated with its processes and services until it receives complaints from students or other stakeholders. As a result, M State may find itself continually reacting to problems rather than preventing them through effective design and implementation techniques.
Reviewing, reaffirming, and understanding the role and vitality of the AQIP Pathway within the institution	Reacting: Evidence of commitment to AQIP is limited. It is not clear how processes are developed and deployed. Additionally, results are not available to show improvement. M State presents limited information to document it clearly understands and can articulate how the AQIP Pathway functions within the institution.
Other identified processes	

6R2 What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality? The results presented should be for the processes identified in 6P2. All data presented should include the population studied, the response rate and sample size. All results should also include a brief

explanation of how often the data is collected, who is involved in collecting the data and how the results are shared.

Results	Evaluation of Results and Systems Improvement
What are the results for continuous quality improvement to evidence a culture of quality?	Reacting: No results are provided to show evidence of continuous improvement.

612 Based on 6R2, what process improvements to the quality culture have been implemented or will be implemented in the next one to three years?

Evaluation of Improvement Efforts
M State looks forward to feedback from this Appraisal. Throughout the Systems Portfolio, M State appears to struggle articulating the majority of its processes, results, and improvements. Often the process descriptions are summaries of activities with little or no specific data or metrics. Finally, improvement initiatives must be grounded in data to explain why each initiative is started; initiatives must conclude with a measure that evaluates the effectiveness of the initiative.

APPENDIX C Criteria for Accreditation & Core Component Evidence Screening

Criterion 1. Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>1.A. The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.</p> <p>1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.</p> <p>2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.</p> <p>3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission.</p>	<p>The 2011-2012 strategic planning process involved a wide range of stakeholders. The College does suggest that there may be opportunities to improve the planning process.</p> <p>Academic programs and services are offered within the framework of the strategic plan as well as the College's Mission and Vision.</p> <p>The lack of specific data related to planning outcomes and measures of the planning process make it difficult to evaluate the full effectiveness of the planning efforts.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>1.B. The mission is articulated publicly.</p> <p>1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.</p> <p>2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its</p>	<p>M State's Mission, Vision, and Values appear to be appropriate for a comprehensive two-year institution.</p> <p>The Mission, Vision, and Values are communicated via the Strategic Plan in addition to numerous other public and campus-wide communications platforms.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.</p> <p>3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.</p>		
<p>1.C. The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.</p> <p>1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.</p> <p>2. The institution’s processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.</p>	<p>As an open access institution, M State’s diverse student groups reflect the community it serves.</p> <p>M State does not clearly describe processes by which new and emerging student and stakeholder groups are identified. While it is clear that the College carefully evaluates proposals and program concepts that are suggested, it remains unclear as to how the College proactively identifies potential stakeholders and their needs.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>1.D. The institution’s mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.</p> <p>1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.</p> <p>2. The institution’s educational responsibilities take</p>	<p>The College regularly reviews its’ mission and uses the stated mission to establish priorities that serve the public interest.</p> <p>M State routinely engages with the College General Advisory Council as well as a variety of program advisory committees to ensure that College programs and activities are in alignment with the mission and the needs of the community.</p> <p>The College’s description of processes related to this Criterion are general in nature and could be strengthened by providing specific examples of instances when engagement with an external group caused a change in institutional activity or planning. This area is an example of how the College seems to answer the question of a</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.</p> <p>3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.</p>	<p>Criterion or Category by simply repeating the question as a statement. The lack of concrete examples or specific evidence creates a material weakness in the portfolio.</p>	
--	--	--

Criterion 2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>2.A. The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.</p>	<p>M State operates a number of systematic processes in support of this component. The College engages in regular ethics training for all faculty and staff and has set forth a clear framework of expectations for ethical behavior.</p> <p>The annual audits coupled with oversight from the Minnesota State System serve to support these activities with a strong third-party review.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>2.B. The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.</p>	<p>Student information is clearly and concisely available online through the College website. The College web pages include detailed information about academic programs, courses, class schedules, cost, student resources, and student rights and responsibilities.</p> <p>Student consumer information is readily available on the College website.</p> <p>Information about the College's accreditation including its status with the Higher Learning Commission is available publicly.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>2.C. The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best</p>	<p>M State, as part of the system of colleges and universities in Minnesota, is governed by the Minnesota State Board of Trustees. This group has clear statutory authority and responsibility for</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p>

<p>interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.</p> <p>1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.</p> <p>2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.</p> <p>3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests, or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.</p> <p>4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.</p>	<p>oversight of the College. The Governor appoints the members of the Board of Trustees.</p> <p>The Minnesota State System has established a wide range of policies and practices to guide the oversight of the institutions under its control.</p> <p>Day-to-day management of the institution is delegated to the College President and executive leadership. The state board maintains direct contact with all college presidents and monitors activities and outcomes at institution through an Accountability Dashboard and Strategic Framework Performance Measures.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>2.D. The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.</p>	<p>The Board of Trustees' policy as well as the Student Handbook clearly identifies academic freedom protections for faculty and students. In addition, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) serves to support an open and encouraging environment for academic freedom and scholarly pursuit.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
<p>2.E. The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of</p>	<p>The College ensures that the principles of academic freedom and the associated responsibilities are applicable to all faculty and all students.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p>

