Idaho State University Mid-Cycle Accreditation Plan

1. Mid-Cycle Evaluation Background:

A. The mid-cycle evaluation is conducted in the third year of the seven-year cycle; it is intended to ascertain an institution’s readiness to provide evidence (outcomes) of mission fulfillment and sustainability in the Year Seven. It is to assist the institution in determining if the process of outcomes assessment will lead them to a successful Year Seven self-evaluation and peer evaluation. It is intended to be a formative and collegial evaluation with the institution in conversation with the evaluators.

B. For mid-cycle evaluations, peer evaluators from other accredited institutions and appropriate agencies study the institution’s Mid-Cycle Self-Evaluation Report and conduct an on-site visit of the institution. The purpose is to provide formative feedback regarding the institution’s assessment plan and use of data for quality improvement.

C. NWCCU Guidelines: The Mid-Cycle Self-Evaluation (MCE) includes institutional self-evaluation on its assessment efforts at both the macro and micro level. Macro refers to an overview of the entire process of assessment for mission fulfillment at the institution. Micro refers to providing representative examples of the details of the assessment process. Thus, the MCE will include three parts; Part I: Overview of entire assessment plan; Part II: Representative examples of assessment process from beginning to end, and Part III: Evaluative overview in light of Parts I and II.

(1) Part I: Overview of Institutional Assessment Plan
Informed and guided by Standards 1 and 3-5, Part I of the MCE will be a narrative shaped by the questions below describing the institution’s plan for linking/aligning mission (Standard One) with mission fulfillment and sustainability (Standard 5). As we analyze our assessment plan, we need to respond to the following questions:

- Describe/explain the process of assessing mission fulfillment. Who is involved in the assessment? Is the Board of Trustees involved?
- Are our core themes and objectives still valid?
- Is the institution satisfied that the core themes and indicators selected are providing sufficient evidence to assess mission fulfillment and sustainability? If not, what changes are contemplated?

(2) Part II: Representative Examples of Assessment Process from Beginning to End
The institution will provide two representative examples of how it has operationalized its mission and core themes progressing from objectives to indicators to outcomes to mission fulfillment. These examples should be regarding student learning at either the institutional, program, or course level. They should illustrate how you are “closing the
loop” on student learning assessment. As you provide these examples please include analysis in regard to the following questions:

• Are our indicators, for the selected examples, proving to be meaningful? Do you have too many indicators or too few?
• What has the institution learned so far and what changes are contemplated? What has been your progress to date using the data? Do the data tell you what you are looking for?
• How is data being collected, analyzed, and utilized and the findings communicated to constituents?

(3) **Part III: Evaluative Overview in Light of Parts I and II**

Evaluative overview in light of Parts I and II In light of your analysis in Part I of your overall assessment plan and in light of your analysis of the representative examples, you provided in Part II please respond to the following question:

• What will we need to do to prepare for the Year-Seven Evaluation?

2. **ADHOC Reports:** The University will also submit ADHOC reports covering recommendations 3 & 4 from the NWCCU’s Year-Seven Evaluation.

• Introduction regarding the context for the report (i.e., when the report was requested, why it was requested (i.e. comprehensive evaluation)
• List each Recommendation or topic to be addressed followed by a thorough response.
• Repeat until all Recommendations and/or topics have been addressed.
• Concluding statement summarizing the institution’s progress in addressing the areas of inquiry requested by the Commission.

3. **Timeline (tentative):**

• January 25- First meeting of AAAPR to discuss requirements
• February 22- Discuss the process the group will use to answer the questions
• March 15- Decide on the organizational structure of the report
• April 25- Outline the answers to the questions
• June 21- Review the outlines
• *July 14- First draft to Vice Provost/ALO Grace
• August 11 - Second draft to Vice Provost/ALO Grace
• August 22 – IEAC Reviews draft
• August 29- Final draft completed and forwarded to Provost then President
• September 8- Self Evaluation due to NWCCU (President)
• October 1- Site visit (tentative)