Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (Y7)

Peer-Evaluation Report

College of Southern Idaho

Twin Falls, Idaho

April 27 – 29, 2022

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

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1

II. Assessment of Self-Evaluation and Support Materials 1

IV. Topics Addressed as Addendum to the Self-Evaluation Report 2

V. Standard 1: Student Success and Institutional Mission and Effectiveness 5

a. Standard 1.A: Institutional Mission 5

i. 1.A.1 5

b. Standard 1.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness 6

i. 1.B.1 6

ii. 1.B.2 7

iii. 1.B.3 8

iv. 1.B.4 9

c. Standard 1.C: Student Learning 10

i. 1.C.1 10

ii. 1.C.2 11

iii. 1.C.3 12

iv. 1.C.4 12

v. 1.C.5 13

vi. 1.C.6 14

vii. 1.C.7 16

viii. 1.C.8 16

ix. 1.C.9 17

d. Standard 1.D: Student Achievement 17

i. 1.D.1 17

ii. 1.D.2 18

iii. 1.D.3 19

iv. 1.D.4 20

VI. Summary 21

VII. Commendations and Recommendations 21

a. Commendations 21

b. Recommendations 21

Evaluation Committee

Name	Role in Committee	Academic Title	Campus
Dr. Beckie Hermansen	Chair	Director, Institutional Research and Effectiveness	Snow College, UT
Dr. Laura Flores Cailloux	Evaluator	Department Chair and Vice President Whidbey Island Campus	Skagit Valley College, WA
Mr. Sergey Shepelov	Evaluator	Associate Vice President, Institutional Effectiveness	Mt. Hood Community College, OR
Dr. Betsy Julian	Evaluator	Vice President of Instruction	Central Oregon Community College, OR

NWCCU Liaison to the Committee:
Dr. Mac Powell
Senior Vice President
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities

I. Introduction

A 4-person evaluation team conducted a Year Seven Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EIE) visit to the College of Southern Idaho from April 27th to April 29th, 2022. The visit covered Standard One in response to the *Year Seven Self-Evaluation Report* submitted by the College of Southern Idaho to the Commission on March 1, 2022. A review and evaluation of Standard Two was completed previously during the College of Southern Idaho's Year Six Evaluation.

II. Assessment of Self-Evaluation and Support Materials

The College of Southern Idaho's (CSI) Year Seven Evaluation Report was represented by (1) a report summary of Standard Two Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review (PRFR) and (2) Standard One, a comprehensive Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EIE). The evaluation committee found the Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness report to be well-written. Both the PRFR summary report and the CSI's EIE provided valuable information about the history and status of the college, which combined represented the College's collaborative work toward institutional goal achievement and continual improvement. CSI was very helpful in providing the Evaluation Committee with all the materials relevant to the comprehensive review as well as access to other evidentiary information published by or otherwise secured by the institution.

III. Visit Summary

The evaluation team conducted visits with various members of the College of Southern Idaho's community. These visits included the President, Board of Trustees representatives, the Vice President for Community and Learner Services, the Provost, the Registrar, CSI's Accreditation Liaison Officer, the Equity and Inclusion Committee, the General Education Committee, CSI's Hispanic Community Liaison, the Strategic Planning Committee, the Institutional Research Office, Enrollment Management representatives, CTE Advisory Board members, Instructional Deans, Instructional Assessment Committee members, Department and Faculty Assessment Week representatives, Student Services representatives, branch and extension campus representatives, Bridge to Success program representatives, concurrent enrollment and distance education representatives, and members of the Project Polaris Team (new database/student information system implementation). The Evaluation Team also attended open forums for faculty, staff, and students. General topics of discussion focused on organizational changes, college achievements, current initiatives, strategic college planning, and other opportunities for the college to achieve mission fulfillment.

IV. Topics Addressed as Addendum to the Self-Evaluation Report

The College of Southern Idaho was asked to address the following items as a part of the Year Seven Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness. These additional items were recommendations from the Policies, Regulations, and Financial Review (PRFR) Evaluation review.

Finding 1: The following standards are areas substantially in compliance but where improvement is needed

Standard 2.A.1: The institution demonstrates an effective governance structure, with a board(s) or other governing body(ies) composed predominantly of members with no contractual, employment relationship, or personal financial interest with the institution. Such members shall also possess clearly defined authority, roles, and responsibilities. Institutions that are part of a complex system with multiple boards, a centralized board, or related entities shall have, with respect to such boards, written and clearly defined contractual authority, roles, and responsibilities for all entities. In addition, authority and responsibility between the system and the institution is clearly delineated in a written contract, described on its website and in its public documents, and provides the NWCCU accredited institution with sufficient autonomy to fulfill its mission.