<p>knowledge by its faculty, students, and staff.</p> <p>1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.</p> <p>2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.</p> <p>3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.</p>	<p>The College has established a Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy to protect student freedom of expression and academic inquiry.</p> <p>The College Institutional Review Board supports the integrity of research and academic activities on campus.</p> <p>M State has established an Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy, which serves to support ethical behavior at all levels including administration, faculty, staff, and students.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>
---	--	---

Criterion 3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>3.A. The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.</p> <p>1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.</p> <p>2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for its undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.</p> <p>3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are</p>	<p>Program and course level outcomes expected of graduates are determined by each department and are designed accordingly. These program specific outcomes address a wide range of knowledge including critical thinking skills, communication skills, and technical skills.</p> <p>As a comprehensive community college, M State awards Associate degrees and certificates.</p> <p>Awarding of transfer credit and credit for prior learning follow the Minnesota State System policies.</p> <p>Academic programs are evaluated by gathering common learning outcomes data, program learning outcomes data, and external measures of pass rates and licensure.</p> <p>The College has a clear process in place to ensure that appropriate standards are in place and enforced for dual enrollments.</p> <p>It is somewhat unclear how the College's standards and expectations extend across all</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).</p>	<p>modes of delivery. Clarification in this area would strengthen the College's portfolio.</p>	
<p>3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.</p> <p>1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.</p> <p>2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.</p> <p>3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and</p>	<p>The Minnesota Community College System's Core Abilities serve as the foundation for M State's measurement of learning outcomes. These learning outcomes align with the Minnesota Transfer curriculum.</p> <p>M State has determined common learning outcomes for its general education curriculum and institutional learning objectives. These outcomes were developed through a collaborative process that engaged faculty in appropriate departments across the College.</p> <p>The College has participated in HLC assessment training and has deployed various AQIP Action Projects in support of assessment of student learning.</p> <p>While the College has developed clear expectations for student learning and these expectations have engaged faculty and key academic leaders, it is less clear how the College identifies specific tools and measures to evaluate student learning outcomes.</p> <p>This is another area where the College describes various processes and the individuals involved yet falls short of providing the kind of evidence and specific descriptions that can adequately describe the processes in question.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.</p> <p>4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.</p> <p>5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.</p>		
<p>3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.</p> <p>1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.</p> <p>2. All instructors are appropriately credentialed, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.</p>	<p>M State supports active faculty engagement with students and makes specific effort to maintain a solid student to faculty ration (17:1).</p> <p>Faculty members are credentialed in line with HLC expectations and consistent with the guidelines set forth by the Minnesota State System.</p> <p>M State support staff are provided training in line with their duties and a sufficient number are in place to support students and their needs.</p> <p>The College supports ongoing professional development of staff and faculty through a variety of initiatives. In addition, the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology offers professional development and support for new and experienced faculty members. The faculty sabbatical program offers experienced faculty an opportunity to further their professional studies and personal development.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.</p> <p>4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.</p> <p>5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.</p> <p>6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.</p>		
<p>3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.</p> <p>1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.</p> <p>2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs</p>	<p>The College offers a range of academic support services including, but not limited to, academic advising, an academic bridge program, library services, and academic tutoring.</p> <p>M State is working on efforts to evaluate and improve the existing early alert system.</p> <p>Entering students receive assessment for course placement as well as career interest.</p> <p>Students and instructors alike have access to infrastructure and resources in support of effective teaching and learning.</p> <p>This is another area where the College response fell short of providing meaningful information that serves as evidence of performance and outcomes. For example, consider the College response to item 4 in this section:</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>for which the students are adequately prepared.</p> <p>3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.</p> <p>4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).</p> <p>5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.</p>	<p>The language of Core Component 3D4 states:</p> <p>"The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings)."</p> <p>The College response says:</p> <p>"The College provides students and instructors with the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning, including computers, software, a robust information and technology infrastructure, classroom and lab spaces, libraries, performance spaces, clinical and practicum sites and study spaces."</p> <p>In the view of the reviewing team, this is another example of the College answering a question by re-wording the language into a statement.</p>	
<p>3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.</p> <p>1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.</p> <p>2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning,</p>	<p>While M State identifies a number of co-curricular activities such as athletics, fine arts, student life programs and student organizations, little explanation is offered to describe the nature of these groups, their impact on student life, and how well the activities are functioning. The bulk of the description in this area focuses on experiential learning opportunities.</p> <p>The College does state that students frequently compete in activities related to disciplines such as accounting or automotive technology. No further description is offered and no information as to the results of these competitions is offered.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.		
---	--	--

