

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.

4 A- Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
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.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
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 in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
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).

Argument

4.A.1

Youngstown State University (YSU) maintains regular program review for graduate programs and programs with professional accreditation. YSU is working to develop a more meaningful practice of regular multi-year program review for undergraduate programs.

Graduate Program Review

The College of Graduate Studies has a separate process for program review, which is a [reporting requirement](#) of the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE). This process provides a mechanism for assessment and continuous improvement for graduate programs.

In fall 2014, a task force was assembled to focus on the program-review process and revise procedures to make the process useful, effective, and efficient. A [new format and procedures for review of graduate programs](#) resulted from this [faculty-driven](#) work.

The process of evaluation and improvement of graduate programs is ongoing and continuous. Programs are scheduled for review approximately every seven years unless the graduate program-review committee determines that more frequent review is needed.

There are two parts to the scheduled review process: a [self-study](#) and [review of the self-study and evidence](#) provided by a team of reviewers. Review concludes with a meeting of the review team and key program personnel to discuss the evaluation. Following the meeting, the review team issues a composite review (see [examples](#) of the full review process).

Program directors, faculty, and key personnel play an important role in continuous assessment and improvement of graduate programs. Program directors and key personnel complete the self-study by reflecting on and responding to the items in the Graduate Program Review Rubric and by providing the evidence and plan. The process provides opportunity to [reflect on and strengthen](#) graduate programs. Graduate program review is in the process of being merged with undergraduate program review, as outlined below.

UPDATE: Most recently, the graduate programs review process has included involvement in the Academic Program Enhancement and Effectiveness Initiative (APEEI). This new APEEI process [[LINK TO APEEI HLC REPORT](#)] enables stakeholders to analyze graduate program data, student demand, employment opportunities, program effectiveness, efficiency of program offerings, and program economics.

Undergraduate Program Review

Undergraduate program review an evolution in process over the last 10 years:

2008–2013: An [annual reporting process](#) had long been in place that required academic departments and undergraduate programs to provide data on program success, including departmental accomplishments, faculty activities, and community engagement.

2014-2018: The reporting process was deemed insufficient because it did not provide enough depth and breadth of review, analysis of data, or development of plans necessary for comprehensive program review. To prepare programs for review, the provost asked faculty and department chairs to begin self-evaluation through [Program Improvement Plans](#) (PIPs) (see completed [example](#)).

PIPs provided an overview of each program's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Each department's faculty members identified significant challenges and significant opportunities for each program. Subsequently, the program's faculty developed action steps to address challenges and opportunities.

Each chair produced an overview describing the department's contribution to YSU, any aspects that might not have been adequately covered through the PIPs, and the value of the department and programs to the university, region, profession, and relevant communities. These documents were forwarded to the dean and provost for review.

2015: A [Program Review Development Committee](#) with broad representation was convened to explore best practices, develop a program review model for YSU, identify needed resources, and develop an inclusive review process.

Based on the Program Review Development Committee's recommendations, the Academic Senate developed the charge, composition, and procedures for the [Academic Program Review Committee](#). Included in the charge was a [Program Review Coordinator](#), a faculty member with release time to manage the process.

Although the Program Review Development Committee recognized the need to revive the review process, it recommended that only 20% of programs submit reports a year with all programs completed over a five-year period. The committee determined that when program review was last required by all programs simultaneously in 2008, YSU's resources did not allow effective execution or feedback. Those programs not undergoing program review in 2015–16 submitted abbreviated reviews to increase awareness of the requirements and to ensure programs were discussing and refining program goals while establishing, reviewing, and collecting support data.

2015–2017: Program review's purpose was to

- Support alignment of program with the university's mission and strategic plan.
- Evaluate programs for strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement.
- Evaluate programs' resource availability and needs.

Programs were asked to provide updates on PIPs and plan next steps and goals to support the program's strategic plan. A notable inclusion in program review was integrating assessment, a recommendation of HLC Mentor Susan Hatfield (see 4.B.1). Guidance and instruction were provided through the [Program Review Handbook](#).

The Academic Senate announced the guiding evaluation principles based in “constructive engagement and transparency.” The process sought to have wide engagement with sign-off at the college level and review by faculty teams at the university level. The Program Review Committee then reviewed the report and evaluation materials to develop final recommendations, which were [presented to the Academic Senate](#). To date, approximately 40% of all programs have submitted full program review self-study documents.

After a lapse in this process, this first iteration of program review focused on developing understanding and support for self-reflection on program mission alignment, program quality evaluation, and education about data resources. It also focused on developing skills in evaluating program data. A number of programs were voluntarily discontinued due to a review of enrollment and graduation rates over the past five years, freeing resources for viable programs.

2017: At the end of the 2017 academic year, the Program Review Coordinator resigned. This resignation provided an opportunity for YSU to step back and evaluate the process. The [Streamlined Academic Reporting Process](#) (SARP) committee was established at this time to do the following:

- Address concerns and requests by departments to reduce redundancy in reporting.
- Evaluate the process for what worked and what could be improved.
- Integrate multiple reporting processes, including program review, assessment, and annual reporting.
- Connect the new process to strategic planning and budgeting processes.
- Combine graduate and undergraduate processes.

A key finding of the SARP committee was the need to roll up reporting to the department level to enable programs and departments to reflect the full range of contributions departments make outside of individual programs, such as GE courses and community engagement. Better data availability and management are needed. YSU has been exploring data tools to better collect and manage faculty activity. YSU plans to connect such a system to existing faculty reporting and review functions, such as evaluations or tenure and promotion processes.

The SARP committee redesigned program review and annual reporting with a [proposed streamlined reporting process](#) that will connect program review, strategic planning, budget, and assessment. The process will be implemented in Taskstream, a document and process management system that will enable programs to connect goals with evaluation, action steps, and achievements. The SARP program review and annual reporting process will be tested with select departments in spring 2018 before a university-wide pilot is implemented in fall 2018. The new process will be implemented by college and will include reporting of all undergraduate and graduate programs in a college.

The SARP committee has chosen to “[think big](#)” in redesigning the process, but it recognizes the challenge of such a departure from previous practice. Enabling vertical integration of strategic planning, evaluation, and budgeting from the program, department, college, and university level has the potential to significantly affect continuous improvement.

UPDATE: 2019 – present

YSU has implemented the Academic Program Enhancement and Effectiveness Initiative (APEEI). Faculty and administration worked to develop this comprehensive process. This process resulted in extensive review of nearly every academic degree program on campus. It is part of the Plan for Strategic Actions to Take Charge of Our Future and is supported by a resolution of the university Board of Trustees. The interim report to the HLC [[LINK TO PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT TO HLC](#)], submitted in August 2021, documented YSU’s significant progress and achievement with program review and indicates YSU has provided evidence of an established schedule of program reviews, examples of departmental self-study, evidence that program review was used to inform changes, and specific details on the APPEI process. The response from HLC on 11-41-21 [[LINK TO HLC RESPONSE](#)] indicates that evidence provided demonstrates that YSU has made adequate progress in the area of program review. Further details on APPEI process can also be found at <https://ysu.edu/strategic-planning/apeei> for detailed information. Ongoing progress and updates to the APEEI process are chronicled on the YSU Strategic Plan website [[LINK TO PDF OF https://ysu.edu/strategic-planning](#)].