Based on the college's 2021 PRFR Report, the PRFR review team noted Board policy approval in June 2017 and 2019. The required policies were in place but the 2020 review was not performed.

The EIE team met with CSI's Board Chair (Laird Stone) and Trustee Jack Nelsen and reviewed minutes from previous board meetings. The CSI Board of Trustees has a clear governance structure with board members who understand their roles and responsibilities, and are knowledgeable and actively support CSI's mission and strategic plan. The evaluation team found evidence that minor revisions to board policy regarding meeting structure and discipline were made in August and September 2021. The board's Policy and Procedure Manual was revised in September 2021, but there was no clear indication of comprehensive board review.

Compliment: The evaluation team compliments CSI's Board of Trustees for their deep commitment to CSI's mission, engagement in CSI's strategic plan development, and passionate involvement in CSI's faculty, staff, and student activities.

Concern: The evaluation team encourages CSI's Board of Trustees to annually review its Policy and Procedure Manual on a regularly scheduled and well-documented basis.

Standard 2.G.1: Consistent with the nature of its educational programs and methods of delivery, and with a particular focus on equity and closure of equity gaps in achievement, the institution creates and maintains effective learning environments with appropriate programs and services to support student learning and success.

Based on the college's 2021 PRFR Report, the PRFR review team reviewed supporting program links and found such programs to be sufficient. The institution is more than 25% self-identified as Hispanic but is still working on outreach and support.

The EIE team found CSI to be actively engaged in learning what it means to be Hispanic serving, not just Hispanic enrolling. The college president is engaging with K-12 superintendents to develop structures that improve high school completion and 'go on' rates for Hispanic students. The newly established Equity & Inclusion Committee has prioritized the work of preparing to become Hispanic-serving and organized an HSI Kickoff program and data summit. The Teaching and Learning Center is providing professional development focused on meeting students where they are, incorporating both backward and universal design, enabling live transcription in zoom, and creating a Spanish language version of student orientation materials. Organizational changes are underway to create an interface between the Equity & Inclusion Committee and the Teaching and Learning Center. Reflection on equity has been incorporated into the Program Review process and faculty have noted disparities in outcomes in course level assessment resulting in course design modifications. For example, the General Education committee reviewed the pre-

requisite requirement for Spanish for Heritage Speakers to serve more Spanish/English bilingual students and is discussing course content that is culturally responsive.

The Hispanic community liaison position has resulted in more outreach into secondary schools and community centers and greater contact with families of Hispanic students. This position has been instrumental in starting a college chapter of Latinos in Action (LIA) and providing more opportunities for Hispanic students to experience the CSI campus through a LIA conference and Hispanic Youth Leadership Summit. The Latinos in Action program is being articulated with a general education health class. Bilingual instructors have been hired to teach welding and CNA to ESL students at off-campus instructional sites. The Bridge to Success program has proven effective in transition and retention of students, the majority of whom are Hispanic.

While the energy and intention to Hispanic students is new and noteworthy, the evaluation team found the clear integration of Hispanic serving into the strategic, institutional and SEM planning and resource allocation process is yet to occur. Faculty and staff in multiple forums expressed a need for continued learning to develop common understanding of equity and best practices for HSI's. This learning will help inform the development of outreach efforts and support systems that will create greater access, a sense of belonging, and increased achievement for Hispanic students.

Compliment: Many areas of the college are independently finding ways to create stronger outreach and support to Hispanic students and families.

Concern: Efforts to become Hispanic serving are not systematically integrated into the data-analysis, planning, and resource allocation processes of the college, which could exacerbate equity gaps, especially in the Hispanic population centers and at instructional sites outside the main campus.

Finding 2: The following standards are areas for additional review by an onsite (virtual) evaluator during the College of Southern Idaho's Year 7 visit

Standards 2.G.7: The institution maintains an effective identity verification process for students enrolled in distance education courses and programs to establish that the student enrolled in such a course or program is the same person whose achievement are evaluated and credentialed. The institution ensures that the identity verification process for distance education students protects student privacy and that students are informed, in writing at the time of enrollment, of current and projected charges associated with the identity verification process.

Based upon the college's PRFR Report, the PRFR review team reviewed a policy in draft form for this standard, which had not completed a campus-wide process for vetting. The institution self-identified this as a need requiring further review and evaluation during the Year 7 evaluation.

