

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (Y7)

Peer-Evaluation Report

Idaho State University

Pocatello, Idaho

October 6 – 8, 2021

*A confidential report of findings prepared for the
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities*

Table of Contents

I.	EVALUATION COMMITTEE	4
II.	INTRODUCTION	5
III.	ASSESSMENT OF SELF-EVALUATION AND SUPPORT MATERIALS	5
IV.	VISIT SUMMARY	5
V.	TOPICS ADDRESSED AS AN ADDENDUM TO THE SELF-EVALUATION REPORT	6
VI.	STANDARD 1: STUDENT SUCCESS AND INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS	6
A.	STANDARD 1.A: INSTITUTIONAL MISSION.....	6
i.	1.A.1.....	6
B.	STANDARD 1.B: IMPROVING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS	6
i.	1.B.1.....	6
ii.	1.B.2.....	6
iii.	1.B.3.....	7
iv.	1.B.4.....	7
C.	STANDARD 1.C: STUDENT LEARNING	8
i.	1.C.1.....	8
ii.	1.C.2.....	8
iii.	1.C.3.....	8
iv.	1.C.4.....	9
v.	1.C.5.....	9
vi.	1.C.6.....	9
vii.	1.C.7.....	10
viii.	1.C.8.....	10
ix.	1.C.9.....	11
D.	STANDARD 1.D: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	11
i.	1.D.1.....	11
ii.	1.D.2.....	11
iii.	1.D.3.....	12
iv.	1.D.4.....	12
VII.	STANDARD 2: GOVERNANCE, RESOURCES, AND CAPACITY	12
A.	STANDARD 2.A: GOVERNANCE	12
i.	2.A.1.....	12
ii.	2.A.2.....	12
iii.	2.A.3.....	13
iv.	2.A.4.....	13
B.	STANDARD 2.B: ACADEMIC FREEDOM	13
i.	2.B.1.....	13
ii.	2.B.2.....	14
C.	STANDARD 2.C: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	14
i.	2.C.1.....	14
ii.	2.C.2.....	14
iii.	2.C.3.....	14
iv.	2.C.4.....	14
D.	STANDARD 2.D: INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY	14
i.	2.D.1.....	14
ii.	2.D.2.....	14
iii.	2.D.3.....	15
E.	STANDARD 2.E: FINANCIAL RESOURCES.....	15
i.	2.E.1.....	15
ii.	2.E.2.....	15
iii.	2.E.3.....	15

F.	STANDARD 2.F: HUMAN RESOURCES	15
i.	2.F.1	15
ii.	2.F.2	16
iii.	2.F.3	16
iv.	2.F.4	16
G.	STANDARD 2.G: STUDENT SUPPORT RESOURCES	16
i.	2.G.1	16
ii.	2.G.2	16
iii.	2.G.3	17
iv.	2.G.4 and 2.G.5	17
v.	2.G.6	17
vi.	2.G.7	17
H.	STANDARD 2.H: LIBRARY AND INFORMATION RESOURCES	17
i.	2.H.1	17
i.	Standard 2.I: Physical and Technology Infrastructure	18
i.	2.I.1	18
VIII.	SUMMARY	18
IX.	COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
A.	COMMENDATIONS	18
i.	Commendation 1:	18
ii.	Commendation 2:	19
B.	RECOMMENDATIONS (EACH RECOMMENDATION MUST REFERENCE ONE OR MORE STANDARDS)	19
i.	Recommendation 1:	19
ii.	Recommendation 2:	19

I. Evaluation Committee

Name	Role in Committee	Academic Title	Campus
Dr. Lindsay Couzens	Chair	Director of Assessment and Accreditation	University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Dr. JoAnne Bunnage	Evaluator	Assistant Vice Provost, Academic Programs and Accreditation	Oregon State University
Dr. Brian Burton	Evaluator	Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs	Western Washington University
Dr. Gary Dukes	Evaluator	Vice President for Student Affairs	Western Oregon University
Mrs. Toni Habegger	Evaluator	Associate Vice President and Chief Financial Officer	Eastern Washington University

NWCCU Liaison to the Committee:

Dr. Ron Larsen
Senior Vice President
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

II. Introduction

A five-person evaluation team conducted a Year Seven Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EIE) virtual visit to Idaho State University from October 6-8, 2021. The visit covered Standards One and Two in response to the *Year Seven Self-Evaluation Report* submitted by the University to the Commission on August 4, 2021.