4.A.2

YSU transcribes academic credit for all credit-bearing courses taught through YSU, for courses completed at regionally accredited colleges and universities and at internationally accredited post-secondary institutions, for passing scores on several standardized exams or departmental challenge exams, and for various forms of prior learning assessments in accordance with ODHE transfer policies. Courses taught at YSU go through a rigorous approval and evaluation process as described in 4.A.4. Below are the evaluation processes for other transcribed credit

Accredited Institutions

In alignment with [ODHE guidelines](#), YSU awards credit for coursework completed at regionally accredited institutions recognized by Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA.) YSU also awards credit for coursework completed at accredited international institutions. However, YSU only evaluates courses if an official syllabus or course description is provided. Transfer evaluation policies and procedures are described in Criterion 4.A.3.

For transfer courses from Ohio public institutions, YSU follows ODHE's [Ohio Transfer Module \(OTM\)](#) for accepting and applying GE transfer credit and ODHE's [Transfer Assurance Guides \(TAGs\)](#) for accepting and applying program-specific transfer credit.

Career and Technical Institutions

YSU awards credit for a limited number of courses and some experiential learning at select career and technical institutions. Following ODHE transfer guidelines, YSU awards credit for career and technical coursework that are part of Ohio's [Career-Technical Assurance Guides \(CTAG\)](#). YSU also awards credit for career and technical school coursework that is part of specific partnership programs.

Non-accredited Institutions

YSU does not automatically grant credit for coursework at non-regionally accredited institutions. In special circumstances, YSU will award credit for coursework at non-regionally accredited institutions on a course-by-course basis. In these circumstances, the relevant department chair will evaluate the coursework to determine whether to accept the credit. There is no guarantee that credit for the coursework will be awarded or applied to a program.

YSU accepts some completed coursework from the [Alternative Credit Project \(ACP\)](#) through the American Council on Education. Individual ACP courses are evaluated by relevant department chairs before being awarded credit.

Credit by Examination

YSU awards credit to students who complete appropriate subject examination through the credit-by-examination process using the Advanced Placement Program (AP), College Level Examination Program (CLEP), International Baccalaureate (IB), or departmental examinations. Policies including passing scores, course equivalencies, and credit hours awarded are as follows:

- AP Exams: YSU's policy is found in the admission for [transfer applicants section](#) of the catalog. Passing scores, course equivalencies, and credit hours awarded are available on the Office of the Registrar's [website](#). YSU follows [ODHE guidelines](#).
- CLEP Exams: YSU's policy is found in the admission with [non-traditional credit section](#) of YSU catalog. Passing scores, course equivalencies, and credit hours awarded are available on the Office of the Registrar's [website](#). YSU follows the new [ODHE guidelines](#).
- IB Exams: Passing scores, course equivalencies, and credit hours awarded are found on Office of the Registrar's [website](#).
- Departmental Challenge Exams: Passing scores, course equivalencies, and credit hours awarded are determined by individual departments.

Prior Learning Assessment

Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) is an additional option for earning credit. In accordance with YSU's Policy on Prior Learning Assessment, students must demonstrate mastery of knowledge in a subject area through standardized or challenge examinations, portfolio, or demonstrated military service learning to earn credit. Criteria for experiential or prior-learning credit have been created and applied in accordance with ODHE and Academic Senate policies. In addition to CLEP Exams and Department Challenge Exams, PLA includes the following options to gain credit:

- Portfolio-based assessments: Students applying for prior learning assessment through portfolio-based assessment must first complete a one-credit hour portfolio development course, [PLA 1500](#). After students complete the portfolio, department faculty and chairs evaluate prior learning for credit. Details of the course and portfolios are found in the [PLA Manual](#).
- Evaluation of local training, certifications, and licensure: If approved at the department level, [specific training, certifications, and licensures](#) may be awarded course credit.
- Military training, experience, and coursework: Ohio's public colleges and universities award college credit for training and experience in the US Armed Forces or National Guard if it has been approved by the American Council on Education (ACE) or a regional accrediting body. The application of that credit to specific coursework follows [ODHE policies](#) and YSU's course evaluation procedures.
 - ODHE provides a statewide guarantee that certain types of military training, experience, and/or coursework align to existing college and university courses through [Military Transfer Assurance Guides](#) (MTAGs.)
 - Courses taken through the US Armed Forces Institute, the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support, and certain formal service school courses are evaluated by department chairs for potential alignment with their courses and programs.
 - Military training and experience that are not part of MTAGs or specific coursework are also evaluated by department chairs for potential alignment with their courses and programs. A listing of [approved equivalencies](#) is available on the PLA webpage.

4.A.3

YSU follows the policies set by ODHE in the [Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy Document](#) and provides additional policies as needed to assure the quality of transfer credit. University processes and policies are different for undergraduate and graduate transfer courses.

Undergraduate

YSU partners with the ODHE for assuring quality in state-approved transfer equivalencies, including OTM, TAG, CTAG, and MTAG equivalencies. Courses belonging to these initiatives are evaluated and approved by state-appointed faculty-led committees to ensure consistency in learning objectives and outcomes.

YSU uses an [internal review system](#) for equating courses that are not part of ODHE's transfer programs. This process applies to coursework from any regionally accredited college or university, or international accredited institutions. Undergraduate transcripts are submitted to the

Admissions Office upon application. A transfer request is forwarded to the Office of Degree Audit for transfer course equates. The degree-audit system (uAchieve) and Banner automatically match courses that have been equated and registered in the system's transfer tables. The appropriate transfer credit is then awarded.

For courses not already equated, Degree Audit follows YSU's [course-equate policy](#). Lower-division, standard courses are equated by professionals in Degree Audit. Upper-division or non-standard lower-division courses are evaluated and [equated](#) by department chairs or relevant program directors.

The Academic Senate's Academic Standards Committee developed a [Transfer Appeal Process](#) in alignment with ODHE guidelines. The appeal process was approved in May 2017 and implemented in the 2017–2018 academic year. The process allows students to appeal a decision about determination of transfer credit. YSU explains the appeals process in the Undergraduate Academic Catalog.

Any articulation agreements, consortial agreements, or partnership programs that grant block credit or equivalencies that are different from those determined during the review process are reviewed by affected departments and the provost's office before being signed. These agreements are evaluated periodically to ensure continuing quality.

UPDATE: The university has implemented a new degree equate system, DegreeWorks, which integrates better with our student information system, Banner, and speeds up the transcript review process. In addition, communication has been improved with students [[LINK TO INFORMATION FOR TRANSFER APPLICANTS \(YSU COURSE CATALOG 2021-2022\)](#)]; they are notified as soon as their transcript has been reviewed and courses equated [[LINK TO EMAIL FROM PENGUIN SERVICE CENTER](#)].

Graduate

At the graduate level, students may [request transfer credit](#) upon submission of transcripts when they apply to the College of Graduate Studies.

This request for transfer credit is forwarded to the respective graduate degree's program director. The program director evaluates the transfer course content and ensures that the transfer credit replaces a required course or integrates satisfactorily into the student's program. The program director then recommends the transfer of credit to Graduate Studies for approval.

Graduate Studies evaluates approved courses to ensure that transfer criteria have been met, such as a grade of "B" or "A" being earned, the institution of the transfer course being accredited, and the student not exceeding the maximum number of acceptable transfer credit hours. Graduate Studies applies credit to the student transcript, and original forms are forwarded to Records.

4.A.4

YSU maintains and exercises authority over prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for its programs, including dual-credit programs. All proposals to add, change, or delete a program or course are reviewed and approved by faculty and administrators at several levels to ensure compliance with Academic Senate and Graduate Council policies and to assure appropriate prerequisites, rigor, student-learning outcomes, and availability of resources.

