

**MSCHE Steering Committee**  
**Minutes of Meeting: July 14, 2015**  
**11:00am – 1:00 pm**

Attendees: Darlene Smith, Catherine Andersen, Peter Toran, Anita Harewood, Vicki Schultz, Shelia Burkhalter, Cheryl Wilson, Jeffrey Sawyer, Joseph Wood

1. Approval of June minutes
  - Minutes approved with the following change
    - i. Strike –“Murray will contact the units by June ...”as this was part of a general discussion and not a specific action item.
  
2. Update on meetings with the President and Executive Team regarding the Steering Committee’s Preliminary Recommendations
  - Some initial concerns about how recommendations were developed; perception versus data driven. Co-chairs reiterated the latter and reinforced that the recommendations were an important mechanism for securing evidence to provide appropriate documentation to demonstrate compliance.
  - Senior leadership team felt they were not sufficiently informed about process; it was determined that co-chairs will meet with and update executive team monthly.
  - A meeting with senior leadership (President, Executive Team and Deans) is scheduled for Thursday July 16<sup>th</sup> at 10 to further discuss the recommendations, identify key individuals responsible for providing information and timelines.
  
3. Update by workgroup co-chairs on data needs and revised research questions.
  - WG1 Recommendations: **(see attached)**
    - i. Standard 7 (institutional assessment) recommends the use of interviews to more fully understand assessment practices. Sub-committee members will be asking the head of each major unit (defined as a school/college or any area under a direct presidential report) the following set of questions:
      1. How is assessment conducted in your area?
      2. How do you benchmark performance?
      3. How are your goals and objectives linked to the strategic plan?

Note: The above could be accomplished by presentations to the group, by interviews with the VPs, by written responses, or by some combination.
    - ii. Members plan to interview President Schmoke to determine how he views institutional effectiveness and how he would like to see it reported and measured.

iii. Standard 1 (Mission and Goals); Question 1.2 How well does the mission statement encompass the long-term visions of the new President and the new USM Chancellor, and the various constituents of UB? What entities were involved in its creation?:

1. Question is confusing. Active discussion on whether question should be modified or deleted, and the role of mission and vision in the strategic plan. UB's current strategic plan does not have a vision statement. Important to note that the last chapter in the Self-Study Motion requires UB to describe its vision for the future.

The Steering Committee asked WG1 to revisit this issue and propose alternative wording to question.

➤ **WG2 Recommendations: (see attached)**

- i. Since several USM universities are currently engaging in the MSCHE self-study, WG2 would like information on how these other institutions are incorporating USM policy and compliance issues into their respective self-study reports. Catherine Andersen and Joe Wood are to follow up with these respective institutions.

➤ **WG3 Recommendations: (see attached)**

- i. Format of report made it difficult to review proposed changes. Will discuss at August meeting.

➤ **WG4 Recommendations:**

- i. No report given as both co-chairs were out of town. Proposed questions added to the "Report on Revised Research Questions."

4. Update on web design on institutional effectiveness

- Collaborative efforts underway between University Relations, Provost Office and Institutional Research to develop webpage on institutional effectiveness and assessment in order to streamline information into a "one stop shop." Goal is to initial design and content available by August 20<sup>th</sup>.

5. New Business: Next Steps for August 20<sup>th</sup> Meeting

- Catherine and Darlene to provide templates for each workgroup
- Workgroup co-chairs need to inform Catherine & Darlene if there are staffing issues within their groups within the next couple of weeks

6. Update on communication plan:

- Under development; will be presented at August 20<sup>th</sup> meeting
7. Good of the Order
- Co-chairs reiterated that the Middle States review process will, by design, identify different perspectives and opinions. Dialogue and rigorous debate is healthy to ensure positive outcome. Thus, need to ensure a culture where all participants feel secure in identifying issues of concern.
8. Next meeting August 20<sup>th</sup> at 1pm