III. Assessment of Self-Evaluation and Support Materials

Idaho State University provided a well-written, thorough self-study report addressing Standard One. An appendix document was submitted which included Standard Two, supplementary materials, a course catalog, institutional data, and examples addressing various standards from the main report. There were links to institutional webpages, though some links needed to be updated in the days leading up to the virtual visit.

IV. Visit Summary

The evaluation team met with a number of constituents and stakeholders to the institution. The visit included open fora for faculty, students, and staff. Additionally, members of the evaluating team met with the ISU President, a representative of the Idaho State Board of Education, deans, department chairs, and staff from departments including assessment, human resources, institutional research, library, technology, and student services. The evaluators also met with representatives from student government, the faculty senate, development officers, and the Administrative and Staff Councils. Idaho State University employees and students were candid, collegial, and very accommodating, which resulted in a smooth and informative visit. The evaluation team was grateful for the virtual hospitality extended during the visit.

The evaluation team was made aware of some issues with the open fora organized by the institution. Very few students participated in the student forum, with most being graduate students. Also, it became apparent that some administrative staff, including some who directly supervise and evaluate faculty, attended the open faculty forum. The institution notified the evaluation chair of the issue in the faculty forum, and indicated that they are taking steps to ensure that employees who should not have been in the session understand why it was inappropriate to attend. Faculty members who wished to privately reach out to the evaluation chair with their thoughts were invited to do so. Those faculty members who did reach out were deeply concerned about the breach in protocol, and shared general thoughts about the institution and concerns specific to their circumstances.

V. Topics Addressed as an Addendum to the Self-Evaluation Report

There were no existing recommendations or other topics to be addressed during this visit.

VI. Standard 1: Student Success and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness

a. Standard 1.A: Institutional Mission

i. 1.A.1

The institution's mission statement effectively reflects the institution's core themes of Learning and Discovery, Access and Opportunity, Leadership in Health Sciences, and Community Engagement and Impact, and thereby defines well the institution's broad educational purposes and commitment to student learning and achievement. The mission statement and core themes date from the time immediately after the last Year 7 review. A new planning process, including a review of the mission statement, was initiated in 2019, but put on hold until fall 2021 because of the pandemic response.

b. Standard 1.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

i. 1.B.1

The institution uses an Institutional Assessment Planning process to continually assess institutional effectiveness. Built on mission and strategic goals, the process includes evaluation of core theme (and thus mission) fulfillment, as well as objectives from the institution's strategic plan (the goals of which differ from core themes but are related to core theme fulfillment). Assessment reports from both academic and non-academic units are used to provide further review of progress on core theme and strategic plan objectives. Assessment reports from academic units are well-developed, but such reports from non-academic units are in an earlier stage of development. The reviews then loop back to mission fulfillment. Strategic projects use charters that then become the basis for evaluation.

ii. 1.B.2

The institution uses core themes to define mission fulfillment. Core themes all have objectives, either two or three in number; each objective is represented by between two and five indicators. Indicators are scored by the extent to which the institution has achieved its goal for each indicator; the extent is represented by percentages. Goals typically were high relative to the institution's performance early in the review period. The institution's performance on most of the indicators has improved, although some indicators dropped in percentage terms during 2020, perhaps as a result of the pandemic. Core theme indicators generally fit their objectives well, although each core theme includes some indicators that are questionable and some indicators that could be added based on the objectives. Peer institution

data, where available from IPEDS, is posted for comparison on the institution's mission fulfillment dashboard. If not available from IPEDS, peer institution data is not included.

The institution is currently engaged in a process of formulating a new strategic plan, which is seen to be more aspirational than the previous plan. The process is predicated on four pillars: student-centered, career readiness, relevant research, and health and the human experience. However, the same term, "four pillars", is used in other documents for different lists of concepts. Further, the core themes continue to be meaningful to the institution. This mix of strategic concepts could be troublesome in the context of an aspirational strategic plan.