Prerequisites for Courses

The Academic Senate developed, implemented, and enforces a [policy on course prerequisites](#) for undergraduate course levels, including any deviation from the approved structure. Prerequisites are subject to written waiver on an individual basis by the department chair in consultation with the instructor(s) teaching the course and for courses offered in that department.

Graduate course prerequisites are codified in the [Graduate Curriculum](#) section of the Graduate Policy Book.

Rigor of Courses and Expectations for Student Learning

Department faculty are responsible for developing and implementing courses and programs of study. Rigor is established and ensured by department faculty representatives serving on a department's curriculum committee. Through a collaborative process, the department's curriculum committee reviews, revises, and approves courses or program proposals. Once approved at this level, proposals are submitted to the department chair for approval.

Once developed and approved through the department, [course](#) and [program](#) proposals at the undergraduate level are reviewed and approved through the Academic Senate process. A course proposal that involves a GE requirement must be submitted simultaneously to the GE committee. The process involves multiple levels and approvals, ensuring thorough and careful assessment.

At the graduate level, curriculum changes follow a similar [review and approval process](#) through the Graduate Council. Graduate programs also have to [notify CCGS](#) regarding program changes.

For additional information on rigor and expectations for student learning, see 3.B.1 and 4.B.1.

Access to Learning Resources

YSU offers many learning resources to address the needs of students. These resources are found in 3.D.2.

Faculty Credentials

YSU maintains an [academic policy](#) for faculty credentials. All full-time and part-time undergraduate instructors, including those who teach dual credit, must meet these minimum guidelines. The policy is enforced by the provost's office. See 3.C.2 for details on the credentialing guidelines and processes.

The College of Graduate Studies oversees implementation of the policy on [graduate faculty credentials](#).

Dual-Credit Delivery

YSU offers college credit for courses under the state-mandated College Credit Plus (CCP) program. The program's [website](#) details policies and procedures that ensure that CCP courses are taught by approved qualified instructors; follow YSU's course withdrawal, grading, absence

policies; and use the same textbooks and syllabi as on-campus courses. [CCP syllabi](#) must follow the template that identifies learning outcomes, outcome-related learning activities, and outcome assessments.

CCP dual-enrollment [course-oversight plans](#) and [course-oversight reports](#) demonstrate that dual-enrollment course standards are current and that appropriate levels of student performance are met and maintained. Department chairs and one or more department faculty mentor(s) have primary responsibility for oversight. CCP instructors have regular professional development and review by department mentors (see 3.A.3).

Consortia

YSU is a member of two consortia. Consortial institutions are regionally accredited, and deans, program directors, and faculty members at each institution are responsible for monitoring their programs and courses. A high degree of collaboration exists between consortial institutions. The [Master of Public Health](#) and [Master in Fine Arts](#) handbooks outline program standards and processes.

UPDATE: The Master in Fine Arts program is being sunset, but the handbook will continue to be followed through teach out processes.

4.A.5

Programs requiring specialized professional accreditation are certified by the appropriate accrediting bodies and maintain good standing. These programs [regularly report](#) to the BOT regarding last certification of accreditation, current standing, and next visit information.

4.A.6

YSU tracks success of graduates in several ways, and it looks for ways to improve this essential information gathering.

YSU Graduate Outcomes Survey Results

The Office of Career Exploration & Development conducts a Graduate Outcomes Survey to collect information about employment and continuing-education decisions made by students who completed degrees during the academic year. Executive summaries are widely distributed to the campus community. Additional information collected from the Office of Alumni Engagement, WCBA Center for Career Management, and STEM Professional Services is incorporated into the report.

In 2015–2016, [the survey](#) was distributed to graduates who received degrees in August 2015, December 2015, and May 2016. Primary data collection was by email. This process occurred four times over a full year: beginning one month before graduation and every three months thereafter. The total response rate was 26%. Out of 2,051 graduates, there were 538 responses.

“Career outcomes” are defined as the total number of respondents who are working full-time, seeking additional education and accepted, serving in the military, or working as a post-graduate volunteer (e.g., Peace Corps).

YSU’s total career outcomes rate is 72% with individual college’s career outcome rates included in the report. Out of the 538 respondents, 388 had outcomes related to a career. Seventeen percent of the respondents have been accepted into continuing-education programs. The mean undergraduate salary is \$28,643 with a median of \$29,000. The mean graduate salary is \$32,224 with a median of \$30,000. The majority of graduates, 73%, stayed within 30 miles of Youngstown.

The student demographic of the report closely matches the YSU demographic in gender and race:

<u>Survey Respondents</u>	<u>YSU seniors</u>
Female 1047 (56%) Male 821 (44%)	Female (55%) Male (45%)
White (78%) Student of Color (22%)	White (78%) Student of Color (19%)
	Unknown (4%)

Other Graduate Success Data

Sources of information regarding graduate success include the following:

- Individual academic departments [track](#) the success of student graduates using alumni surveys, social media, and other communication methods.
- Many discipline-specific accreditations require tracking graduates to determine if they have found appropriate professional positions or passed essential licensing exams. Typically, these outcomes are reported annually and often must be posted on the relevant website.
- The Office of Alumni Engagement gathers information that is historic in nature to provide data on graduates as they progress through careers. YSU has expanded its Penguin family by including all YSU graduates in the Alumni Society. To assure that graduates remain connected to the university, YSU converted its Alumni Society from a dues-paying organization to a non-dues organization. YSU alumni are automatically granted membership to the Alumni Society.
- *YSU 2020* includes BOT post-college success [metrics](#): job placements, graduate school placements, GRE/MCAT/LSAT scores, and license and certification scores.

Sources

- HLC1_GraduateAcademicPolicy Book2017.pdf
- HLC1_GraduateAcademicPolicy Book2017.pdf (page number 9)
- HLC1_GraduateAcademicPolicy Book2017.pdf (page number 17)
- HLC1_GraduateAcademicPolicy Book2017.pdf (page number 37)

