NEASC Chairs Committee Meeting
August 26, 2016


Agenda Setting for the Semester
Copies of the NEASC Self-Study Timeline and the Standards for Accreditation (in book format) were distributed. G. Fitzgerald indicated that she wants to make sure everyone is clear on the agenda that has been set for the semester, and review what progress has been made to date prior to the October 15th deadline, which is when written materials are due to the Steering Committee. She also wants to do a brief walkthrough of the website and talk about the UA position. Y. Kirby will also share information pertaining to the data first forms.

Updated Timeline
The timeline document has only been slightly modified since the last meeting. It was noted that information should be submitted in narrative form. Ultimately, the narrative is limited to 100 pages, however Chairs were encouraged to submit as much information of substance as they felt appropriate. The Steering Committee will be responsible for reading and editing the materials down in order to adhere to the page limit. It was noted that the page limit is just for the narrative, and does not include appendices.

G. Fitzgerald noted that the items in large bold font on the timeline are what this group is responsible for. The other items are included so as to see how it all fits together. Dates are included until the end of the semester. Spring dates are still under development.

Update on Website
M. McLaughlin indicated that everything should be there. All the links are live, as is the data associated with the links. G. Fitzgerald suggested that everyone review the last self-study report, along with the five-year review letter in order to re-familiarize themselves with any areas of concern noted by NEASC the last time around. The PowerPoint slides from the first meeting are also included for reference. Y. Kirby noted that the 2013 and 2008 standards have been reorganized, so the standard numbers do not necessarily match up.

C. Lovitt noted that the 2008 report is a good reference point to understand the scope of what is being undertaken. You will see how those 100 pages translate, and it puts things into perspective. He urged the group to be as succinct and informative as possible. Data rich is what we are looking for. If there is information you don’t have or you don’t know how to access, please let him, G. Fitzgerald or Y. Kirby know. NEASC will want to see evidence of data-based decision making this time around.
**UA Call for Nominations**
The UA job description was distributed. The ideal candidate will need to be organized, have good attention to detail, and the ability to pull all the information pieces together. We are looking to hire someone as soon as possible, and the position would be for the duration of the project. Hours are limited to 19 per week, and the rate of pay would be $18-$20 per hour. Please forward any candidate nominations along to G. Fitzgerald.

**Updates from Standard Chairs**
It was clarified that the Steering Committee will be responsible for writing the preambles that occur before the standard sub-sets. G. Fitzgerald asked chairs to indicate whether there are any areas they see as glaring, or any areas we need to think about, areas of intersection, etc.

**Standard 1: Mission and Purpose:** S. Adair indicated that the group has not yet met. He did have a question regarding 1.5 which states: “The institution periodically evaluates the content and pertinence of its mission and purposes, ensuring they are current and provide overall direction in planning, evaluation, and resource allocation.” He is unaware of the ways in which the university’s vision and mission statements have been revisited in the last few years. G. Fitzgerald responded that the Steering Committee would review this.

**Standard 2: Planning and Evaluation:** Y. Kirby indicated that the group has not met yet.

**Standard 3: Organization and Governance:** S. Cohen indicated that the chief challenge is the switch from a BOT to a BOR, which requires a full review of a new set of documents to determine if the standards are being met.

**Standard 4a: Assuring Academic Quality:** J. Mulrooney indicated he sees no areas of concern.

**Standard 4b: UG Degree Programs:** M. Jackson indicated that he feels confident that the information is there to answer most questions. He noted that a lot of the information in this area overlaps with general education, so he anticipates there will be a good deal of collaboration with this group.

**Standard 4c: General Education:** D. Adams indicated that Multi-state Collaborative was used to assess general education, and data from the first round has been summarized and is ready to use. Data from the subsequent two rounds are still being tabulated. Y. Kirby noted that the narrative should also include how the data will be used.

**Standard 4d: Major or Concentration:** M. Jackson indicated he sees no areas of concern.

**Standard 4e: Graduate Degree Programs:** E. Leonidas indicated that numbers on graduates employed in relevant fields after completing a program will be needed, along with the rate of students who are passing their board, licensure and certification exams. Also, the number of students who are receiving support from research, or who are working on grants with faculty. Y. Kirby indicated that data for the first two items can be found on the data first forms. Employment information can be obtained from the School of Education and the School of Science, Engineering and Technology.
S. Kliger noted that the BOR has launched a salary information page on their website. He will send G. Fitzgerald the access information and link.

**Standard 4f: Integrity in the Award of Academic Credit:** J. Snyder indicated that the 2013 report was reviewed to determine what data has been collected at that point. As the CCSU website has migrated since that point, it appears that some of the links are no longer active. G. Fitzgerald noted that the data and information from both the 2013 and 2008 reports are still accessible. The group was asked to contact M. McLaughlin if access to this information was needed.

**Standard 5: Students:** L. Hall indicated that the group has been meeting weekly for the last month. No areas of concern were noted.

**Standard 6: Teaching, Learning and Scholarship:** G. Fitzgerald indicated that the team has met, and she feels they have a pretty good handle on the information needs and where to go to get them filled.

**Standard 7: Institutional Resources:** C. Casamento noted that each item in this standard has been assigned to a lead, who has been charged with pulling the information together. The books do not officially close until the end of September. She has received narratives for a couple of sections so far. Most of the data that has been put together would be similar to what has been put together in the past. She believes it will be possible to complete the task without any additional data assistance.

**Standard 8: Educational Effectiveness:** M. Horton noted that the team has met twice, and is ready to start writing. Much of the information will come from the data first forms. In terms of missing information, the group had trouble finding learning outcomes for several programs, largely due non-working links. J. Mulrooney confirmed that the information is available. For 8.8, it was noted that the ABET and ASP reports would be needed. For 8.9, the CPA certification tests.

**Standard 9: Integrity, Transparency and Public Disclosure:** M. McLaughlin indicated that no areas of concern were noted.

G. Fitzgerald noted that the self-study is meant to help us identify, as an institution, the areas where we need to have more data. It is also a roadmap of where we want to go. We will identify the areas where we are doing well, better in, or succeeding, and also the areas where, as we plan for the next ten years, we need to put more effort. S. Cohen suggested that the open forum be utilized to assist in the group’s efforts in getting a better handle on what we are doing and not doing in different areas.

**Data First Forms**

Y. Kirby provided a brief walk through of the information, which ties back to the 2013 5th Year Report. An overview and responsibility page has been created. The layout of the form was reviewed. It was noted that the forms are organized by standard. Y. Kirby suggested that group members check to see if evidence exists to support what you are saying or the conclusions you are trying to draw. Who is responsible for that information is included in the list. You can see if a new person is responsible or if the section has changed from the last time. A crosswalk to the 2013 report is provided. Links are also provided to where the data reside on the OIRA website. When you find a piece of evidence that
supports something you want to use, save the file so you have access at a later date. There is a lot of information here. The worksheet currents contains over 30 tabs.