## APPENDIX

### **Feedback for 7.14.15 Steering Committee Meeting—Workgroup 1**

#### **Additional reports and data needed:**

##### Standard 1 – Mission and Goals

- Accessible education for traditional and non-traditional students
  - Data on course demand, offerings and distribution, including
    - ratio of online to in person courses by college
    - days and times of course offerings
    - demand and enrollment at Shady Grove
- A foundation for lifelong learning
  - Bio/demo & registration data on students, including
    - Age ranges of student body by academic career and program
    - Return rates of students from baccalaureate to post-baccalaureate programs
    - Credit counts of students by age range to extrapolate estimated number of working adults by career and program
- UB as an integral partner in the culture, commerce and future development of Baltimore and the region
  - Data on UB partnerships with Baltimore City institutions, including
    - High schools
    - Community colleges

##### Standard 2 – Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

- Planning and resource allocation based on mission and goals
  - Details of ongoing renovation and construction projects
  - Details of the current master plan
- All audit reports – financial, technology, etc.
- Unit assessment activities and processes; for an example, see [UR folder](#) in Working Group 1, subgroup Standard 7.

## **Proposed changes to and questions about draft research questions:**

### Standard 1 – Mission and Goals

- Add the question, “Are the processes used to implement the institution’s mission and goals consistent with standards of effectiveness and efficiency, and can these standards be measured and monitored?”

From Standard 1: 2. How well does the mission statement encompass the long-term visions of the new President and the new USM Chancellor, and the various constituents of UB? What entities were involved in its creation?

- This question is confusing. The new chancellor has just taken office; it is unrealistic to expect him to have and immediately implement a long-term vision that departs from the existing institutional mission. Secondly, unless the president has received specific instructions from the hiring authority (the Board of Regents) to alter the institutional mission, most presidents are chosen because they are drawn to and supportive of the mission. Finally, as a state entity, there is a clear, regularly scheduled process by which UB’s mission is reviewed; see <http://www.mhec.state.md.us/higherEd/about/commissi.asp>

### Standard 2 - Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

- Question 6 - How is UB addressing increasing costs, and are strategies in place to help deal with these costs increased efficiency?
  - The question itself is a bit confusing in that it appears that increased efficiency is detrimental—strategies to help deal with—rather than something like, How is UB addressing increasing costs, and are strategies in place that leverage efficiencies to help deal with these costs?

### Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The sub-committee met once to discuss the research questions and required data as listed in the Self-Study Design Plan. We agreed that both lists were comprehensive. Other data that would be helpful regarding this standard were already included in lists for the other standards (i.e. strategic plans, hiring plans, budget process documents) so we have not added those to the list for standard 7.

What we did do was to discuss an approach that would allow us to (1) understand the process used by each school and administrative department to assess the effective and efficient uses of resources in their area and (2) identify specific data already in existence. We identified contacts for each area (using a fellow member of the accreditation team whenever possible) and four discussion questions as follows:

1. Is there a strategic plan for your area?
2. How do you allocate resources to be in-line with the plan goals?

3. How do you measure whether your resource allocation is effective and if adjustments are necessary?
4. Do you have a process for forecasting resource allocation needs?

While we have not completed the process yet, the following section includes what we have determined to date.

Student Affairs:

SA makes use of mid-year and annual reports, tracking of student interactions and participations, facility usage reports, budget reports, as well as staff and unit level goals to operationalize its mission.

1. Strategic Planning: UB Student Affairs uses both qualitative and quantitative data for strategic planning purposes including:
  - a. Mid-Year and Annual reports for each office
  - b. Year-round interaction and usage data for key traffic areas
  - c. Facility usage reports
  - d. Budget reports
  - e. National Organization Standards and Benchmarking
  - f. Staff and unit level goal-setting documents
  - g. PMP review
2. Operational monitoring, gap analysis, and (re-)direction
  - a. Year-round interaction and usage data for key traffic areas
  - b. Facility usage reports
  - c. Budget reports
  - d. National Organization Standards and Benchmarking
3. Mid- to long-term resource planning and provision
  - a. Mid-Year and Annual reports for each office
  - b. Year-round interaction and usage data for key traffic areas
  - c. Facility usage reports
  - d. Budget reports
  - e. Staff and unit level goal-setting documents
  - f. National Organization Standards and Benchmarking