- HLC1_GraduateAcademicPolicy Book2017.pdf (page number 38)
- HLC3_CcgsGuidelines01222018
- HLC3_CcgsGuidelines01222018 (page number 7)
- HLC3_CcgsGuidelines01222018 (page number 25)
- HLC3_CcpAndYsuSyllabi
- HLC3_CcpDocumentingQuality
- HLC3C_CCPOversightVisitHistory
- HLC3C_FacultyCredentialsGuidelines
- HLC4_GraduateProgramReviewExamples
- HLC4_GraduateProgramReviewExamples (page number 264)
- HLC4_GraduateProgramReviewMinutes
- HLC4_GraduateProgramReviewProcess
- HLC4_ProgramReviewHandbook
- HLC4A_AdmissionWithNonTraditionalCredit
- HLC4A_AlternativeCreditProjectWebPage
- HLC4A_CampusSARPMemo121217
- HLC4A_CCP InstructorsWebPage
- HLC4A_CreditbyExaminationAPWebPage
- HLC4A_CreditByExaminationCLEPWebPage
- HLC4A_CreditByExaminationIBWebPage
- HLC4A_CurrentAccreditationActivityMarch2018pdf
- HLC4A_EquateAppFAQ
- HLC4A_GraduateOutcomesReport2015-2016
- HLC4A_GraduateProgramReviewForCompletionByProgram
- HLC4A_GraduateProgramReviewForEvaluationOfSelfStudyIndividual
- HLC4A_HHSPiP2015
- HLC4A_international-undergraduate-admission
- HLC4A_MilitaryCreditArticulations
- HLC4A_OATN Policy COMPLETE 2018.1.9
- HLC4A_OATN Policy COMPLETE 2018.1.9 (page number 85)
- HLC4A_OATN Policy COMPLETE 2018.1.9 (page number 99)
- HLC4A_OATN Policy COMPLETE 2018.1.9 (page number 116)
- HLC4A_OATN Policy COMPLETE 2018.1.9 (page number 118)
- HLC4A_OATN Policy COMPLETE 2018.1.9 (page number 120)
- HLC4A_ODHE CLEP Alignment Policy - Revised 12-1-17
- HLC4A_Ohio AP policy
- HLC4A_PiPInstructions12.12.2014
- HLC4A_PLA1500PortfolioDevelopmentCourseSyllabus
- HLC4A_PLAManual2015-16
- HLC4A_Policies and Procedures Handbook_Transfer_Equates
- HLC4A_ProgramReviewDevelopmentCommitteeKickoffEmail
- HLC4A_ProgramReviewGuidelines2007
- HLC4A_SARPOverview
- HLC4A_SARPWorkingGroup2017-2018pdf
- HLC4A_Selected InformationFrom2008-2009AnnualReports
- HLC4A_SenateAcademicProgramsProposal

- [HLC4A_SenateCourseProposalGuidelines](#)
- [HLC4A_SenateMinutesMay2016](#)
- [HLC4A_SenateMinutesMay2016 \(page number 22\)](#)
- [HLC4A_SenateOctoberMinutes2015](#)
- [HLC4A_SenateOctoberMinutes2015 \(page number 4\)](#)
- [HLC4A_SenateProgramReviewCommitteeRoster](#)
- [HLC4A_TrainingAndCertificationCrosswalksWebPage](#)
- [HLC4A_TransferAppealWebPage](#)
- [HLC4A_TransferApplicantsCatalog](#)
- [HLC4A_TransferEquateProcedure2018](#)
- [HLC4A_TransferProcessWorkflow](#)
- [HLC4A_www.ysu.edu_admissions_apply-to-ysu_transfer-students](#)
- [HLC4A4_MPHConsortiumHandbook](#)
- [HLC4A4_NEOMFAConsortiumHandbook](#)
- [HLC4A6_ChairSurveyOfGraduateContacts](#)
- [HLC4C_SSCornerstoneReportBOTJune2017](#)
- [HLC4C_SSCornerstoneReportBOTJune2017 \(page number 10\)](#)

1.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
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.

Argument

4.B

YSU has developed comprehensive processes to support student learning and success through assessment in academic, co-curricular, and GE programs.

4.B.1

Assessment

YSU's [Office of Assessment](#) (OOA) oversees assessment of student learning in academic degree programs and co-curricular programs.

Although a good foundation for assessment had been laid earlier, multiple effective processes for assessment and achievement of learning goals grew out of the 2008 HLC peer-review team visit findings. To increase participation in assessment and to create a positive culture of assessment, YSU entered the Academy for the Assessment of Student Learning in 2008. [YSU's Academy projects](#) built broader understanding and participation in assessment activities and improved professional development. The YSU Academy team created programs that expanded capacity and celebrated efforts to support student learning assessment involvement.

Effective assessment processes to support continuous improvement are evidenced in the following ways:

- Student learning goals: Academic and co-curricular programs have comprehensive student learning outcomes, and learning must be differentiated in closely related programs. Learning-outcome goals are posted in [YSU's course catalog](#) and on the [OOA webpage](#) for every program. They [are reviewed](#) at the start of each complete assessment cycle for currency.

- Clear expectations: Assessment handbooks provide comprehensive assessment processes and reporting instructions for [academic](#) and [co-curricular](#) programs. In addition, OOA provides [education and support](#) to programs through workshops, training, new-faculty orientation, and consultation services.
- Structural support: The OOA staff's primary mission is support and promotion of student-learning assessment. [Resources for assessment](#), both human and budget, have been prioritized in a time of financial constraint. OOA's annual budget allows for support and professional development through programs such as mini-grants and appreciation events.
- Broad ownership: Responsibilities for assessment activities and evaluation are distributed across campus. Each program designates an assessment coordinator to collect and submit reports, but programs have broad faculty and staff participation. Reports are [evaluated](#) in part by the level of participation of faculty in assessment, and faculty assessment expectations are clear (see 4.B.4).
- Stakeholder involvement: The [Assessment Council](#) (AC) includes representatives from all colleges and major co-curricular divisions. The AC evaluates assessment reports and [provides expertise and consultation](#) about assessment improvements, positive culture building, and data use.
- Evaluation responsibility shared: In addition to AC members, between 10 and 30 faculty and staff volunteers review assessment reports yearly. Volunteers are often past participants in assessment professional development programs, and many cite increased understanding of and participation in assessment processes as benefits of participating.
- Yearly reporting: Academic and co-curricular programs report yearly and engage in [comprehensive assessment](#), including developing learning outcomes and curriculum maps, aligning methods with SLOs, collecting and evaluating data, identifying action steps, and evaluating action steps.
- Evaluating action steps: Programs first began reporting on the status and impact of previous action steps in 2012. Two actions are helping programs to “close the loop” in their assessment cycle: first, assessment has been integrated into and aligned with program-review processes that ask programs to [reflect on their entire assessment cycle](#) and its impact on learning; second, YSU is adopting a process management system to better connect action steps and follow-up analysis of learning.
- Program review integration: As a result of an Academy Evidence Inventory, Visiting HLC scholar Susan Hatfield [recommended](#) that assessment be integrated into graduate and undergraduate program review. Beginning in 2015, integration into the five-year program review cycle provided programs with greater motivation to participate and an opportunity to reflect on the assessment cycle and priority areas for assessment in the next cycle.
- Information widely disseminated: Feedback, evaluation of assessment reports, and [aggregate historical participation and quality reports](#), are shared with departments, colleges, divisions, [campus leadership](#), and other constituents.

UPDATE: Assessment is not integrated into the APEEI program review process, due to the primary focus on economic viability and prioritization model.

General Education

[The GE committee](#), reporting to the Academic Senate, oversees the GE curriculum. The general-education coordinator provides committee leadership and administers the program.

The GE program has clearly stated [learning goals](#) that were last updated in 2011. Every course in the GE curriculum [must fulfill learning goals](#) set forth in the program. See Criterion 3.B. for detailed GE curriculum analysis.

One of YSU's goals in the HLC's Academy was to [improve GE assessment](#). YSU decided to use an authentic artifact-based and developmental rubric-based model:

- When the learning outcomes were updated in 2011, the GE committee developed the Repository of Assessment Documents (ROAD) Project. A sample of student-uploaded artifacts from beginning composition and upper-division courses are evaluated yearly by trained faculty reviewers using adapted VALUE Rubrics. Results are evaluated for trends and to make curricular improvements (see 4.B.3).
- ROAD has sought to assess the intersection of outcomes in the GE curriculum with the development of those outcomes in the major. YSU programs include a capstone course as part of the GE curriculum, and core outcomes in communication, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking are to extend into the major. ROAD included an exercise with program coordinators to develop [writing-specific curriculum maps](#) that outlined expectations of and instructional opportunities for students in writing throughout and upon completion of the curriculum.
- ROAD is evaluating other outcomes in the curriculum. In response to campus concerns, ROAD began [curriculum mapping of diversity and global competency](#) expectations and achievement in the majors. These data will be used as the GE committee considers changes to ensure that students are achieving GE outcomes in these areas.
- ROAD will continue to use the artifact model as it works through evaluating all Core Competency outcomes of the curriculum. While writing and critical thinking will continue to be evaluated yearly, other core competencies will be evaluated every other year.