Recommendation: The evaluation team recommends that as the institution transitions to a more aspirational strategic plan, it articulates one clear set of meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators to define mission fulfillment (1.B.2).

iii. 1.B.3

The institution's planning process, as refined in 2019, appears inclusive. The Strategic Plan Committee is broadly representative of units and locations. The planning process includes multiple direct opportunities for feedback from members of its community. The institution's budget process also allows for proposals regarding strategic investments, including those resulting from project charters. Department chairs expressed appreciation for the recently revised process, which includes both transparent presentation of the institution's budget realities and opportunities for units to present their strategic budget requests in open sessions of the Leadership Council. That council then prioritizes the requests and makes recommendations to the Administrative Council. This process ensures that all members of the Leadership Council have a collective understanding of the budget needs of various units across campus, and as a result, the budget request process has become more robust.

Commendation: The evaluation team commends the work of the institution to foster an inviting, inclusive, and student-centric culture in which members of the campus community feel valued, seen, and heard.

iv. 1.B.4

The institution uses standard environmental scanning processes such as SWOT and STEEP-L to monitor environments. The SWOT process takes place every few years in conjunction with the development of a new strategic plan; that process was delayed by the pandemic response, and the new SWOT is not yet publicly available. The process feeds into Strategic Plan Committee work. Program health assessment also includes an element of environmental scanning, and this process leads to decisions regarding

program offerings. It is less clear how these processes align with the mission fulfillment process.

c. Standard 1.C: Student Learning

i. 1.C.1

A review of the catalog, governance structure, and processes revealed that the institution offers academic programs with appropriate content and rigor, consistent with its mission. The development, approval, and review of academic programs and credentials are governed by both state of Idaho and university policies and include appropriate involvement of faculty. Program requirements and student learning outcomes are identified on programs' overview pages within the catalog; some programs also post student learning outcomes and/or program goals in student handbooks. Course-level student learning outcomes are available on the Academic Affairs webpage. Student learning outcomes are provided by instructors on course outlines and syllabi to enrolled students.

ii. 1.C.2

The awarding of academic credits, degrees, certificates, and credentials is based upon student learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning. The institution requires that academic programs participate in an extensive process for program development and review that begins at the department level and culminates at the state level. Student learning outcomes and course sequencing are included in the Idaho State Board of Education proposal for New Undergraduate/Graduate Program form. Starting in June of 2020 and continuing through June 30, 2021, the State Board formally waived full proposal submission requirements due to the pandemic. The institution requires that academic programs without specialized accreditation engage in a process of academic program review following a seven-year cycle with annual updates. A review of program assessment documents indicated that academic programs are engaged in assessment as outlined by the institution, including curriculum mapping and the scaffolding of learning. Major Academic Plans (MAPs), four-year degree plans for each baccalaureate degree program, are readily available so that students can see the suggested sequencing of courses and requirements, and advisors can use them to help students achieve success.

iii. 1.C.3

The institutionally identified program learning outcomes, assessment plans, and assurance of quality are required when adding a new program or modifying a program. Program requirements, including student learning outcomes, are publicly available in each program's overview page within the Undergraduate Catalog. Many programs also post learning outcomes on departmental websites and/or in student handbooks. General Education course learning outcomes are available via course syllabi, the General

Education Objectives and Learning Outcomes webpage, and in the Undergraduate Catalog. General Education objectives which provide student learning outcomes are delineated by State Board of Education policy (III.N. – Statewide General Education). Course-level student learning outcomes are available on the Academic Affairs webpage. Student learning outcomes are provided by instructors on course outlines and syllabi to enrolled students. It was noted the vast majority of syllabi are available to students on each course’s Moodle site, through the instructor or by the department. Currently, syllabi storage is decentralized, typically at the department level.

Concern: The evaluation team suggests the institution consider a university-wide process to make syllabi for all courses available publicly so that students can easily review them prior to making registration decisions.

iv. 1.C.4

The evaluation team verified that the institution’s undergraduate and graduate admission and completion or graduation requirements are clearly defined and widely published for easy access to students and the public. Undergraduate admission requirements are published in the Undergraduate Catalog, and available on the institution’s admissions website. Graduate admissions requirements are available and described in the Graduate Admissions section of the catalog, on the institution’s website, and on departmental or college websites. Undergraduate graduation and completion requirements adhere to state of Idaho policies and specialized accreditation where applicable, and are published in the Undergraduate Catalog. The institution is effectively using two different degree systems, Degree Works and Major Academic Plans (MAPs), that allow undergraduate students to track their progress. Graduate program graduation requirements are available on the graduate school webpage and in the Graduate Catalog. The Graduate School monitors each student’s program of study a minimum of three times.