CSI established a process that requires identity verification for all students participating in an online or hybrid course. This process was drafted by the Student Success Dean, reviewed and edited by Faculty Senate, Department Chairs, Academic Affairs and Curriculum Committee as well as the provost and president before being approved by the Council of Department Chairs on April 28, 2021. Student verification begins with individualized secure credentials created by the Office of Information Technology. Access to CSI's learning management system (Canvas) requires these credentials. To verify course and program achievements, online and/or hybrid students are required to use Canvas, conduct all email communication using their CSI account, and complete additional authentication measures as established by their course instructor. These additional measures include taking one on-campus proctored exam, completing a remote exam proctored at an approved testing site or using the Respondus Monitor, having one videoconference (Zoom) or in-person meeting with the instructor, submitting photo identification with an assignment or an exam, or attending a mandatory, graded on-campus class activity. All students are adequately informed of these requirements at https://www.csi.edu/online/default.aspx and https://www.csi.edu/online/identity-verification.aspx.

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

a. Standard 1.A: Institutional Mission

i. 1.A.1

The institution's mission statement defines its broad educational purposes and its commitment to student learning and achievement.

The College of Southern Idaho has a clear mission statement that defines its educational purpose to serve as the educational, social, cultural, and workforce development center for all South-Central Idaho communities. This mission statement was reviewed and reaffirmed as part of CSI's Strategic Plan (2022-2026), which aligns strategic goals, objectives, and achievement metrics according to a mission-based CODE: Cultivating community engagement; Optimizing student access; Driving student success; and Ensuring institutional sustainability. CSI's mission statement is widely published in all digital and printed materials and is consistently referenced in variety of institutional reports.

Compliment: The evaluation team compliments CSI's embodiment of its mission as central to its student-centered, student-serving culture.

Evidence of this singular focus was found in administrative actions such as the Solution Summits, major operational decisions such Project Polaris, and among all personnel who collaborate and innovate in ways that drive student success.

b. Standard 1.B: Improving Institutional Effectiveness

i. 1.B.1

The institution demonstrates a continuous process to assess institutional effectiveness, including student learning and achievement and support services. The institution uses an ongoing and systematic evaluation and planning process to inform and refine its effectiveness, assign resources, and improve student learning and achievement.

The college has a well-defined process for evaluation of institutional effectiveness and planning that engages every level of the organization (including the Board of Trustees), and aligns with Idaho State Board of Education goals and reporting requirements. The college recently completed a deliberative and inclusive process resulting in CSI's Strategic Plan, 2022-2026.

Operational planning to achieve strategic planning goals occurs through a bottom-up process beginning with the creation of Individual Development Plans (IDP) and Program Reviews that inform Unit Development Plans (UDP). Each UDP identifies necessary resources and serves as an inclusive plan-driven budgeting tool. These processes are ongoing and systematically implemented for instructional areas of the college. The Teaching and Learning Center manages a well-organized Canvas site that serves as a resource about the process as well as a platform for organizing plan submission and feedback.

As a companion to IDP/UDP procedures, CSI designed a new Institutional Stabilization and Optimization (ISO) process to provide support service units a method for assessment and evidence-based goal achievement. Moving forward the ISO process supports annual program and unit evaluation and provides administration with formal reports on non-instructional units every two years and instructional units every four years. A newly formed Enrollment Management Council has almost completed a detailed strategic enrollment management plan which will be included in the planning process alongside unit and program development plans to help guide institutional priorities and resource allocation.

Compliment: College faculty understand the planning process and have contributed significant thought and effort into making the process

meaningful and a part of a culture of continuous improvement. This includes the addition of a reflective component to identify practices that promote instructional equity.

Compliment: The Canvas sites for planning and program review managed by the Teaching and Learning Center are well-designed to both inform and support the process and serve as well-organized and readily accessible repository for IDP and UDP plan submission.

Concern: The IDP/UDP process has not been systematically implemented in areas outside of instruction. While ISO plans are flexible allowing for different criteria and data to be used for analysis in each unit, the lack of a consistent equity filter could disproportionately impact underrepresented populations.

Concern: Examination of equity gaps and prioritization of strategies related to becoming a Hispanic-serving institution is not consistently considered in the planning process. College planning units and committees need to be able to articulate how the college's value of equity and the intention to become a Hispanic-serving institution are represented and prioritized in the planning process.

ii. 1.B.2

The institution sets and articulates meaningful goals, objectives, and indicators of its goals to define mission fulfillment and to improve its effectiveness in the context of and in comparison with regional and national peer institutions.

CSI has developed goals, objectives, and indicators of achievement in the strategic plan-based areas of community engagement, student access, student achievement, and institutional sustainability. All goals, objectives, and indicators are supported by rationales that justify their significance to the institution and by narratives regarding progress, limitations and opportunities for improvement. Indicators are updated regularly and published on a mission-fulfillment scorecard that is color coded to denote where targets have been met (yellow), exceeded (green), or missed (red). The information is regularly shared among faculty, staff, and administrative leadership (including the Board of Trustees) and is integral to the college's planning and decision-making processes.