YSU recognizes that knowledge domain assessment is [needed](#). The GE committee initially tried a [faculty learning community model](#) in 2012–2014, which was not successful in YSU's campus culture. The GE committee is discussing deployment of a [course-portfolio model](#) to assess knowledge domains (e.g., Natural Science), possibly in conjunction with program review. This approach would allow departments to evaluate if the GE curriculum meets learning outcomes and provide data that show achievement of learning outcomes.

UPDATE: While there are pockets of domain assessment [[LINK TO CMST1545 COURSE EVALUATION](#)] that use good practice to assess learning outcomes and make improvements to student learning, YSU recognizes the need to expand assessment and revisit General Education goals. The YSU Board of Trustees has charged the university to review and revise our general education goals towards a more transformative and integrated curriculum [[LINK TO 3/2/22 AESS AGENDA ON EDUCATIONAL QUALITY BOT RESOLUTIONS COMPILATION](#)]. In response to this charge, YSU has initiated the Academic Program Transformation Initiative to both develop institutional learning outcomes and reform General Education curriculum [[LINK TO APT WEBPAGE—BUT NOT FULLY DEVELOPED YET, PDF CLOSER TO DEADLINE](#)].

4.B.2

Assessment

YSU evaluates achievement of student learning outcomes in both academic and co-curricular programs through broad participation in a strong assessment process (see 4.B.1).

- Academic programs evaluate learning outcomes at least once during the [five-year assessment and program-review cycle](#). Programs typically evaluate two learning outcomes a year; each learning outcome is assessed using two measures. Data may be from a single year, or multiple years may be aggregated. Data are evaluated for strengths and challenges in student learning, and action steps are identified for areas of challenge.
- At the end of five years, programs submit an “[Assessment-Cycle Reflection](#)” with program review. They will report on the impact of action steps on learning. If they do not have evidence of learning impact, they must incorporate that goal into the next assessment plan.
- Since 2007, co-curricular programs have participated in assessment of student learning. Co-curricular programs have [built knowledge and capacity](#) through training, professional development, and reporting. Beginning in 2015, co-curricular programs developed [comprehensive sets of outcomes](#) that align with their mission and vision, developed learning opportunity maps to visually map co-curriculum, and developed [three- to five-year plans](#) for evaluating learning. One learning outcome per year is evaluated, mirroring the academic assessment process and action-step status. Programs will be asked to submit an assessment reflection upon completing their first full assessment cycle.

General Education

The GEC has used ROAD artifacts to assess achievement of GE learning outcomes. Initial data regarding writing and student learning revealed a potential problem. On the 4-point [developmental scale of the rubrics](#) used for writing and critical thinking, on average, students were not getting to the second level of the rubric on [any rubric dimension](#). Many students were not moving to the top level of the rubric by the time they submitted their upper-division writing artifacts. The GE committee used this data to begin closer investigation and to initiate planning:

- These data led to the writing curriculum map phase of ROAD. This exercise provided opportunity to begin dialogue with program coordinators about writing preparation through GE courses and responsibility for writing instruction.
- Assessment data allowed the GE coordinator and committee to better understand expectations in the academic programs and to document disciplinary expectations and learning opportunities through curriculum mapping.
- Curriculum mapping led to the realization that expectations and opportunity for developing writing varied greatly across programs. Many faculty were not aware of the skill level of students completing the composition sequence, and feedback reflected that faculty considered writing something that English faculty were “supposed to” teach. In addition, many faculty felt unprepared to provide writing instruction in their courses, either due to workload or lack of knowledge base (actions discussed in 4.B.3).

Recently, English has implemented assessment of Writing 1 (English 1550), the first course in the composition sequence, to evaluate progress between the first and second courses. English faculty will use the same ROAD rubric. The samples will include on-campus and online courses to ensure quality across modes of delivery.

4.B.3

Assessment

YSU has a long history of evaluating strengths and challenges in student learning and

taking steps to improve outcomes, as evidenced in these summaries of [academic](#) and [co-curricular](#) assessment actions. Programs began reporting on prior year's actions in 2012. This addition to the reporting structure ensured that action steps were implemented and impact on learning assessed.

Assessment's integration into program review supports programs taking a holistic view of their SLO assessment process. Programs evaluate strengths and challenges in learning, actions taken toward curricular improvement, and impact on learning. The process allows programs to identify emergent learning issues and incorporate them into the next assessment-cycle plan.

OOA [evaluated](#) the use of data and implementation of action steps in academic programs over the past five years. Data show a significant majority identify strengths and challenges, take action steps for improvement, and complete those steps. Case studies in [academic](#) and [co-curricular](#) departments provide evidence of departments closing the assessment loop. The implementation of Taskstream, a document and process management system, will make tracking action steps more accurate and align actions with other program-improvement processes.

UPDATE: The formation of the YSU Institute for Teaching and Learning in 2019, which brought together the Office of Assessment and Faculty Development through extensive feedback and research [[LINK TO ITL NEEDS ASSESSMENT WHITEPAPER](#)] has increased the ability for the office to apply data around student learning to inform and improve professional development and teaching improvements [[LINK TO ITL ANNUAL REPORT 2019-2021](#)].

General Education

Based on GE assessment reported above in 4.B.2, several changes were made to improve student learning in the GE curriculum. Composition faculty standardized composition syllabi, sequenced style-guide instruction, and aligned writing prompts to improve artifact evaluation.

In 2014, ROAD recruited 21 faculty members for a [one-day training and scoring session](#) to broaden awareness of student writing skills.

- Faculty were educated on ROAD, trained on scoring writing samples using the rubric, and evaluated lower- and upper-division student artifacts.
- Faculty feedback reflected better understanding of foundational instruction provided through first-year composition; they better understood the lack of progress some upper-division sample papers reflected.
- Discussion around solutions included designing better writing prompts and providing more instructional opportunities for students to practice writing.

The challenge of connecting writing with instructional strategies led a team of faculty and staff working on the ROAD project to write a [book chapter](#) in 2016 on how to connect dimensions of the VALUE Rubrics with instructional strategies around writing and information literacy.

To implement these strategies, the GE committee teamed with OOA in FY2018 to fund a [pilot project](#) in the Economics Department to score writing samples using the ROAD rubric. Department faculty will identify curricular or instructional strategies as targets for improvement. The intent is to use the results of the pilot to target additional departments for participation.

4.B.4

Assessment

YSU's processes and methodologies reflect development over a long time and with the expertise and guidance of mentors in the Academy for the Assessment of Student Learning. YSU's

Academy Team developed much more sustainable processes because of participation in the Academy. In preparation for the final year, the team requested an Academy Evidence Inventory. Susan Hatfield, YSU's HLC Academy mentor, visited campus in 2011 to perform a 360-degree review of assessment projects that had been developed for the Academy to remediate issues identified in the 2008 reaffirmation. The mentor had several [recommendations](#) that were implemented by the OOA:

- Reaffirmation or revision of learning outcomes.
- Development of curriculum maps.
- Alignment of assessment and program review reporting processes.