v. 1.C.5

The institution engages in comprehensive assessment planning, with approximately 65 individual assessment coordinators working closely with faculty in their programs, units, and departments to lead efforts for student learning and student success. Additionally, faculty-led committees are involved with curricula and assessment of student learning outcomes following a developing standardized process. There are a number of committees that evaluate the quality of student learning, and multiple changes have taken place to program learning outcome assessment since the Mid-Cycle Review. The changes still seem to be in the development stage, with some faculty and assessment coordinators recognizing the need for continued improvements to alignment and articulation.

vi. 1.C.6

ISU has nine General Education objectives, six of which are common across all public institutions of higher education in Idaho. The six General Education objectives and competences were developed and approved by the board and faculty from across the state in April of 2014, and approved and implemented by the institution in 2015. The General Education Requirements Committee (GERC) reviews and approves assessment plans for all General Education courses, reviews annual assessment reports and departmental five-year assessment reports; and conducts summative objective reports according to an established schedule. Additionally, there has been a significant increase (from 72% in 2015-16 to 95% in 2020-21) of General Education courses having completed assessment plans. The goal of having all General Education courses having completed assessment plans will be met this fall. Faculty, members of the GERC, and department Assessment Coordinators mentioned improvements to assessment processes.

Compliment: The evaluation team compliments ISU's coordinated efforts to report undergraduate General Education outcomes as well as the work of the Director of Assessment for helping to create a stronger institutional culture of assessment and student success.

vii. 1.C.7

As noted in Standard 1.C.5, ISU has a developing system for assessing student learning outcomes and has provided ongoing support to help faculty learn more about assessment, curriculum mapping, and using outcome data to inform academic planning. The institution was slowed by the deficiencies of an institution-wide tracking system, and the COVID-19 pandemic that led to delays in completing program reviews for those scheduled in academic years 2019-20 and 2020-21. Results of student learning assessment are shared within disciplines and available to use to improve courses and programs. Faculty and assessment coordinators offered several examples of curricular change based on learning outcomes assessment, including expanding and building upon student support programs, increasing academic advisors in departments, and revising high DFW courses.

viii. 1.C.8

Idaho State University has clearly defined and widely published transfer credit policies that provide safeguards to ensure academic quality. The credit transfer process is appropriate for its programs in terms of content, academic rigor, and quality. State Board of Education policy establishes a common course numbering for General Education courses that are common across eight public institutions of higher education in Idaho. This numbering provides transparency and ease of transferability among Idaho's public institutions. The institution's Prior Learning Assessment has recently gone through review with policy and procedures streamlined and in keeping with standards of the NWCCU; policies for applying for and granting prior learning credit were established to ensure comparable quality; procedures

are made available to students and the public on ISU's website. The institution's articulations agreement processes are outlined in the Idaho State University Articulation Agreement Manual and hosted on the Academic Affairs website.

ix. 1.C.9

The institution's graduate program offerings are in alignment with its mission, especially in that the institution offers many health-related graduate programs at multiple levels (master's, clinical doctorate, and research doctorate). Some programs operate with differential tuition or fees that support their operations; others are traditionally funded. Graduate programs require high performance from their students and more in-depth study than undergraduate programs in the same discipline; graduate-only courses are distinguished not only from undergraduate courses, but also from courses open to both graduate and undergraduate students. In the latter courses, graduate students have increased requirements to earn graduate credit, including additional scholarship or creative activity. Student learning outcomes are included in catalog language for some programs, with more programs expected to follow suit. The institution has identified dissonance between graduate program goals and more general departmental student learning outcomes in some programs and has a process in place for rectifying that issue. Periodic reviews of programs by outside reviewers contribute to program assessment. Progress is being made on investment in graduate assistantship numbers and stipend/benefit packages, but the Graduate Council identifies this area for additional attention.