Indicators associated with state, regional, or national reporting use comparable peer institutions for benchmarking and goal achievement. Student achievement data is disaggregated to identify equity gaps. The

evaluation team found that CSI had developed intentional peer institution groups to disaggregate measurable community development, student success, and student achievement progress respective to Hispanic students of Mexican ancestry.

Concern: The evaluation team discovered many data points (and trends) that indicated goal achievement, but the overall metric was not meaningfully articulated with the goal or objective. For example, the Cultivate Community Engagement goal is defined by an objective that fosters a climate of inclusivity among students, employees, and community members. The associated metric (1.1) tracks the percentage of students who would recommend CSI to a friend or family member. There is no meaningful relationship between student recommendation percentages and the development of an inclusive college environment. In addition, there is a need to strengthen objectives and goals with disaggregated measures focused on equity gaps in community engagement, student access, and student learning; and to connect that data more expressly with similar information supplied to unit and program level assessment (IDP/UDP and ISO processes).

iii. 1.B.3

The institution provides evidence that its planning process is inclusive and offers opportunities for comment by appropriate constituencies, allocates necessary resources, and leads to improvement of institutional effectiveness.

The evaluation team found evidence of participation among all college personnel in the planning processes of the college. During the strategic planning process, a variety of Solution Summits provided students, faculty, and staff opportunities to express their ideas regarding the main strategic plan initiatives. All college personnel were able to view drafts of the strategic plan prior to full ratification. Several of the planning enterprises of the college such as Cabinet, Faculty Senate, the Faculty Staff Connections Committee, the Instructional Assessment Committee, Curriculum Committee, and Project Polaris (the ERP planning process) accommodate collaborative faculty and staff membership. The new ISO process promises a systematic instructional program and non-instructional unit review framework reliant on broad-based faculty and staff participation. In addition, the recently formed Enrollment Management Council has college-wide participation. Ideas and initiatives from this group feed directly into the college's cabinet-level planning and resource allocation procedures.

These efforts are supported by greater access to data relevant to each level or area of planning. The ability to disaggregate data according to different student characteristics is already producing changes in decision-making and practice.

Compliment: The evaluation team recognizes President Fisher's focus for CSI to have both inclusive pedagogy and inclusive practice, which is supported by intentional participatory governance and planning as demonstrated by the college's recent organizational changes, the continued use of Solution Summits, and regular "President's Notes" campus communications.

Concern: The integration of ISO for sites outside the main campus and the large Equity and Inclusion Committee into the college's planning and resource allocation processes needs clarification. The evaluation team also recognized that while many employees participate in the college's planning process, many could not describe the connection between planning to resource allocation or improvements in institutional effectiveness.

iv. 1.B.4

The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it considers such findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, planning, intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement of its goals.

CSI utilizes several methods to monitor internal and external data trends. This includes regular monitoring of employee and student satisfaction insights and trends obtained by HEDS, SENSE, and CCSSE instruments. During the college's strategic planning process and strategic enrollment management planning, environmental scans provided the college with external perspectives and trends related to student success, belonging, inclusive campus climates, and best practices for serving Hispanic and other underrepresented student populations. Career and technical education faculty work with their advisory boards to maintain awareness of current and emerging business and industry developments. CSI Cabinet members regularly engage with members from the Idaho legislature, State Board of Education, and other national organizations to stay informed on financial, educational, and socioeconomic trends.

CSI is developing a data-informed decision-making culture. External and internal data provides point-in-time and longitudinal information on enrollment, achievement, and student learning. Interactive dashboards provide dynamic data disaggregation that identifies equity gaps and areas of improvement. CSI faculty were able to speak to insights they gained from disaggregated data that resulted in curricular re-design or the rethinking instructional approaches.

Compliment: The evaluation team recognizes the diligence by which CSI's leadership team stays well-aware of local, regional, and national trends that have influence on current college efforts and future institutional sustainability. This is conveyed through regular study of periodicals, publications, and other avenues of scholarly work that are intentionally shared with the President's Cabinet each month, and dedicated service on committees associated with the Idaho State Board of Education, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, and other regional and national organizations.

c. Standard 1.C: Student Learning

i. 1.C.1

The institution offers programs with appropriate content and rigor that are consistent with its mission, culminate in achievement of clearly identified student learning outcomes that lead to collegiate-level degrees, certificates, or credentials and include designators consistent with program content in recognized fields of study.

CSI offers transfer degrees and career and technical terminal degrees and certificates. The college Curriculum Committee reviews the learning outcomes of all new programs, oversees changes to learning outcomes, and regularly assesses existing learning outcomes for relevance. Credit-bearing programs must meet the rigor and credit requirements established by the Idaho State Board of Education. Course content and rigor are also advised by articulation agreements with partnering institutions.

