



June 25, 2019

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

Dear President Crow:

This letter is accompanied by the Quality Initiative Proposal (QIP) Review form completed by a peer review panel. Arizona State University's QIP is approved.

Within the QIP Review form, you will find comments from the panel for your consideration as you proceed with your Quality Initiative. The panel reviewed the QIP for four areas:

- Sufficiency of initiative's scope and significance
- Clarity of initiative's purpose
- Evidence of commitment to and capacity for accomplishing the initiative
- Appropriateness of the timeline for the initiative

If you have questions about the panel's review, please contact either Kathy Bijak (kbijak@hlcommission.org) or Pat Newton-Curran (pnewton@hlcommission.org). For any questions about your Quality Initiative, contact your Commission liaison, Linnea Stenson, at lstenon@hlcommission.org.

The Higher Learning Commission

Open Pathway Quality Initiative Proposal Review Form

Date of Review: June 14, 2019

Name of Institution: Arizona State University State: Arizona

Institutional ID: 1002

Reviewers (names, titles, institutions): Dr. Anne Drougas, Professor of Finance, Dominican University,
Dr. Tami Eggleston, Associate Provost and Professor of Psychology, McKendree University

Review Categories and Findings

1. Sufficiency of the Initiative's Scope and Significance

- Potential for significant impact on the institution and its academic quality
- Alignment with the institution's mission and vision
- Connection with the institution's planning processes
- Evidence of significance and relevance at this time

Finding:

The Quality Initiative proposal demonstrates acceptable scope and significance.

The Quality Initiative proposal does not demonstrate acceptable scope and significance.

Rationale and Comments: (Provide two to three statements justifying the finding and recommending minor modifications, if applicable. Provide any comments, such as highlighting strong points, raising minor concerns or cautions, or identifying questions.)

ASU's Quality Initiative Project is the assessment of undergraduate, authentic student work products. Embedded within the first-year course experience, ASU leverages existing technology, early intervention strategies, academic program assessment, and digital e-Portfolios with its analytical planning model, Civitas. The impact of mission is evidenced by careful sequencing of courses across the undergraduate general education and how those skills scaffold as students transition through major fields of study. ASU has a history of assessing student learning and has used the CLA and ETS proficiency profile. ASU will use the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. General Education and Assessment are appropriate in scope and significance for a quality initiative.

2. Clarity of the Initiative's Purpose

- Clear purposes and goals reflective of the scope and significance of the initiative
- Defined milestones and intended goals
- Clear processes for evaluating progress

Finding:

- The Quality Initiative proposal demonstrates clarity of purpose.
- The Quality Initiative proposal does not demonstrate clarity of purpose.

Rationale and Comments:

Utilizing AAC&U Value Rubrics as a guide, ASU's Quality Initiative has clear processes for evaluating progress. ASU outlines mechanisms for benchmarking baseline student undergraduate general education requirements, including training faculty to supply student evidence within e-Portfolios and rating evidence within the portfolio. Leadership of the general core will review data yearly and make adjustments as appropriate. Milestones include benchmark assignments in English Composition and additional assignments throughout students' academic career. Intended goals include drawing a representative sample of students to evaluate assignments by trained faculty. ASU has a clear evaluation process with pre-test/post-tests, a senior-level assignment, and sampling procedures. This report made it clear that ASU has a history of assessment work and is committed to continuous improvement with their assessment activities.

3. Evidence of Commitment to and Capacity for Accomplishing the Initiative

- Commitment of senior leadership
- Commitment and involvement of key people and groups
- Sufficiency of the human, financial, technological, and other resources
- Defined plan for integrating the initiative into the ongoing work of the institution and sustaining its results
- Clear understanding of and capacity to address potential obstacles

Finding:

- The Quality Initiative proposal demonstrates evidence of commitment and capacity.
- The Quality Initiative proposal does not demonstrate evidence of commitment and capacity.

Rationale and Comments:

ASU administrators and the faculty senate charged a faculty committee to lead this work. ASU has also committed to technology resources such as digital e-Portfolios. Senior Leadership, faculty and staff committed to piloting the program in 2013 with 300 students via the creation of digital e-portfolios. Key stakeholders in the Offices of the Provost, Student Success, Accreditation, and Program Review work with teams of faculty and staff to ensure AAC&U VALUE rubrics are applied. Adequate resources, both financial and technological, are secured, as evidenced by the 62,000 users of the Student Success Suite of e-tools being employed to monitor the undergraduate first-year experience.

4. Appropriateness of the Timeline for the Initiative

- Consistency with intended purposes and goals
- Alignment with the implementation of other institutional priorities
- Reasonable implementation plan for the time period

Finding:

- The Quality Initiative proposal demonstrates an appropriate timeline.
- The Quality Initiative proposal does not demonstrate an appropriate timeline.

Rationale and Comments:

The General Education Core is at the heart of ASU's mission. The academic timeline built into the plan leverages institutional learning from the 2013 pilot program. The timeline includes the review of the plan by senior leadership, the university curriculum committee, and faculty and staff. During the initial semester, faculty are trained in developing assignments appropriate for assessment. Assignments are then administered via e-Portfolios in the subsequent academic year. As assignments are administered, faculty are further trained on VALUE rubrics. In the final year, VALUE rubrics are applied by professionals for presentation of findings. ASU provided a detailed Spring 2019 timeline with clear activities on faculty training, committees, etc. The years following 2019 were less detailed (e.g., train faculty, assess, present preliminary findings). These timelines may want to be a bit more specific with months, the individuals/committees responsible, any measurables or specific things that will be collected at each point (e.g., May 2020, there will be a faculty training on rubrics, faculty will submit surveys to the XX committee by August, 2020, etc.).

5. **General Observations and Recommended Modifications:** (Panel members may provide considerations and suggested modifications that the institution should note related to its proposed Quality Initiative.)

General education assessment is a significant undertaking and while challenging can certainly improve student learning. ASU is commended for tackling these issues. ASU has a history of assessment activities and has also made a commitment to technology to support their activities. ASU has a strong team of individuals and committees to support their activities. ASU also has clear goals and processes in place. A more detailed

timeline with activities, committees, workshops, measurables, etc. may help the initiative to be completely implemented.

6. Conclusion:

- Approve the proposed Quality Initiative with or without recommended minor modifications. No further review required.
- Request resubmission of the proposed Quality Initiative

Rationale and Expectations if Requesting Resubmission

Timeline and Process for Resubmission (the Commission staff will add this section if the recommendation is for resubmission)