Concern: The evaluation team suggests that ISU systematically evaluates the benefit packages available to graduate assistants to ensure that these students are appropriately compensated for their work, and sufficiently supported in areas such as healthcare.

d. Standard 1.D: Student Achievement

i. 1.D.1

The institution is in the process of developing an enrollment management plan based on the university's strategic plan. Enrollment goals have only been established for one year at this point. ISU has also recently changed the process of student orientation from a week prior to the start of school to a summer orientation process. Students go through a two-step process where they complete modules online and then are able to register for either an in-person orientation or a virtual orientation program. Graduate students go through a one-day orientation process.

ii. 1.D.2

The institution has established a set of indicators for student achievement and has integrated these into the evaluation process. The institution has a website listing all of the indicators and progress towards meeting these

indicators. However, the institution generally only disaggregated these indicators by race and ethnicity, and in some cases, socioeconomic status and first-generation. While this information could be requested, it was not easily available on public websites or in the self-study materials.

Recommendation: The evaluation team recommends that the institution consistently disaggregates all of its indicators for student achievement by every category listed in Standard 1.D.2 (1.D.2)

iii. 1.D.3

The institution has established indicators of student achievement which are published on the university website. Faculty and staff seemed aware of these indicators and the strategic planning process. Staff commented that frequent emails effectively communicated planning and decision-making processes. The institution recently identified a list of peer institutions for benchmark comparison which were approved by the State Board of Education.

iv. 1.D.4

The institution has created a mission fulfillment website to track and monitor student achievement indicators for the university. The evaluators found that faculty and staff were aware of this website and the university's efforts with respect to strategic planning. In discussion with various constituent groups, the evaluation team found that these indicators have been used to allocate resources and mitigate gaps in student achievement. One specific example involved the transition from a week of orientation prior to the start of classes to a summer orientation model where students need to complete online modules and then attend either a virtual or in-person orientation and registration program.

VII. Standard 2: Governance, Resources, and Capacity

a. Standard 2.A: Governance

i. 2.A.1

The institution is governed by the Idaho State Board of Education, which grants broad authority to the institution to make decisions related to internal management. The evaluators found evidence to support this relationship both through discussions with President Satterlee and a representative from the State Board of Education.

ii. 2.A.2

The evaluators found ample evidence of a broad administrative structure. This structure, for the most part, appears to be effective and appropriate to the goals of the institution.

The university does not employ a Vice President for Financial Affairs. This organizational change has been in place since July 2021 upon departure of the Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs and subsequent reorganization. The president has appointed a Senior Associate Vice President/Chief Fiscal Officer position. The president indicated that under State Board of Education policy, creation of a new vice president position requires approval by the State Board of Education. As communicated to the evaluation team, the university decided to restructure duties and responsibilities for areas typically under the Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs between the Vice President for Operations and Senior Associate Vice President/Chief Fiscal Officer. The evaluation committee recognizes the criticality of a full Vice President for Financial Affairs with respect to responsibility, oversight, and accountability for the financial affairs of an institution.

Concern: The evaluation team suggests that the institution elevate the position of the CFO to a Vice President level position as soon as feasible.

iii. 2.A.3

The institution has employed a dedicated, approachable, and mission-driven president, who consistently communicates clear goals to campus constituents.

Commendation: The evaluation team commends the work of the current administration to effectively and transparently communicate information to all campus constituents.

iv. 2.A.4

Decision-making processes at the institution are transparent and inclusive. The evaluators found evidence of broad campus support for the ways in which decision-making processes are communicated to the campus. There is a multi-tiered structure of decision-making bodies in the form of councils and committees. The evaluators found some indication that this layered approach may slow down some processes; however, the trade-off in the form of transparency seemed to be widely appreciated. The evaluators found extensive overlap among council and committee membership and caution the institution to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of this structure and its impact on workload.

Concern: The evaluation team suggests that the institution periodically evaluate the effectiveness and workload impact of the Administrative and Leadership Councils, as well as other executive/administrative committees, to ensure that the significant overlap in membership does not impede institutional progress.

b. Standard 2.B: Academic Freedom

i. 2.B.1

The evaluators found evidence of the institution's commitment to academic freedom both from meetings with campus constituents and through links to various policies from the institution and the State Board of Education.

ii. 2.B.2

The institution provided a link to the Faculty Constitution, which extensively outlines academic freedom as it relates to ISU. The Faculty Constitution is aligned well with other institutional and State Board of Education policies relating to academic freedom. The evaluators were able to verify the institution's affirmation of academic freedom for faculty, staff, administrators, and students through discussions with campus constituents.