CSI uses feedback from CTE advisory committees to ensure content relevance and applicability consistent with currently recognized fields of study. This is achieved using active advisory committees (comprised of local business and industry leaders) that meet biannually. Some CTE programs (e.g., Radiology Program) survey employers within a year of graduate employment, using the results to inform curricular relevance, student preparation, and student achievement/placement. Results of surveys are incorporated into program review documents to make curricular or pedagogical improvements.

All technical and academic programs conduct annual Program Reviews to qualify appropriate levels of course and program rigor and monitor student learning outcomes. The evaluation team found evidence of course and/or program improvement because of this process. For example, several programs used outcomes data to reduce the number of required credit hours by re-defining and re-organizing appropriate levels of course learning and course sequencing to drive learning outcome achievement. In particular, the physical science department used program assessment data in concert with the learning and course sequencing patterns at transfer institutions to eliminate non-essential pre-requisite courses.

Compliment: The college actively seeks feedback from local business and industry to ensure program and course content relevancy.

Concern: Some Advisory Committee meetings fail to represent a clear set of expected learning and/or skills outcomes which hinders the ability for a program to make curricular improvements. This may result in a loss of valuable business or industry input and is counterintuitive to effective program completer placement.

ii. 1.C.2

The institution awards credit, degrees, certificates, or credentials for programs that are based upon student learning and learning outcomes that offer an appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning.

CSI's Office of the Registrar awards credits, degrees, certificates, and other credentials based on demonstrated evidence that students have met the required learning outcomes. CSI's Curriculum Committee governs all instructional curricula and affirms that programs have documented and measurable student outcomes consistent with awarding credit and award recognitions. The Curriculum Committee also recommends the acceptance or removal of general education courses and provides regular review of all curricula.

Analyzing the breath, depth, sequencing, and synthesis of learning is accomplished through CSI's annual Program Review process (see Standard 1.C.5). This process assesses student learning using signature assignments associated with program learning outcomes and evaluates student achievement (retention, completion, and student success) using data provided by the Office of Institutional Research. Program reviews are further vetted by department chairs and instructional deans.

iii. 1.C.3

The institution identifies and publishes expected program and degree learning outcomes for all degrees, certificates, and credentials. Information on expected student learning outcomes for all courses is provided to enrolled students.

Course-level student learning outcomes are available in course syllabi regardless of modality. Some course learning outcomes are published on critical course assignments or projects. Several CSI faculty members noted that transparency in learning and teaching with reference to intended learning outcomes was becoming a part of regular practice. Program learning outcomes are regularly reviewed and published in the CSI college catalog and on individual program websites.

New students are provided with general degree information during orientation which is available in-person or via pre-recorded webinar. Degree determination and more specific degree pathway information is shared with students during their first, in-person, comprehensive visit with an advisor. These meetings encourage students to develop their educational plan and are conducted among new students during their first semester.

Concern: There is a lack of consistency in how program outcomes are published. Many program outcomes are listed under specific degrees and certificates, but some program outcomes are listed a level above under their disciplines. Other program outcomes are published but not identified as program outcomes. The evaluation team did not find any published program outcomes for the Industrial Systems Maintenance Technology certificate.

iv. 1.C.4

The institution's admission and completion or graduation requirements are clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible to students and the public.

The college is an open access institution. The evaluation team found admissions requirements published on the college website and in the CSI college catalog. Admission requirements for programs with distinct admission conditions (i.e., Nursing) are identified and published in the CSI college catalog with reference information pointing to the information located on the program's admission webpage.

CSI publishes an annual academic catalog easily accessible to students and other stakeholders, which is regularly reviewed and updated for current and accurate information. In addition to admission and graduation requirements, the catalog provides policies on unsatisfactory performance, rights of appeal, and how to add or drop courses.

Students may access their degree audit online at any time. Currently, CSI is developing a system by which students receive timely notifications of their degree progress.

v. 1.C.5

The institution engages in an effective system of assessment to evaluate the quality of learning in its programs. The institution recognizes the central role of faculty to establish curricula, assess student learning, and improve instructional programs.

The evaluation team observed that CSI has a well-established system of learning outcomes assessment represented by respective course, program, general education and state level assessment procedures. Course level assessment is completed at the department level by faculty who use signature assignments and other student generated artifacts to determine student success and end-of-course learning outcomes. Student course evaluations are also considered in this process. Assessment results inform departmental faculty on curricular and pedagogical gains and needed improvement. Course evaluation results also serve as a resource for the development of IDPs and UDPs, and chairs reference these data for yearly faculty evaluations.