OTS

OTS uses a project management and system which allocates staff resources. Resources are allocated and prioritized based on decisions by the Executive Committee and Technology Council. A time tracking system is used by staff to specifically charge time to projects. Daily and weekly reports are generated for OTS leadership so that changes can be made quickly to insure projects are on track and staff resources are deployed effectively. Reports identified to date include:

1. Strategic plan
2. University Project Ideas and Proposals
3. Active University Projects

#### 4. Executive Committee PPM Dashboard

##### UB Foundation

UBF has a three year strategic plan (2015-2017) approved by the Board of Directors which ties directly to the UB strategic plan. Each goal is assigned to (at least) one committee of the board and monitored by the Strategic Planning Committee. The entire board reviews progress against plan metrics quarterly. The Budget & Finance Committee monitors financial performance quarterly and the Investment Committee monitors the endowment fund performance against benchmarks monthly. A new Development Committee has been established which will work closely with Institutional Advancement and the President in setting and meeting short and long-term fundraising goals. UBF staff work closely with each UB school and department to which private donors have designated resources to insure they are used in accordance with those requirements and in support of the UB strategic plan.

University Properties, an affiliate of UBF, is a 501 c(2) property holding company with its own board appointed by UPF. This board works closing with UB's Facilities Management and Capital Planning Department.

Reports identified to date:

1. UBF Strategic Plan
2. UBF/UPI Audited Financial Statements
3. Board metric dashboard
4. Endowment investment performance report
5. Budget and financial reports

##### Institutional Advancement

IA has a three year strategic plan which developed in conjunction with the UB strategic plan. Monthly reports are used to track fundraising results against goals and resources are adjusted as needed. IA is funded in part by UB and UBF. UB funds salaries and a small amount of G&A while UBF funds all other development costs. Budget reports are generated by both entities. IA is also required to submit fundraising reports to USM monthly and completes an annual survey conducted by CASE and required to be completed by all USM institutions.

Reports identified to date:

1. IA Strategic Plan
2. Monthly USM fundraising reports
3. CASE – Voluntary Support of Education Survey
4. Budget reports

##### Facilities Management and Capital Planning

FMCP aligns its allocation of resources so that they are consistent with the Campus Master Plan. The master plan is generated every 10 years, with an update every five years, and it serves as the guide for prioritizing our capital improvement while also informing our approach to smaller renovation projects. Requests for us to initiate a renovation project are submitted using a formal project request form that is then reviewed and added to our queue in order of priority. Request for

maintenance are submitted using our campus work order system which allows us to track the efficiency of our staffing levels while also helping to identify items that need to be replaced in advance of equipment failure.

The following reports are available:

- 10 year campus master plan (latest version will be available in Jan 2016)
- Space utilization master plan
- Facilities list of requested projects
- Campus Space inventory (submitted to USM annually)

### Procurement and Materials Management

The Procurement office's mission is tied to the university's strategic plan and their organization chart and responsibilities have been developed to be consistent with that plan. The department has a number of reports that they generate which track their resource allocation and efficiencies including reports on P-card usage and purchase orders awarded to MBE, small and disadvantaged business. These reports can be made available to support the accreditation process.

### **Standard 7: Institutional Assessment**

#### **Additional reports needed:**

- External USM reports to add to those uploaded to the [Required Reporting](#) Sharepoint folder.
- School/program accreditation and peer review reports. The School of Law posts these [online](#).
- Institutional audit reports.

#### **Feedback on proposed research questions:**

- Is the Institutional Assessment Plan referenced here well-known? Has it been broadly discussed? Is it implementable?

We propose an alternative approach:

- Ask each major unit (defined as a school/college or any area under a direct presidential report):
  - How is assessment conducted in your area?
  - How do you benchmark performance?
  - How are your goals and objectives linked to the strategic plan?