Assessment processes are aligned with standard and accepted processes for assessment of student learning; processes have grown out of well-known literature (Walvoord, 2004; Suskie, 2009) and consultation through the Academy. OOA also uses elements of the [National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment's Transparency Framework](#) (NILOA) when considering how to make materials and evidence of processes available to the campus community. Using the NILOA framework would enable YSU to seek the [NILOA Excellence in Assessment Designation](#).

Each of the six components in the framework is considered when sharing data with the campus community:

- Student learning-outcome statements are posted in the [university catalog](#) and the [assessment website](#), and they are reviewed each assessment cycle.
- Program [assessment plans](#) are available to the [campus community](#), describe assessment methods and timeline, and are updated each assessment cycle.
- In addition to direct workshop, training, and consultation services, resources are available through the [academic](#) and [co-curricular](#) handbooks. These handbooks explain the assessment process and provide resources and links for further information.
- [Reports and feedback](#) to reports are available on the OOA webpage. In addition, data-collection activities, such as [National Survey of Student Engagement \(NSSE\) data](#), are shared across campus, and results and resources made available publicly.
- Evidence of student learning is shown through assessment reports, and NSSE data results are disseminated widely.
- Use of student learning evidence is shown through action steps outlined in assessment reports and through reflection on impact on learning in program review. As mentioned, NSSE data are shared widely and facilitate conversations on student learning and [potential improvements/recommendations](#).

As mentioned in 4.B.1, there is broad participation in assessment reviews. Teams of faculty and staff are trained in peer review and scoring calibration every year. They review reports and provide feedback. OOA staff also reviews documents and provides feedback to programs.

Co-curricular assessment reports adopted a cohort-review model, in which small groups of co-curricular departments meet to review and evaluate colleagues' reports and provide feedback and recommendations. This process fosters skill building and learning from peers and assessment staff.

OOA periodically evaluates campus participation in assessment; [results](#) indicate gains in campus participation in and value of assessment. Faculty have clear expectations around participation in assessment activities. According to the *YSU-OEA Agreement*, assessment activities are to be outlined in department governance documents ([Article 9.4](#)) as a shared responsibility and as one of the activities included in teaching duties ([Appendix C](#)). Assessment handbooks note that faculty members should be involved in assessment, at a minimum participating in yearly review and discussion of assessment outcomes. Report evaluation includes faculty participation. Integration with program review will support increased faculty participation.

OOA uses numerous professional development and positive assessment programs to build a positive assessment culture. For example, the [Student Learning Assessment Mini-Grant Program](#) builds capacity in department or program assessment; past participants often volunteer for additional assessment activities.

UPDATE: The strategic plan initiative, Academic Program Transformation, began work on developing institutional learning outcomes with the university community [[LINK TO UWLO EMAILS 1 & 2](#)]. In addition to the benefits institutional learning outcomes provide to prioritize a focus on student learning both in and out of the classroom, this work will enable YSU to seek an NILOA Excellence in Assessment Designation.

General Education

YSU's approach to assessment of the GE curriculum has followed national best practices. GE assessment methodology focuses on artifact collection and scoring to include faculty in the process.

Following the [rising national trend](#), YSU used adapted VALUE rubrics to evaluate writing and critical thinking in ROAD. YSU adapted its assessment to use the ROAD data as part of its former participation requirements in the Voluntary System of Accountability in the first year that alternate evidence was allowed.

YSU has used a backward design approach to the GE assessment model:

- Goal setting: developed GE learning outcomes in 2012.
- Self assessment: developed rubrics through a representative committee process to articulate specific performance criteria for writing and critical thinking.
- Curriculum mapping: raised questions about curricular fidelity to Core Competency expectations. Also served as a starting point to discuss instructional design.
- Artifact collection: involved faculty and students across campus in contributing data.
- Scoring: identified areas of strength and challenge in student learning in GE.
- Curricular improvements: developed from dissemination of data and dialogue.

Substantial participation of full-time and part-time faculty has been integral to the success of ROAD. Faculty have been involved in the following:

- GE committee developed GE outcomes and consulted on ROAD.
- A representative faculty committee developed the ROAD rubric.
- Program faculty choose the assignments submitted and coordinate student artifact submission.
- Part-time faculty participate in scoring artifacts, and full-time faculty have been trained and participated in scoring events. Over 4,000 artifacts have been scored to date since inception.

- Discussions with deans, chairs, and faculty regarding ROAD data have led to curricular improvements in English and select improvements in programs. For example, the Public Health program decided to add a one-credit course in the major that focused on improving writing and research in the discipline. The FYE course included writing as a component in the course as a result of ROAD data.

Sources

- HLC3_LearningOutcomesAndCurricularMaps
- HLC4_2017ReportOnTheStatus
- HLC4_AcademicAnecdotalEvidenceOfAssessment
- HLC4_AcademicAssessmentHandbook
- HLC4_AcademicAssessmentHandbook (page number 59)
- HLC4_AcademicAssessmentPlanRubric2017
- HLC4_AcademicAssessmentReportingHistory2008
- HLC4_AcademicAssessmentRubricDimensionAnalysis
- HLC4_AssessmentCouncilMeetingAgendasAnd
- HLC4_AssessmentCouncilRoster
- HLC4_AssessmentMissionStatementAndCouncil
- HLC4_AssessmentWikiArchiveScreenshot
- HLC4_CoCurricularAnecdotalEvidenceOf
- HLC4_CoCurricularAssessmentHandbook
- HLC4_CoCurricularAssessmentHandbook (page number 40)
- HLC4_CoCurricularAssessmentHandbook (page number 43)
- HLC4_CoCurricularAssessmentReportingHistory
- HLC4_EconomicsRoadPilotReport
- HLC4_GeneralEducationCourseApprovalProcess
- HLC4_HlcAcademySEvidenceInventory
- HLC4_NiloaTransparencyFrameworkIntroduction
- HLC4_OeaAgreement20142017Re
- HLC4_OfficeOfAssessmentMissionStatement
- HLC4_OoaAssessmentCycleExplanation122717
- HLC4_OoaNsse2016ResultsAnd
- HLC4_OoaSloCmWebpage122717
- HLC4_OoaWorkshops20152017
- HLC4_PositiveAssessmentProjectExamples
- HLC4_RoadChapterFromTheFuture
- HLC4_RoadScoringDaySummaryEmail
- HLC4_SampleAssessmentUpdatesToYsu
- HLC4_YsuAcademyImpactReportW
- HLC4_YsuCatalogSloScreenshot122717
- HLC4B_2012GEOOutcomes
- HLC4B_AACUVALUEAssessment
- HLC4B_AssessingKnowledgeDomains(Chairs)
- HLC4B_BFAStudioArtInternationalPerspectives

- HLC4B_CatalogSLOExampleAccounting
- HLC4B_CC2YearTrainingAndProfessionalDevelopment
- HLC4B_ExamplePlanandFeedbackCommunications
- HLC4B_ExampleReportandFeedbackCounseling
- HLC4B_GECBylawsMembers
- HLC4B_GECDomainAssessmentProposal
- HLC4B_HLC2014ROADPaper
- HLC4B_LearningCommunityGenEdAd
- HLC4B_MiltCoxFlyer
- HLC4B_NILOAAssessmentExcellenceDesignation
- HLC4B_NSSE2016KeyTakeawaysRecommendations
- HLC4B_NSSE2016Snapshot
- HLC4B_OOABudgetandPersonnel2008-2018
- HLC4B_OOAHompage
- HLC4B_OOAHompage(2)
- HLC4B_OOAWikiArchivePage
- HLC4B_PsyandMathWritingCurriculumMaps2014
- HLC4B_ROAD_Rubric_revised_2014
- HLC4B_ROADUpdateSenate2016
- HLC4B_ROADUpdateSenate2016 (page number 4)
- HLC4B_YSUHLCAcademyProject2008-2012
- HLC4B3_ExerciseScienceCaseStudy
- HLC4B3_FinancialAidCaseStudy
- YSU-OEA Collective Bargaining Agreement 2017-2020
- YSU-OEA Collective Bargaining Agreement 2017-2020 (page number 26)
- YSU-OEA Collective Bargaining Agreement 2017-2020 (page number 75)

1.C - Core Component 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.