Program level assessment is organized by the department chairs or program leads who leverage course assessment information and work with respective faculty to determine the measures and tools for effective program learning outcome evaluation. For CTE programs preference is given to industry or licensing certification exams or national technical skill assessments. These codified instruments allow the college's CTE programs to benchmark program learning results against industry standards and compare to student results generated by respective peer programs. Revision to curriculum maps and course content also occur during regular program reviews.

The evaluation team recognized Assessment Week as CSI's commitment to systematic program and general education learning outcome review. Held each November, faculty convene to organize, evaluate, and form proactive conclusions using course, program, and general education

student success and achievement indicators. Assessment Week activities also involve independent appraisals of general education and other state-level learning competencies (see Standard 1.C.6)

Results of the assessment activities are well organized and documented in CSI's learning management system, Canvas. The evaluation team found that that CSI effectively "closes the loop" on learning assessment with feedback provided by Instructional Deans and the incorporation of findings in individual and unit development plans (IDPs/UDPs). Meetings with faculty and various faculty leadership groups (i.e. Instructional Assessment Committee, Curriculum Committee, and general education Ways of Knowing committees) during the visit affirmed the processes of student learning assessment and program improvement are both student-centered and faculty driven. Furthermore, CSI reviews and evaluates all assessment processes, which was evidenced by revisions to Program Review templates and the newly developed Institutional Optimization and Stabilization process (see Standard 1.B.1)

The evaluation team observed a lack of evidence of systematic learning assessment at off-campus instructional sites, including dual enrollment instruction at area high schools. Many of these courses are taught by adjunct faculty or high school teachers who are encouraged to participate in Assessment Week and other main campus learning evaluation activities. Located exclusively on the main campus and held only on weekdays, these assessment events preclude adjunct and other off-site from being fully involved.

Compliment: Dedicating an entire week for program and related learning outcome assessment each year is an excellent step in establishing a strong assessment culture, and supports other commendable assessment and informed planning practices (see standards 1.B.1 and 1.C.6).

Concern: According to data provided by the college, over 50% of dual enrollment headcount and 30% of the credits taken are from high school students. The size of the program warrants more active participation by high school and off-site faculty and better integration of their efforts into CSI's existing system of student learning assessment.

vi. 1.C.6

Consistent with its mission, the institution establishes and assesses, across all associate and bachelor level programs or within a General Education curriculum, institutional learning outcomes and/or core competencies. Examples of such learning outcomes and competencies

include, but are not limited to, effective communication skills, global awareness, cultural sensitivity, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and logical thinking, problem solving, and/or information literacy.

CSI's general education curriculum effectively adheres to Idaho's state-wide credit policy which is represented by Ways of Knowing and Integrative Skills core competencies, which are organized into four main institutional goal areas: THINK (humanistic, artistic, mathematical, scientific, and social/behavioral ways of knowing), COMMUNICATE (oral and written integrative skills), CONNECT (representing the institutionally designed introduction to general education), and BE WELL (representing learning and skills associated with personal wellness). Specific general education courses are identified to satisfy the credit requirements of each learning goal area.

The general education assessment process accommodates a continuous assessment process with faculty submitting student artifacts on a semester-by-semester basis. This process culminates in an annual, formal assessment of general education learning outcomes during CSI's Assessment Week. Faculty and non-faculty "readers" review and assess the submitted work using an established general education rubric. Results of this assessment contribute to an annual report of findings and improvements that is published on CSI's website. This report is to improve teaching and learning in general education courses and serves as a reference for individual and unit improvement plans (IDP/UPD). During the visit, the evaluation team learned of the college's work to implement an online platform (Engage) that will facilitate the connection of student support services initiatives and activities to the learning outcomes shared among general education courses.

Compliment: Collaborating with student support service units in evaluating general education learning outcomes is an effective way to supplement general education instructional efforts and bolster student-centered core competency achievement.

Concern: While there is clearly an effort to engage high school faculty teaching dual credit classes in training and assessment sessions, there is no evidence of broad participation in general education outcome assessment for dual credit classes.

vii. 1.C.7

The institution uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices to continuously improve student learning outcomes.

The evaluation team found sufficient evidence that CSI uses the results of its assessment efforts to inform academic and learning-support planning (see Standards 1.B.1, 1.B.3, 1.B.4, 1.C.5, and 1.C.6.) Examples of this assessment-based culture of improvement include global changes to Art and Music curricula to reduce the number of credit hours required for degree completion, resulting in cost and time savings for students and a positive increase to CSI's timely completion metrics.

Another example reassigned previously required classes to elective classes in physics, chemistry, computer science, and engineering programs. This change provided students greater course selection flexibility and reduced excess credit accumulation that served as a barrier to student achievement.