The above could be accomplished by presentations to the group, by interviews with the VPs, by written responses, or by some combination. We also recommended interviewing the president to determine how he views institutional effectiveness and how he would like to see it reported and measured.

WORKING GROUP 2  
IDENTIFIED DATA SOURCES

***Standard 4 – Leadership and Governance***

Evidence of Governance and Oversight Structure – Definition, Roles and Operation

- I. USM and MHEC – 4.2a, b,c, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.11, 4.12, 5.1, 5.2
  - Maryland Annotated Code Links:
    - [Educ. § 10-201](#)
    - [10-101](#)
    - [§ 12-101](#)
  - BOR policies and procedures <http://www.umsa.umd.edu/regents/bylaws/>
  - MHEC mission, roles, responsibilities, bylaws <http://www.mhec.state.md.us/higherEd/about/index.asp>
  - Review Other USM Institutions’ Self-Study Reports re: governance structure and assessment
  
- II. UB Foundation – 4.8, 4.10
  - University of Baltimore Foundation: mission and financial reports <http://www.ubfoundation.com/about.html>
  
- III. Legislature – 4.8
  - Legislative testimony – <http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/offices-and-services/government-and-community-relations/publications.cfm>
  - [Audit Reports –](#)
  - <http://www.ola.state.md.us/reports/Fiscal%20Compliance/UofB08.pdf>
  - <http://www.ola.state.md.us/reports/Fiscal%20Compliance/UB11.pdf>
  
- IV. UB Shared Governance – 4.1, 4.3
  - Faculty - <http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/shared-governance/faculty-senate.cfm>
  - Staff – <http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/shared-governance/staff-senate/index.cfm>
  - Students – <http://csi.orgsync.com/org/sga>
  - UB Plan for Shared Governance –
    - <http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/shared-governance/>
    - [Suggest an Assessment of Shared Governance system](#)

***Standard 5 – Administration***

Leadership and Institutional Assessment

- I. Leadership/Employee Recruitment, Qualifications and Performance Assessment – 4.12, 5.3,
  - Meet with AVP for HR



- Performance Assessment process – 5.  
<http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/offices-and-services/human-resources/employee-and-labor-relations/performance-management.cfm>

II. Staffing: Structure and Assessment – 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7

- Org Structure: [http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/offices-and-services/human-resources/organization\\_charts.cfm](http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/offices-and-services/human-resources/organization_charts.cfm)
- AVP for HR – re: process for review/assessment
  - ELC – periodic review for adequacy and effectiveness?
  - Unit-level review

***Standard 6 – Integrity***

Equity, Ethics and Academic/Intellectual Freedom

I. Transparency: Availability of Information and policies

- UB Policy Guide – 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6 –  
<http://www.ubalt.edu/policies/index.cfm>
- Student handbook – 6.1, 6.4 – <http://www.ubalt.edu/campus-life/student-handbook.cfm>
- Student Data – 6.8, 6.15: <http://www.ubalt.edu/admission/tuition-and-fees/index.cfm>;  
<http://www.ubalt.edu/campus-life/career-center/about-us/facts-and-figures.cfm>  
<http://www.ubalt.edu/disclosure.cfm>
- Academic catalogs – 6.10, 6.11, 6.12  
<http://www.ubalt.edu/academics/catalogs.cfm>  
But see 6.9 – availability of classes – need data on offerings and frequency from Provost Academic Deans
- Org charts – [http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/offices-and-services/human-resources/organization\\_charts.cfm](http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/offices-and-services/human-resources/organization_charts.cfm)
- Employee Practices and Policies - 6.2: <http://www.ubalt.edu/about-ub/offices-and-services/human-resources/employee-and-labor-relations/policies-procedures-guidelines.cfm>

II. Climate re: Equity, Ethics and Intellectual Freedom – 6.5, 6.7

- Review existing survey data
- Suggest Climate Survey – students and faculty/staff