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.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
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.)

Argument

4.C

YSU is dedicated to student retention, persistence, and completion of programs. One of YSU's Core Values, the Centrality of Students, states that it is "committed to the education . . . and the success of students of all ages and from all walks of life." Growing out of this focus, *YSU 2020* operationalized this value as an institutional priority through the Student Success Cornerstone and more specifically, Theme 1: Academic Achievement. Like similar institutions, YSU has experienced multiple challenges in this area, but it has implemented initiatives for improvement and planned strategically to improve performance.

4.C.1

[Theme 1: Academic Achievement](#) of the Student Success Cornerstone of *YSU 2020* identifies retention and completion goals and metrics tied to YSU's mission and undergraduate population. Goals include improving the following:

- Overall six-year graduation rate.
- Six-year graduation rates for sub-populations, including minority and first-generation students.
- Graduation rates for student-athletes.
- Number of STEM graduates.
- First-to-second year retention rates.
- Course-completion rates.
- Number of students in good academic standing.

The six-year graduation rate was identified as an [institutional metric](#) with a defined goal for achievement by conclusion of *YSU 2020*. Other metrics were monitored by the BOT for [baseline data](#) in 2012. [Goals](#) were developed in 2014. [Progress](#) was evaluated in 2015. [Achievement](#) was last reported to the BOT in 2017. Programmatic goals are identified when required by accreditors. Program review has acted as a catalyst to encourage more attention to persistence and completion in programs across campus.

An ambitious goal was set out in the strategic plan to move YSU's six-year graduation rate to 43% overall, an increase over the 2010 graduation rate of 35.6%. YSU students historically have started at the university with challenges such as inadequate preparation and full-time work schedules. To support these goals and metrics, YSU adopted an [initiatives-based approach](#) that would contribute to goal success. In 2016, after many initiatives were completed, [additional initiatives](#) were identified and organized around four themes to target areas of greatest challenge for students:

- First-Year Experience.
- Academic Assistance.
- Academic Progress.
- Increased Affordability.

YSU's understanding of appropriate goals and strategies has evolved over the last 10 years, first in response to state-funding formula shifts to completion and later when YSU recognized that checkpoint goals may be more effective in evaluating intervention effectiveness. YSU needed to target points in the persistence "pipeline" where students may be more vulnerable and need additional support. Recently, YSU hired an [associate provost](#) to refine and implement goals related to retention, persistence, and completion. Under her leadership, a Strategic Retention Planning Task Force is in development with the goal of identifying retention priorities to be incorporated into the next strategic planning cycle (see 1.A.1).

UPDATE: YSU continues to update goals and objectives around student retention, persistence, and completion [LINK TO COMPLETION PLANS FOR 2018 AND 2020; PUT IN 2022 WHEN COMPLETE], a reflection of the central role that student success plays in the YSU strategic plan.

4.C.2

Institutional Research and Analytics (IR) is the primary office at YSU engaged in data collection and analysis. IR regularly collects and analyzes [first-to-second year retention rates](#) and completion data [by race and/or ethnicity](#), [gender](#), conditional admit status, and other classifications. [Data](#) are split by college and program. IR provides specialized reports by request to assist with retention and academic support. Examples include the following:

- Student use of [tutoring](#) and supplemental instruction.
- GPA performance of students who regularly use academic support services.
- [Early warning](#) and intervention activity.
- Academic coaching contacts.
- [Summer Bridge program outcomes](#).
- [Retention](#) of conditionally admitted students.

Annual enrollment reports track demographic and academic profile characteristics of incoming cohorts tied to initiatives identified in *YSU 2020*.

Through program review, programs use [numerous reports and filterable data](#) from IR to inform planning. They use data and reports regarding student retention, persistence, and completion (see 4.B). In those reports, programs address trends and any issues that arise. Accredited programs also include retention, persistence, and completion tracking as a regular feature of their re-accreditation processes and reports.

One of the initiatives identified in *YSU 2020* was the [Complete Withdrawal Exit Survey](#) fielded by the Office of the Registrar. The mandatory survey asks students why they are withdrawing and if YSU could have done anything to help them remain in college. The office informs students about paths back to enrolling and offers additional assistance with re-enrolling.

Individual committees or ad hoc groups collect data to inform persistence and completion in a particular group. In 2014, the African American Recruitment and Retention Committee collected and analyzed multiple data points to identify why enrollment and retention were below other student groups at YSU. The committee reported [findings](#) to the BOT.

YSU collects and analyzes data regularly, but it recognizes more could be done to disseminate data widely, provide guidance in its use, and connect it more clearly with institutional decision making. Senior leadership has begun to address use of data toward institutional effectiveness:

- In summer 2017, a consultant was hired to document IR practices and develop a possible [model for Institutional Effectiveness](#).
- In December 2017, the BOT approved a [reorganization](#) that included a new Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Planning, led by a new [Special Assistant to the President](#).
- In February 2018, the [Special Assistant to the President](#) position was filled. This person will lead efforts to design systems to support and improve data-informed decision-making.

UPDATE: YSU has significantly expanded capacity for collecting and analyzing data around student success metrics reported as Key Performance Indicators [LINK TO COMPLETION PLANS FOR 2018 AND 2020; PUT IN 2022 WHEN COMPLETE].

4.C.3

YSU uses retention and completion data to track progress in retention and completion goals. The [2014 Campus Completion Plan](#) and the [2016 Completion Plan Update](#) demonstrate how activities are related to goals and document progress on implementation.