When it was discovered that public speaking was an issue for many students, changes were made to courses across multiple disciplines to improve outcomes achievement in communication. In addition, the Teaching and Learning Center utilizes assessment data and active membership on various assessment committees to identify key topics and sponsor critical improvement workshops every term.

viii. 1.C.8

Transfer credit and credit for prior learning is accepted according to clearly defined, widely published, and easily accessible policies that provide adequate safeguards to ensure academic quality. In accepting transfer credit, the receiving institution ensures that such credit accepted is appropriate for its programs and comparable in nature, content, academic rigor, and quality.

Information about credit transfer is available on the college's webpage and catalog, and processes are clearly outlined. CSI accepts credits from regionally accredited institutions (a list of accrediting associations is available on the website). Official transcripts are required. Students who earned an Associate Degree or higher are considered core certified and are not required to take additional non-program specific courses. CSI provides adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality in transfer.

Transfer equivalencies are determined primarily by course descriptions, supplemented by course outcomes or syllabi, and referred to faculty as needed. A common course numbering system provides greater transparency of course articulation and seamless transfer for students across all Idaho institutions.

Credit for Prior Learning is awarded for satisfactory performance on an approved examination. The list of acceptable exams is published on the website. Vertical credit may be awarded for students who place in a higher-level class in a sequence and successfully pass that class with a grade of "C" or better. This placement also requires instructor approval. Experiential-based prior learning is limited to 25% of credit required in student's declared major. Experiential-based portfolio assessment is available to those who can demonstrate competencies acquired through work and life experiences. Faculty consult is required for all experiential-based assessments.

Concern: Credit for Prior Learning information is available on the website but challenging for students to find.

ix. 1.C.9

The institution's graduate programs are consistent with its mission, are in keeping with the expectations of its respective disciplines and professions and are described through nomenclature that is appropriate to the levels of graduate and professional degrees offered. The graduate programs differ from undergraduate programs by requiring, among other things, greater: depth of study; demands on student intellectual or creative capacities; knowledge of the literature of the field; and ongoing student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression, and/or relevant professional practice.

CSI does not offer graduate-level courses or programs.

d. Standard 1.D: Student Achievement

i. 1.D.1

Consistent with its mission, the institution recruits and admits students with the potential to benefit from its educational programs. It orients students to ensure they understand the requirements related to their programs of study and receive timely, useful, and accurate information and advice about relevant academic requirements, including graduation and transfer policies.

The college is an open access institution. Its admissions policies are published on the website and in the catalog. Additional sources of information such as an Admissions Brochure, a CSI View Book, and a "Next Steps for New Students" section on the website are also available. Student orientation is offered as an in-person meeting and a student-led campus tour. Live and pre-recorded webinars on admissions, registration, and new student orientation are available to all students. Orientation topics focus on helping students navigate the college environment, transition to college life, and accomplish their intended completion, transfer or workforce placement goals.

Faculty advisors are available to provide information on specific degree and instructional programs. The college has recently moved to a one-stop enrollment advising model, which simplifies the student on-boarding experience by eliminating the need for students to see multiple people to get relevant information or satisfy admissions and registration business. This student-centered advising model also provides each student with a reliable, personable resource to help resolve unforeseen educational or personal issues.

ii. 1.D.2

Consistent with its mission and in the context of and in comparison, with regional and national peer institutions, the institution establishes and shares widely a set of indicators for student achievement including, but not limited to, persistence, completion, retention, and postgraduation success. Such indicators of student achievement should be disaggregated by race, ethnicity, age, gender, socioeconomic status, first generation college student, and any other institutionally meaningful categories that may help promote student achievement and close barriers to academic excellence and success (equity gaps).

CSI's performance measures of mission fulfillment are used to assess the achievement of core objectives associated with the college's four strategic goals: 1) cultivate community engagement; 2) optimize student success; 3) drive student success; 4) ensure institutional stability. The evaluation team observed nine of 21 indicators directly related to student achievement, which included metrics for student persistence, retention, graduation, transfer, and workforce training (postgraduation success).

The college has selected seven national peers and six regional peers to compare its results against. The evaluation team recognized the selection of these comparable peer institutions involved a strict criterion to guarantee that the peer institutions were as comparable as possible to

CSI's institutional, student, and cultural characteristics. This was particularly highlighted by representation of Hispanic Serving Institutions respective of the Mexican Hispanic student demographic. CSI is also evaluating possible peer institutions and comparative data points associated with the Postsecondary Data Partnership. The evaluation team confirmed CSI's finding that this rigorous process has limited the college peer-based comparable data to only IPEDS-defined retention and timely graduation rates. CSI has effectively leveraged this data to established reasonable fall-to-fall retention and 150% of time completion goals.