**DRAFT: Working Group 3**  
**Revised Research Questions**

*Standard 8 – Student Admissions and Retention: The institution seeks to admit students whose interest, goals and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students’ educational goals.*

1. Do the University’s admission policies reflect the University’s mission? Are they clearly stated to allow prospective students to make informed decisions about how to apply to, and enroll in, the University?
2. What is the relationship between the University’s admissions policy and student success? How do we know recruited and accepted students are succeeding/graduating based on our admission standards? What is the progress of students? The retention rates of first-time students and transfer students? Of graduate students? What policies and programs are in effect to improve retention?
3. What do demographic trends suggest will be the future of the University’s student base? How is the institution positioning itself to handle any anticipated demographic changes, and what else should it consider doing?
4. What strategies have been used to increase enrollment and how effective have these strategies been? How do we assess effectiveness? Have resources been allocated to the most effective strategies? How effective are the processes in yielding a talented and diverse student body?
5. Does the University have an enrollment plan? If so, is it reviewed to ensure congruence with recruitment, admissions, retention, marketing and advertising?
6. To a large extent, the University has a “local” orientation in its admission and recruiting efforts. How would expanded regional, national and/or international recruitment impact the university’s growth? Is it compatible with the University’s urban / Baltimore orientation?
7. How effective in the University in making clear to all undergraduates their Path to Graduation?
8. What processes are in place to assess student progress along the Path to Graduation, and how is this information used to make change?
9. Is the University effective in the timely identification of students in need of remedial help, and once they are identified, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the University’s efforts to provide that help? What pre-collegiate level courses and/or support services are available to these students? How are these services evaluated?

10. Does UB communicate pertinent information on expected learning outcomes for its prospective students and assessments of its educational offerings across the University's fields of study?

11. Does UB effectively use placement and diagnostic testing results in guiding student advisement to enhance student success?

12. How clearly does UB communicate the policies and procedures that govern transfer?

13. How effectively does the University use financial aid support as a recruiting tool as well as means of helping students along the path to graduation? Does UB communicate effectively to students and prospective students the range of options available for various forms of financial aid? What are the criteria by which the University makes decisions about offers of scholarships and other forms of financial aid?

***Standard 9 – Student Support Services: The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.***

1. The first goal of the University's Strategic Plan is to enhance student success and career readiness through program innovation, ongoing assessment of student learning and expanded student support services. To what extent are academic and non-academic student support services available, and to what extent do students utilize them? How does UB meet the needs of various members of its student population (e.g., commuter students, transfer students, students with disabilities, international students, graduate students, etc.?)

2. How effective is the University's orientation program in informing students of available academic and support services such as advising for freshman, freshmen with relatively weak secondary school preparation and transfer students?

3. What support services are available in the sophomore year, including academic support and advising the students in choosing a major?

4. How does the University assess the effectiveness of its student advising services? How does it determine which services to initiate, enhance or reduce? Are the methods for coordinating services effective in avoiding duplication or gaps in service? For example, what are the sources of student advising, and are these sources coordinated?

5. Are qualified professionals available in sufficient number to supervise and provide the academic and non-academic student support services and programs?

6. In what ways are faculty made aware of and make use of student support services that assist students on their path to graduation?

7. What support services does the University offer to students at academic risk? How are these students identified and notified of available services? How effective are these programs in assisting students at academic risk?

8. What are the policies and procedures for addressing student complaints or grievances (both academic and non-academic)? Are they effective and known to students? How are student grievance policies and procedures created, assessed, updated and disseminated to students, faculty and professional staff? How are these records maintained?

9. What career and life-after graduation initiatives and programs are available to students? How effective is the University in helping to place students after graduation? Is the University's Career Center adequately staffed and supported? Are the institution's students, alumni and employers satisfied with the breadth of depth of services and programs? What percentage of students use the services provided in the Career Center? What mechanisms are in place to assess the effectiveness of the career center? What changes have been made based on these findings?

