

THE NEW SYSTEMS APPRAISAL: DEVELOPMENTS IN AQIP

Robert Spohr
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Montcalm Community College

Why The Change?

- Over the past nine months, AQIP has been examining ways to improve the systems portfolio and appraisal process and value to institutions.
- In other words... Quality Improvement isn't just for institutions.

AQIP Action Project Task Force

- Barbara Keinath, Metropolitan State University, MN
- Scott Epstein, Davenport University, MI
- Kate Alley, South Dakota School of Mines & Technology, SD
- Vince Linder, Cleary University, MI
- Mary Sue Marz, Eastern Michigan University, MI
- Cathy Mullins, Shawnee State University, OH
- Marcia Sauter, University of Saint Francis, IN
- Connie Wilson, University of Indianapolis, IN
- Robert Spohr, Montcalm Community College, MI

When Changes Take Effect

- Optional for institutions submitting November 2012.
- But to take the "option" of using the new format, an institution must notify AQIP before July 1, 2012, and AQIP will confirm participation in the "pilot" version of the new format by August 1, 2012. (This will ensure AQIP knows how many institutions will take the option, and how many peer review teams must be prepared to deal with them.)

When Changes Take Effect

- Some institutions can "opt" to use the new Portfolio features in November 2012.
- Some changes will affect Systems Appraisal teams in November 2012 that are reviewing institutions that have "opted" to use the new format.
- All changes will affect all institutions and Systems Appraisal teams from June 2013 onward.
- **Let's look at the changes.**

Changes for Institutions

The Overview

- **Reduced from 10 pages to 2 pages**

- The first page will include important information like:
 - Student Demographics
 - Locations
 - Campuses
 - etc.
- The second page will include trends and issues that are important to the institution.

Where Are the Other 8 Pages?

- **For each of the nine categories the institution will include a one-page Category Summary that includes:**

- Its perceived level of maturity on that category.
- Special activities the institution has been engaged in.
- Foci that it wants feedback on.

- **The revised Systems Portfolio Guide will provide guidance and examples.**

Systems Maturity Example

| Example | Reacting Approaches | Systematic Approaches | Aligned Approaches | Integrated Approaches |
|----------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Category 1 (example) | End of course evaluations are "done" but how they are used in instructor evaluations is not defined, nor can any meta-level data analysis be done because of variations in the instrument and practice across programs. | A common end-of-course evaluation tool is used across programs, and language on instructional excellence appears in annual review docs. Department heads review all evals over time... | Teaching excellence and student success are linked strategic foci. Each program works from a common definition of instructional excellence to create program strategic criteria... | The aligned processes described for program heads involve other units of the institution, such as student affairs, retention, tutoring, placement and testing, and institutional research... |

100-11=89? Is that enough?

- **There will be no separate Index or Self-Assessment: everything about how an institution meets the Criteria and Core Components will be embedded in specific locations (under P questions).**
- **Because of the additional work, the maximum length will be 125 pages.**

Embedded Criteria

| Core Component | AQIP Categories Process Questions | | Core Component | AQIP Categories Process Questions | |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------|----------------|--------------------------------------|------|
| 1A | 5P1 | 5P2 | 3A | 1P4 | 1P12 |
| 1B | 5P3 | 5P8 | 3B | 1P1 | 1P2 |
| 1C | 1P4 | 1P10 | 3C | 4P2 | 4P10 |
| 1D | 3P3 | 3P5 | 3D | 1P7 | 1P15 |
| 2A | 4P7 | | 3E | 1P16 | |
| 2B | 1P6 | | 4A | 1P4 | 1P13 |
| 2C | 5P2 | | 4B | 1P2 | 1P18 |
| 2D | 1P1 | | 4C | 3P1 | |
| 2E | 1P1 | 4P7 | 5A | 8P6 | |
| | 1 | | 5B | 5P5 | 5P9 |
| | | | 5C | 5P2 | 5P6 |
| | | | 5D | 7P2 | 7P4 |

Example

- 4P7. How do you ensure the ethical practices of all of your employees?
Address Core Component 2A under 4P7

Standard Statements

- Institutions submitting their second or subsequent Systems Portfolio *MUST* also answer *EVERY* P, R, & I question.
- They may refer and link to previous Systems Portfolios if nothing has changed.
 - Links must take reviewers directly to the specific items within the previous Systems Portfolio.

Changes to the Appraisal

Example Statements

- *Our student assessment system measures attainment of clearly stated learning goals in every academic program, and produces data that we use to annually improve curriculum and pedagogy. (See our 2009 Portfolio on 1P1) The 2009 Systems Appraisal praised our system as an SS. (See 2009 Appraisal 1P1 response).*
- *In our 2008 Portfolio (see SP2008-7R1), we reported we nearly reached consensus on measures to evaluate our IT support and data collection and storage; the Appraisal team recognized this as an OO opportunity (SA2009-7R1). We still have not reached consensus or begun actual data collection, so our OO remains critical.*

Team Make-up

- One Team Leader.
 - Currently trained, or will be invited to become a team leader and will be trained.
 - Guidelines for Team Leaders to follow will be created.
- At least five trained Appraisers as Team Members (in addition to Team Leader).
- One team member will be tasked with editing.
- The corps of AQIP Peer Reviewer is being refined.

Giving Feedback

- Reporting the Critical Characteristics at the beginning of each category is eliminated.
- The SS, S, O, OO labels will remain
- The Team Leader (with consent of the team and AQIP) may e-mail or call the institution to get answer to questions it believes are critical to the Appraisal.

Giving Feedback (Continued)

- Team writes summary sections introducing each category and the team's appraisal of the institution's level of maturity.

Tentative

- The Team Leader calls the institution's AQIP Liaison after the end of the appraisal to:
 - Reaffirm the team's findings and advice.
 - Debrief the liaison on the usefulness of the team's work.

Accreditation Issues

• If serious issues regarding the Criteria are identified, the team can recommend either:

1. The institution must provide a monitoring report (3 – 24 months) documenting that any accreditation issue has been rectified.

Tentative

2. The institution is required to host a focused visit that permits an onsite team to evaluate that the issues have been corrected.

Questions?