Data are used at the unit level to assess and inform operational activity as these examples demonstrate:

- The Center for Student Progress, Math Assistance Center, and Writing Center track use of services and assess impact of [tutoring](#) and [supplemental instruction](#) on student academic performance.
- The Center for Student Progress tracks [Starfish Early Alert data](#) and compiles reports on its impact on course-completion rates and grade point averages.
- The Math Department relies on data collected by the Comprehensive Testing Center to analyze the [impact of ALEKS](#) on remedial math placement and support curricular innovation
- YSU reports DFW rates to deans and chairs

YSU also uses data to assess the need for new strategies and initiatives. While it is difficult to prove causation, YSU strives to take action on and monitor data points for trends. Examples of improving student learning and success based on data over past five years are included in the following table:

Issue or Data	Actions	Result
<p>First-to-second year retention was low: 63% in 2009 (goal is 72% by 2020)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Success Committee recommended implementation of first-year experience by 2012. • YSU developed a first-year experience course as a GE requirement, piloted it 2016, and implemented it in 2017. 	<p>First-to-second year retention has improved:</p> <p>2013—69%</p> <p>2014—72%</p> <p>2017—76%</p>
<p>Conditional admit policy was poorly enforced. 27% of conditional admits completed first semester successfully in 2009</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Success Committee recommended enforcing YSU Conditional Admit Policy. • Academic Senate passed a Conditional Admit policy in May 2012 with tightened enforcement and structure. 	<p>In fall 2013, 70% of conditionally admitted students completed the first semester successfully. YSU achieved Strategic Plan goal of 70%.</p>
<p>Six-year grad rate, a Strategic Plan Board Metric, was at 36.8% in 2010. Goal is 43% by 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YSU increased admission requirements through changes to conditional admit. • Organizational response was to create Associate Provost of Student Success in 2014 under the Academic Affairs Division to bring together multiple student services. • Strategic Retention Planning Task Force to develop a retention plan. 	<p>Six-year graduation rate:</p> <p>2010—36.8%</p> <p>2013—33.4%</p> <p>2017—34.9%</p> <p>Based on fall-to-fall retention rates, YSU anticipates that graduation rates will continue improving with the graduating class of 2018–19.</p>

<p>Minority graduation rate was poor.</p> <p>Strategic Plan Metric, was 16% in 2014 (goal of 25% by 2020)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • African American Recruitment and Retention Committee convened to evaluate best practices and factors in YSU’s biggest minority group. • YSU has historically struggled to make progress. • In fall 2017, YSU created the Office of College Access and Transitions to support under-represented groups. • Strategic Retention Planning Task Force was created to develop a retention plan. 	<p>After a dip, minority graduation rate is beginning to trend up:</p> <p>2013—13.2%</p> <p>2016—12.6%</p> <p>2017—14.4%</p> <p>YSU anticipates that graduation rates will continue improving with the graduating class of 2018–19.</p> <p>YSU will continue address this challenge through strategic planning and investment.</p>
---	--	--

YSU has continued to learn from our evaluation of student success efforts and initiatives and makes improvements to improve student outcomes and success [LINK TO COMPLETION PLANS FOR 2018 AND 2020; PUT IN 2022 WHEN COMPLETE].

4.C.4

As outlined in 4.C.2, retention and completion data are collected regularly, and data are used to identify strategies that have resulted in increased retention. YSU data are collected through the student information system. Data are submitted to the National Student Clearinghouse, IPEDS, and the state higher education information system, which provide YSU with comparison data. IR has checks in place to clean data to ensure accuracy of institutional reports.

Although YSU follows good practices, it realizes that it should strive for best practices. Recognizing the importance of a stronger methodology to track continuous improvement, YSU engaged an external consultant to [review and assess](#) its practices related to data collection and analysis. In 2017, YSU hired an associate provost to lead the Division of Student Success and implement strategic-retention planning.

The 2015, 2016, and 2017 cohort tracking files allow greater disaggregation of data. The data identify departure points that contribute to sophomore- and junior-year attrition and progression barriers leading to delayed time to degree. A strategic retention planning taskforce is forming to use data to understand progress and retention trends, and to identify barriers to student progress, identify opportunities for institutional action, and coordinate annual retention planning.

Sources

- C2- Student Success_
- C2- Student Success_ (page number 3)
- GradRates2004Cohort
- GradRates2007Cohort
- GradRates2010Cohort
- GradRates2011Cohort
- HLC3_CspStudentTutorialServicesS17Summary.pdf
- HLC4_2016YsuCompletionPlan
- HLC4_AssessmentWikiArchiveScreenshot
- HLC4_CampusCompletionPlan2014
- HLC4_CompleteWithdrawalExitSurveyData
- HLC4C_AQSABOTAagendaCollegeAccessReorgSept2017
- HLC4C_AQSABOTAagendaCollegeAccessReorgSept2017 (page number 195)
- HLC4C_AQSSCommitteeAARecruitmentandRetentionJune2014
- HLC4C_AQSSCommitteeAARetentionReport2013
- HLC4C_BOTAQSSCornerstoneCompletionPlanJune2014
- HLC4C_BOTEnrollMgmtPositionOct13
- HLC4C_ClaireBerardiniArticlefall17
- HLC4C_CompleteWithdrawalSurvey2016
- HLC4C_Conditional Admission Retention (only) 2009 through 2016 by Race
- HLC4C_ConditionalAdmissionRetentionNOT2009Through2016ByGender
- HLC4C_ConditionalAdmissionRetentionNOT2009Through2016ByRace
- HLC4C_ConditionalAdmitPolicySenateMay2012
- HLC4C_ConditionalAdmitPolicySenateMay2012 (page number 27)
- HLC4C_ConditionalAdmitRevisionSenateMar2014
- HLC4C_CSPHistoricalData2012-2017
- HLC4C_Fall 2015toFall2016RetentionByCollegeAndMajor
- HLC4C_FallToFallRetention2011-2012 through 2016-2017
- HLC4C_MAC_Cohort Summary Report.pdf
- HLC4C_ProgramReviewDataFalltoFallRetention16to17
- HLC4C_ProgramReviewDataonWikiScreenshot
- HLC4C_ReorgSpecialAssistantBOTDec2017
- HLC4C_ReorgSpecialAssistantBOTDec2017 (page number 2)
- HLC4C_ReorgSpecialAssistantBOTDec2017 (page number 3)
- HLC4C_SenateFYECourseProposalFeb2016
- HLC4C_SenateFYECourseProposalFeb2016 (page number 8)
- HLC4C_ShermanAnnouncement
- HLC4C_ShermanEffectivenessReportAug17
- HLC4C_SPMatrixBOTAuditJune2014
- HLC4C_SPMatrixBOTDec2012
- HLC4C_Spring2017SISummaryReport
- HLC4C_SSCornerstoneReportBOTJune2017
- HLC4C_SSCornerstoneReportBOTJune2017 (page number 9)
- HLC4C_StarFishEarlyAlertSummaryFall2016
- HLC4C_SummerBridgeRetentioncomparison.docx Summer 2017docx
- HLC4C_YSUCampusCompletionPlan2016

- HLC4C_YSUCompletionPlan2014
- HLC4C_YSUStrategicPlanUpdate2015
- YSU_strategic_booklet_final_2011
- YSU_strategic_booklet_final_2011 (page number 36)

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

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.

Summary

YSU maintains quality of its academic programs. YSU has a regular process of program review for graduate programs and is redesigning and improving its multi-year program-review processes for undergraduate programs. Transcribed and transfer credit is systematically and consistently evaluated and granted as appropriate. New and modified courses and programs are scrutinized to ensure appropriate levels of instruction. Programs requiring specialized professional accreditation are certified by the appropriate accrediting body and maintain good standing.

YSU maintains regular outcomes assessment for both undergraduate and graduate programs. The GE program's writing and critical-thinking outcomes undergo regular assessment, and plans are underway to include the other knowledge domains. Co-curricular programs are included in the assessment process. A culture of assessment and continuous improvement has developed at YSU, and it drives curricular and programmatic changes across campus.

YSU is dedicated to student retention, persistence, and completion of programs and uses data to track related goals. Institutional Research, the primary office at YSU engaged in data collection and analysis, regularly collects and analyzes first-to-second year retention rates. Recognizing the importance of a stronger methodology to track continuous improvement, YSU hired a new special assistant to the president to oversee IR and data governance. YSU also hired a new associate provost for student success and created the Office of College Access and Transitions to improve persistence and completion rates for its students.

Sources

There are no sources.