Criterion 4. Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.</p> <p>1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.</p> <p>2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.</p> <p>3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.</p> <p>4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent</p>	<p>The College describes a systematic process for Program Review as well as the outline of criteria used within the review process. However, the College does not provide examples of recently completed reviews, outcomes of those reviews and or how information from those reviews was used to improve program performance. The College simply states, “The Program Review Committee and Faculty develop continuous improvement action plans and future directions.” While there is no doubt that the program review activity is taking place, the distinct lack of information and evidence provided in the portfolio renders meaningful evaluation of the effectiveness of the process difficult, at best.</p> <p>With regards to transfer of credit and transcription of credit, the College follows guidelines established by the Minnesota State System.</p> <p>The College lists a number of specialized accreditations for various programs. Providing information on how long these accreditations have been sustained would strengthen this response.</p> <p>M State does report a range of data related to student pass rates for national licensure exams. These data are an important measure of student success. The information presented would be strengthened by the inclusion of comparative data from national results or regional institutions.</p> <p>Although the College presents data related to licensure and pass rates for external exams, little data is presented to document student transfer rates or success, outcomes from dual credit programs, or resulting employment after graduation/completion.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.</p> <p>5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.</p> <p>6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and AmeriCorps).</p>		
<p>4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.</p> <p>1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.</p>	<p>M State describes extensive work on improving the processes associated with assessment of student learning. While this work is commendable and clearly well intended, the problem remains that assessment of student learning has been an open issue with the College since the prior portfolio review. The only data presented related to student learning outcomes was institutional in nature (Figure 1R1). No examples of data or evidence was presented related to learning outcomes at the program or course levels and no description was offered as to how such data is used to improve the teaching/learning experience.</p> <p>A formal assessment process does not appear to be in place for co-curricular activities.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.</p> <p>3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.</p> <p>4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.</p>		
<p>4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.</p> <p>1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.</p> <p>2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.</p> <p>3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of</p>	<p>M State reports Fall-to-Fall and Fall-to-Spring persistence rates for students (2R2 – Table 2) yet fails to place these figures within context of other colleges in Minnesota or other peer institutions nationwide. Further, there is no discussion or analysis offered as to these results.</p> <p>In Table 3 (2R2), the College reports gains in persistence and completion but these figures have no clear context, are not shown as comparative numbers, and lack any comparison to external benchmarks. The College is recognized for responding to these questions but it must also be understood that the very limited information presented makes it very difficult for an evaluation team to form a sound judgment of the effectiveness of the College efforts.</p> <p>No analysis is presented related to the data presented, and the College provides little or no insight as to actions considered or undertaken to improve outcomes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.</p> <p>4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)</p>		
--	--	--

Criterion 5. Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Core Component	Evidence	Screening Feedback
<p>5.A. The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.</p> <p>1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.</p>	<p>Fiscal: The College fiscal resources are managed by a clear budget process that is tied to the strategic planning process. It appears that key stakeholder groups are involved in the relevant processes. Fiscal activities are monitored by external auditors as well as at the Minnesota State System office.</p> <p>Human resources: M State has established a range of support systems for training and professional development of both staff and faculty.</p> <p>Physical resources: The College has established and sustains sufficient capital facilities to support students, staff, and faculty.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.</p> <p>3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.</p> <p>4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.</p> <p>5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expenses.</p>	<p>Technology: This is a strength for the College. The College sustains a robust IT system with a strong backbone of technology to support student learning needs.</p> <p>Resources are allocated annually and are in line with goals and objectives of the strategic plan as well as with the College's mission.</p>	
<p>5.B. The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.</p> <p>1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.</p> <p>2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal</p>	<p>As part of the Minnesota State System, M State has a strong governing board that is fully engaged with system-wide information as well as information from individual colleges.</p> <p>The College routinely employs external advisory groups as well as key stakeholders in various processes intended to monitor programs and student outcomes.</p> <p>The College has a solid system of shared governance, with several structures directed by the CBA as well as the state system, and routinely engages faculty and staff from all levels in relevant conversations.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.</p> <p>3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.</p>		
<p>5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.</p> <p>1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.</p> <p>2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.</p> <p>3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.</p> <p>4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.</p>	<p>M State has a defined set of processes for strategic planning. These processes have clear timetables and routinely involve stakeholders from both internal and external locations.</p> <p>No evidence is presented to allow evaluation about how the College links learning processes for assessment of student learning to the other parts of the planning process; evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.</p> <p>The consistent lack of clear evidence (reporting of results, comparison to external benchmarks, internal targets, and other measures) again makes it very difficult to evaluate the strength and validity of the College responses in this Criterion.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>

<p>5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.</p>		
<p>5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.</p> <p>1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.</p> <p>2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.</p>	<p>Statements and data, or lack of, through the course of the portfolio serve to highlight the deficiencies in response to this Core Component. Throughout the portfolio there are serious gaps in data or in evidence that might be offered in support of the processes described.</p> <p>As highlighted in the strategic issues, the team views this lack of data to be even more serious given that the 2013 portfolio was considered to be deficient in presentation of supporting data.</p> <p>Further, the team feels that there may, in fact, be evidence that the College is not learning from prior reviews in that some of the same strategic issues continue to exist after a prior review and into the current review.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strong, clear and well presented</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Adequate, but could be improved</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unclear or incomplete</p>