

June 2, 2015

Dr. George Ross President Central Michigan University 106 Warriner Hall Mount Pleasant, MI 48859

Dear President Ross:

Attached is the Quality Initiative Report (QIR) Review evaluation information. Central Michigan University's QIR showed genuine effort and has been accepted by the Commission. The attached reviewer evaluation contains a rationale for this outcome.

Peer reviewers evaluate all the QIRs based on the genuine effort of the institution: the seriousness of the undertaking, the significance of scope and impact of the work, the genuineness of the commitment to the initiative, and adequate resource provision.

If you have questions about the QIR reviewer information, please contact either Kathy Bijak (kbijak@hlcommission.org) or Pat Newton-Curran (pnewton@hlcommission.org).

Higher Learning Commission



Forms

Open Pathway

Quality Initiative Report Panel Review and Recommendation Form

The Quality Initiative panel review process confirms or questions the institution's effort in undertaking the Quality Initiative proposal approved by the Commission. As indicated in the explication of the review, the Quality Initiative process encourages institutions to take risks, innovate, take on a tough challenge, or pursue a yet unproven strategy or hypothesis. Thus, failure of an initiative to achieve its goals is acceptable. An institution may learn much from such failure. What is not acceptable is failure of the institution to pursue the initiative with genuine effort. Genuineness of effort, not success of the initiative, constitutes the focus of the Quality Initiative review and serves as its sole point of evaluation.

Name of Institution: Central Michigan University

State: Michigan

Institutional ID: 1313

Reviewers (name, title, institution):

Thomas J. Enneking **Executive Vice President and Provost** Marian University - Indianapolis

Jan M. Murphy

Interim Director, Campus Dining Services; Professor of Food, Nutrition & Dietetics Illinois State University

Date: July 14, 2015

II.

T	O 114	T • 4 • 4 •	D .
1	Onality	Initiative	Review

<u>X</u>	The institution demonstrated its seriousness of the undertaking.	
<u>X</u>	The institution demonstrated that the initiative had scope and impact.	
<u>X</u>	The institution demonstrated a commitment to and engagement in the initiative.	
_X	The institution demonstrated adequate resource provision.	
Recommendation		
<u>X</u>	The panel confirms genuine effort on the part of the institution.	
	The panel cannot confirm genuine effort on the part of the institution.	

III. Rationale (required)

Promoting Academic Challenge: Taking Stock and Moving Forward

The primary goal of this Quality Initiative was to develop strategies for producing an academically challenging environment for Central Michigan University students. Building upon previous work of several faculty committees, the institution established a Quality Initiative Leadership Team with institution-wide representation. Within the first year, the focus was narrowed to 100- and 200-level courses with an emphasis on General Education courses. In year two, a new Director of General Education was hired, and a variety of significant resources were initiated including a Teaching and Learning Toolkit, an extended faculty orientation program, an online student orientation module, and a Writing Intensive Project for the General Education program. The development of these resources, while somewhat incomplete, with limited documented intermediate assessment of results, demonstrates widespread commitment to the project and significant faculty, staff and student engagement. The University committed appropriate resources to this project and has expended these resources in meaningful ways. An Evaluation Plan, by design, will document the use of the Toolkit and student access to resources but not the actual effectiveness of the project in increasing the academic rigor and challenge of the undergraduate education. The University is encouraged to continue its work on not only developing these importance resources but implementing them and then to determine evaluation processes which will close the loop between measurable outcomes of these various projects and their impact on students' academic performance.