Most student achievement indicators are not disaggregated on the scorecard by Standard 1.D.2's expressed parameters. For example, the retention and graduation rate indicators are disaggregated on the scorecard only by high school GPA (3.0 or lower). The required disaggregation categories for enrollment, retention, persistence, degrees awarded, and graduation rates and other student indicators are evident on dashboards located on the college's "Data at a Glance" webpage. Similar disaggregated data for course and program learning assessment is made available to faculty on internal data dashboards and reports prepared prior to Assessment Week activities.

Concern: The evaluation team encourages the college to expand the application and transparency of these data disaggregations to other mission fulfillment KPIs such as the "Go On" Rate, Placement of CTE Completers, Academic Progress, Median Credits Earned, and the Non-CTE Transfer Rate. This is in harmony with the concern expressed on Standard 1.B.2.

iii. 1.D.3

The institution's disaggregated indicators of student achievement should be widely published and available on the institution's website. Such disaggregated indicators should be aligned with meaningful, institutionally identified indicators benchmarked against indicators for peer institutions at the regional and national levels and be used for continuous improvement to inform planning, decision making, and allocation of resources.

Some disaggregation of student achievement is published on the college's institutional scorecard. Data disaggregated by race, gender, first generation or socioeconomic status, and/or other characteristics important to the college are provided on the "Data-at-a-Glace" dashboards. Course and program learning outcome data is disaggregated on internal data

dashboards and published among faculty in student learning achievement reports preparatory to CSI's Assessment Week (see Standard 1.D.2).

The evaluation team found that some indicators of student achievement are benchmarked against national and regional peers, and these indicators are used to determine reasonable persistence and graduation rate goals (see Standard 1.D.2). CSI did provide evidence of disaggregated data on course and program learning outcomes.

Concern: The lack of disaggregation and transparency on some indicators of student access and student success makes it challenging for internal and external stakeholders to ascertain the value of the college as an inclusive and equity driven institution.

iv. 1.D.4

The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing indicators of student achievement are transparent and are used to inform and implement strategies and allocate resources to mitigate perceived gaps in achievement and equity.

CSI's Institutional Research department provides an impressive cadre of dashboards and reports, several of which explain the process by which data are referenced, collected, analyzed, and reported. Course and program learning outcome data are systematically provided to faculty and help support the institution's Assessment Week activities. Faculty also have access to course and program data for IDP/UPD document preparation, which is used to assess program improvement and determine resource allocation.

Updates to the Institutional Scorecard and CSI's strategic planning documents are provided in a timely manner for regular reporting to several constituencies such as the Board of Trustees, President's Cabinet, and various committees. CSI effectively demonstrated how these data are used to inform on the status of the college and implement new initiatives for college success. The evaluation team observed the absence of a consistent process by which these data can be reviewed and discussed at other levels of the college.

The evaluation team also observed how the Project Polaris team is leveraging the implementation a new ERP to bolster institutional data governance best practices. These habits include better data organization, improved data integration with existing data collection and other API platforms, and high-quality data definitions—definitions that provide both

a public facing glossary-type description and a behind-the-scenes technical description. Project Polaris team members noted how the strategically piecemeal implementation of Anthology will support general reporting, facilitate a report catalog, improve data integrity, and promote consistency among commonly reported data elements.

Concern: The evaluation team observed how the use of data to inform resource allocation and mitigate perceived equity gaps is not implemented across all college areas nor fully standardized in the college's planning processes.

VI. Summary

The College of Southern Idaho's Standard One Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness (EII) report was well-written and documented to provide a comprehensive self-appraisal of the institution. The main report and related documents clearly provided evidence of institutional planning and improvement centered on the College mission and strategic plan while recognizing areas of recent development and planned improvement.

The Evaluation Team found the site visit (albeit virtual) complimentary to the report and associated documents. The student-centered focus and spirit of collaboration among all college personnel was apparent and readily felt by students. The Evaluation Team appreciated the collegiality, candor, and transparency of college personnel throughout the visit. All materials and interactions served to recognize the college as a vibrant and innovative institution with leadership, participation, assessment practices, and planning activities that affirm CSI's mission as the College of Southern Idaho.

VII. Commendations and Recommendations

a. Commendations

The evaluation team commends the institution for its

1. Comprehensive and collaborative student-centered culture that guides institutional planning, strategy development, business decisions, community relations, and everyday academic and student support operations.

2. Commitment to access as evidenced by its dual credit programs.

3. Commitment to the continuous improvement of student learning through the systematic learning outcome assessment process.

b. Recommendations

The evaluation team recommends that the institution

1. Continue to expand assessment efforts to evaluate student learning in dual credit programs and instructional sites outside of the main campus (Standards 1.C.5, 1.C.6).