10. What security mechanisms, policies and procedures are in place to guarantee appropriate confidentiality of student records?

11. Are the University's public safety policies and procedures accessible and known to students? How effective is the process for notifying students, faculty and staff of emergency procedures, emergency resources and emergency situations? How are these policies and procedures evaluated?

12. What are the policies and procedures regarding the initiation and continuation of student-run clubs and organizations? How are these evaluated? What resources does the University provide to these clubs and organizations? How do these activities support the mission and goals of the University?

13. What information technology support services are available to the University's students, and how effective are they at meeting students' needs?

14. How does UB assess student satisfaction with its diverse core of living, learning, support services, and extracurricular activities? How does the University use data obtained from these assessment vehicles to improve the quality of life on the campus? Is there any evidence that levels of student satisfaction have improved (or declined) over the years?

***Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning:*** *Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.*

1. In what ways are expected student learning outcomes stated at the University level? By department or program? At the level of individual courses? How well are expected learning outcomes integrated across all those levels?

2. To what extent does UB employ a well-documented, organized, systematic, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning? Does the institution use multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures that maximize the use of existing data and information?

3. What evidence is used to assess student learning, and how well do such assessment reflect the breath of the learning experiences available at UB?
4. What evidence is there that assessments of student learning are appropriately disseminated and used to improve the student learning experience?
5. What do assessment results indicate about how well students are achieving learning outcomes in UB's courses, academic programs, and across the University?
6. How consistently does UB evaluate the effectiveness of its student learning assessment processes?
7. Are there sufficient and sustained resources to support faculty and staff in the developing their skills in assessment?
8. Does the University regularly survey its alumni base to access the educational and occupational benefits they derive from a UB education? If so, what has the University learned from this data, and what improvements were made based on this information?

Questions more appropriate to other Standards:

UB offers programming online and face-to-face classes on its Baltimore campus and at the USM Shady Grove campus. What procedures are in place to ensure that student learning outcomes and curriculum are consistent across these delivery channels? [Should be with Group 4/Standard 13 instead]

What is UB's vision for what is meant by providing innovative education in business, public affairs, the applied liberal arts and sciences, and how does the University assess its success or failure to do so? [Should be with Group 1/Standard 1]

Working Group 3: Strengthening Commitment to Student Success

Data Needs correlated to Revised Research Questions

Research Question	Data Needed	Source(s)	Status	Fundamental Element
<b>Standard 8</b> 1	Evidence of link between Admissions policies and Mission	Admissions Office Office of Planning		8.1, 8.2
2	Admissions profiles; Graduation profiles; Retention rates broken out by demographics; Retention plans by program	Admissions Office Academic Affairs		8.2, 8.8
3	Demographic data; Enrollment/Recruitment plan	Office of Enrollment Management		8.1
4	Enrollment/Recruitment plan; Enrollment Management assessment plan and report; Student body profiles	Office of Enrollment Management		8.1
5	Enrollment/Recruitment plan; Enrollment Management assessment plan and report	Office of Enrollment Management		8.1
6	Enrollment/Recruitment plan; Demographic data	Office of Enrollment Management		8.1
7	Advising materials re: pathways to graduation	Colleges/Assistant Deans		8.7
8	Student progression data; DFW rates; Program data on completion and progress toward degree (how do programs get students through?)	Office of Enrollment Management; Colleges/Assistant Deans		8.7
9	Assessment of college readiness and developmental programs	Assistant Provost	Provided (inconsistent before 2015)	8.3, 8.4
10	Evidence of learning outcomes on program websites	UR; Academic Affairs		8.5
11	Correlation between placement testing and student	Assistant Provost	Provided	8.3, 8.4