c. Standard 2.C: Policies and Procedures

i. 2.C.1

The institution maintains policy information about transfer of credit on several institutional websites. This institutional policy is aligned with State Board of Education policy. Additionally, all 2- and 4-year institutions under the purview of the State Board of Education have articulation agreements, ensuring that students can move through in-state institutions smoothly.

ii. 2.C.2

The evaluation team was able to verify through links and conversations with campus constituents that the institution maintains multiple policies related to academic honesty, conduct, appeals, grievances, and accommodations for students with disabilities.

iii. 2.C.3

The evaluation team was able to find information about admission and placement policies both in the catalog and on the institution's website. Admissions standards are governed by faculty through the Faculty Senate, the Academic Standards Council, and the Graduate Council.

iv. 2.C.4

The institution has well-defined procedures for the secure retention of student records. These procedures comply with FERPA and, when appropriate, HIPAA rules and regulations.

d. Standard 2.D: Institutional Integrity

i. 2.D.1

The evaluation team reviewed the documentation provided in the report and verified based on a sampling of materials as to the consistency of the statements. Public and internal information appear to be verified by appropriate parties and departments with lead responsibility.

ii. 2.D.2

The university maintains an established compliance team and compliance committee, along with policies which contribute to assurance and resolution, if necessary, to ethical standards and equitable treatment of students, employees, and stakeholders.

iii. 2.D.3

The university maintains and monitors compliance for conflict-of-interest activities. In addition, the State Board of Education has a policy that applies to all institutions.

e. Standard 2.E: Financial Resources

i. 2.E.1

The university financial statements are audited annually by an independent accounting firm and displayed on the university's public website. In addition, quarterly and annual reports are made available to the campus. The evaluation team reviewed the website to ensure the financial statements were easily located, along with the annual budget book. The State Board of Education, by policy, requires 5% reserves which has been met and exceeded by the university. The annual budget book was clear, and demonstrated the budget environment in sufficient detail for a reader to gain a clear understanding. In addition to external auditors, the university also employs an internal auditor. The internal auditor reviews the annual audit plan with the president, after which the plan and results are provided to the State Board of Education.

ii. 2.E.2

The university has a clearly defined budget process, with appropriate involvement with stakeholders. The planning process, including estimates, appears to consider short- and long-term financial impacts. The recent enrollment declines and COVID-19 environment have required the university to use reserves to provide a bridge for permanent budget impacts. The Moody's recent rating affirmation points to the financial environment and adequacy of planning functions to ensure short- and long-term financial viability.

iii. 2.E.3

The university's transparency in managing financial resources was demonstrated through review of documents, web-based documents, and conversations with leadership, faculty, and staff. The State Board of Education applies appropriate levels of oversight of the planning, budget, and financial reporting processes.

f. Standard 2.F: Human Resources

i. 2.F.1

The university has an effective employee onboarding process, including training, for new employees. Evaluations are completed annually in compliance with State Board of Education policy.

ii. 2.F.2

The evaluation team reviewed and verified evidence and policies supporting employment development for faculty and staff.

iii. 2.F.3

The university's self-study report outlined the process for ensuring the appropriate levels of staffing/faculty are in place to effectively complete the work of the units and meet instructional needs. While there were some mentions of staffing shortages due to the recent budgetary impacts, there were no units that demonstrated substantial and work limiting resource levels.

iv. 2.F.4

Based on the evidence provided and reviewed by the evaluation team, the university has made substantial efforts to evaluate employees on an annual basis as required by ISU and State Board of Education policies. ISU has appropriate policies to govern the human resources functions of the university.

g. Standard 2.G: Student Support Resources

i. 2.G.1

The institution offers a wide array of educational programs and services which support learning and success. The Bengal Bridge program is a seven-week summer program designed to provide additional academic support to incoming students. Idaho State University also has several TRiO programs which support first-generation and low-income students at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The institution provides tutoring through the Math Center, Writing Center, and through University Tutoring with Content Area Tutoring. Students with documented disabilities can receive services through the office of Disability Services. The institution also offers a Veteran's Student Resource Center.

ii. 2.G.2

The Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs are available on the university website. The catalogs contain all the necessary items as outlined in this standard including current and accurate information regarding institutional mission, degree and program completion, learning outcomes, and required courses. The cost of tuition, fees, additional program costs, as well as the refund policy and procedures are listed in the catalog. Information regarding financial aid and the various types of aid can be found in the catalog as well.

