

July 6, 2022

Dr. Michael Crow President Arizona State University P.O. Box 877705 Tempe, Arizona 85287-7705

Dear President Crow,

This letter is accompanied by the Quality Initiative Report (QIR) Review form completed by a peer review panel. Arizona State 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



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 HLC. 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.

Submit the final report as a Word document to HLC at hlccmmission.org/upload. Select "Pathways/Quality Initiatives" from the list of submission options to ensure the report is sent to the correct HLC staff member. The file name for the report should follow this format: QI Report Review <Name of Institution>.

Name of Institution: Arizona State University

State: AZ

Institutional ID: 1002

Reviewers (names, titles, institutions): Kristin L. Mallory, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Wor-Wic Community College; Patrick Oliver, Director of the Criminal Justice Program, Cedarville University

Date: 6-30-22

I. Quality Initiative Review

☑ The institution demonstrated its seriousness of the undertaking.
☑ The institution demonstrated that the initiative had scope and impact.
☑ The institution demonstrated a commitment to and engagement in the initiative.
☑ The institution demonstrated adequate resource provision.

Audience: Peer Reviewers

orm

Published: September 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Open Pathway Quality Initiative Contact: 800.621.7440

Page 1

II. Recommendation

☐ 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)

The University's Quality initiative developed and piloted an infrastructure for general education assessment, using best practices in assessment to provide a more accurate and consistent reflection of students' knowledge and skills gained during their time at the university. Four key lessons have been learned by the university from this project. First, university leadership is essential for engaging faculty, including considerations for additional compensation and funding for assessment work. Second, facilitating the proper interplay of assessment artifacts and scorers to successful assessment across a large scale. Third, the development of robust assessment technology designed to match other data systems is essential for the assessment of general education on a large scale. Fourth, university-level authority is necessary to coordinate communication across academic units, analyze data, and recommend continuous improvement across the entire university curriculum.

The University provided significant evidence of its efforts to develop and implement a new infrastructure for general education student assessment. Two different methodologies for assessment were evaluated by the university identified as Approach One and Approach Two. Both approaches included course-embedded artifacts, a nationally normed rubric, and rubric training and norming. The project also evaluated the resources necessary to support the expanded assessment approach to include faculty responsibilities and time, and assessment technology.

The commitment to general education assessment and student learning was demonstrated by harmonizing assessments across all three Arizona public universities. They accessed one of four competencies each year- written composition, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, and civic engagement. To implement this quality initiative, they had to define the technology, train specialized staff, and provide the financial needs for this type of assessment. The university coordinated collaboration between the writing faculty and assessment personnel to gain buy-in and support to measure assessment results.

The University committed a significant amount of human and technological resources to implement this quality initiative. They hired three graduate student workers providing wages and benefits to function as external scorers for Approach One. A management research analyst was hired with salary and benefits for Approach Two for an 18-month term to conduct research, train faculty scorers, and write project reports. To facilitate Approach Two, faculty raters were paid supplemental stipends totaling over \$40,000. Additionally, several existing faculty and staff were used to develop, analyze, and summarize this project. The collaboration for the QI was comprehensive and included 14 different offices of the University along with the Arizona Board of Regents and the American Association of Colleges and Universities.

The University deserves praise for its willingness to take on a comprehensive quality initiative of this size and scope to improve the general education curriculum and increase student performance. The QIR is well written and is consistent with the documentation required in the benchmark areas identified. It also includes eight key lessons learned that will be applied to their continued pursuit of this initiative.

Audience: Peer Reviewers

Form

Published: September 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Open Pathway Quality Initiative Contact: 800.621.7440