	success		(inconsistent before 2015)	
12	Evidence of transfer policies on website	UR; Admissions Office		8.7
13	Evidence of financial aid information in recruiting; Links between financial need and student success	Office of Financial Aid		8.6
<b>Standard 9</b>				
1	Data on student use of support services; Evidence of communication of student support services hours, availability, etc.	Student Affairs		9.1, 9.10
2	Assessment of orientation	Admissions Office	Provided (2015)	9.1
3	Advising handover process/major declaration policy	Advising Offices	Draft provided by CAS	9.3, 9.4
4	Advising assessment plan	Colleges/Assistant Deans	Requested: draft near completion	9.2, 9.4
5	Information on student support staffing; Information on advisor/student ratio	Student Affairs; Colleges/Assistant Deans		9.2
6	Student Affairs communication plan	Student Affairs		9.1, 9.3
7	Achievement and Learning Center assessment plan and report; Advising assessment plan and report	Student Affairs; Colleges/Assistant Deans	Requested	9.3
8	Evidence of record maintenance and communication plan	Dean of Students	Website up to date	9.6, 9.7, 9.8, 9.9
9	CPDC assessment plans and reports; Job placement data	CPDC	Provided	9.1
10	Evidence of record maintenance	Dean of Students/Records Office	Available in student handbook	9.8, 9.9
11	UBPD Assessment plan and communication plan	UB Police	Requested	9.1
12	Student Affairs assessment plan and reports	Student Affairs		9.1

13	OTS assessment plan and reports	OTS	Inquiry	9.1
14	Student surveys (NSSE, etc.)	Institutional Research; Student Affairs		9.10
<b>Standard 14</b> 1	Evidence of SLOs on website Evidence of SLO integration	UR, Academic Affairs	Action Needed	14.1, 14.5
2	Assessment Plans and Reports for all units	Assessment Coordinators	Ongoing	14.2a
3	Assessment Plans and Reports for all units	Assessment Coordinators	Ongoing	14.2b
4	Evidence of assessment results on website	UR, Academic Affairs	Action Needed	14.4
5	Assessment reports, including benchmark information	Assessment Coordinators		14.3
6	Assessment Plans and Reports; Assessment of assessment materials (i.e. syllabus audit)	Provost's office	ongoing	14.2e
7	Evidence of faculty development	CELTT, Provost's Office, Academic units	Requested	14.2b
8	Alumni information correlating UB education to current job	Alumni office		14.5

#### Data Needs Summary

- ♦ Evidence of link between Admissions policies and UB Mission
- ♦ Admissions Profiles
- ♦ Graduation Profiles
- ♦ Retention rates (broken out by demographics and by program)
- ♦ Demographic data on UB students and broader population targeted for recruitment
- ♦ Enrollment/Recruitment plan
- ♦ Enrollment Management assessment plan and report
- ♦ Student body profiles
- ♦ Advising materials showing pathways to graduation
- ♦ Student progression/completion data by program



- ♦ DFW rates
- ♦ Assessment of college readiness and developmental programs
- ♦ Evidence of learning outcomes on program websites
- ♦ Correlation between placement testing and student success
- ♦ Evidence of transfer policies on website
- ♦ Evidence of financial aid information in recruiting
- ♦ Links between financial need and student success
- ♦ Data on student use of support services
- ♦ Evidence of communication of student support services hours, availability, etc.
- ♦ Assessment of orientation
- ♦ Advising handover process/major declaration policy
- ♦ Advising assessment plan
- ♦ Information on student support staffing
- ♦ Information on advisor/student ratio
- ♦ Student Affairs communication plan
- ♦ Achievement and Learning Center assessment plan and report
- ♦ Advising assessment plan and report
- ♦ Evidence of record maintenance and communication plan
- ♦ CPDC assessment plans and reports
- ♦ Job placement data
- ♦ UBPD Assessment plan and communication plan
- ♦ Student Affairs assessment plan and reports
- ♦ OTS assessment plan and reports
- ♦ Student surveys (NSSE, etc.)
- ♦ Evidence of SLOs on website
- ♦ Evidence of SLO integration
- ♦ Assessment Plans and Reports for all units
- ♦ Evidence of assessment results on website
- ♦ Assessment of assessment materials
- ♦ Evidence of faculty development
- ♦ Alumni information correlating UB education to current job