The names, titles, and degrees held of administrators and full-time faculty is not readily available for many individuals.

iii. 2.G.3

The undergraduate and graduate catalogs as well as educational program websites contain information regarding academic degree programs, certificates, and licensures available, accreditations, alternate routes to certification, admission standards, and graduation requirements

iv. 2.G.4 and 2.G.5

Financial aid is awarded consistent with the institution's mission and based on student needs and institutional resources. Students have access to federal, state, and institutional aid which is detailed and easily accessible on the website. Student loans are not automatically awarded to students, and must be requested to prevent students from borrowing unnecessary funds. Students receive loan counseling annually when they apply for loans. Students also receive loan repayment information as they leave the institution. ISU contracts with an outside agency to manage student loan delinquency. The last published rate of 7.4% in 2017 was below the national average of 9.7%. In meeting with financial aid staff, they reported their most recent default rate is 5.5%. The evaluators could not find this most recent default rate published on their website.

v. 2.G.6

First- and second-year students receive advising centrally through the academic advising office. Third- and fourth-year students receive advising from their major departments. This past year, new students were required to meet with their advisor before they could register for classes. New students are required to meet with their academic advisor prior to registering for classes. Staff in academic advising are knowledgeable of the various academic programs and graduation requirements.

vi. 2.G.7

Students taking on-line courses utilize the learning management system Moodle for all course information, work, and examinations. Moodle requires a unique log-in and password for each student. In addition, some courses require students to come to proctoring centers for exams.

h. Standard 2.H: Library and Information Resources

i. 2.H.1

The evaluation team found that the library is managed and staffed by qualified professionals to support the mission, programs, and services necessary for the size and breadth of the university. The university invests in library resources on a systemic basis with consultation with the library staff, faculty, and other staff across the university.

i. Standard 2.I: Physical and Technology Infrastructure

i. 2.I.1

The evaluation team found that the university employs qualified employees to manage the information technology structure of the university. The university's enterprise software is standardized by the State Board of Education across all institutions. The university also supports specialized technology necessary for departments to effectively complete their work. The CIO supports a project prioritization process that is included as part of the university-wide budget process in support of institutional priorities. The evaluation team determined, based on inquiry, that technology assets and services are in place to serve the university faculty and staff. Furthermore, the CIO continues to support the movement towards enhancing access to data to support university decision making. The IT department provided enhanced services as a part of the pandemic response, including wi-fi connectivity and video conferencing technology to support asynchronous and synchronous learning modalities. Due to the virtual nature of this evaluation visit, the evaluation team was not able to visually confirm the condition of the campus physical facilities. The university will develop a new physical campus master plan based on the outcome of the new strategic plan. The evaluation team focused the review of this standard on the materials in the report and conversations of leadership and staff. The university updates and invests in campus buildings and infrastructure based on a facilities project prioritization process which is funded by allocations from the Permanent Building Fund Advisory Council (State of Idaho process) and institution resources. Specific to hazardous waste requirements, the university has a hazardous waste management plan in place.

VIII. Summary

Idaho State University has spent the past several years improving the transparency and inclusivity of planning and decision-making. These efforts, along with an approachable and student-focused administration, have resulted in a strong campus culture that values communication and clear leadership. The institution is well-situated to develop a strong, aspirational strategic plan that should guide mission fulfillment well in the coming years.

IX. Commendations and Recommendations

a. Commendations

i. Commendation 1:

The evaluation team commends the work of the current administration to effectively and transparently communicate information to all campus constituents.

ii. Commendation 2:

The evaluation team commends the work of the institution to foster an inviting, inclusive, and student-centric culture in which members of the campus community feel valued, seen, and heard.

b. Recommendations (each recommendation must reference one or more standards)

i. Recommendation 1:

The evaluation team recommends that the institution consistently disaggregates all of its indicators for student achievement by every category listed in Standard 1.D.2 (1.D.2)

ii. Recommendation 2:

The evaluation team recommends that as the institution transitions to a more aspirational strategic plan, it articulates one clear set of meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators to define mission fulfillment (1.B.2).