**Assessment Report Feedback 2012**

**For Admissions Department**

**Assessment Report Feedback 2012**

**For Admissions Department**

This Assessment Report is reviewed and requires some revisions before it can be approved. **Please submit a revised Report by Aug. 15** the SHARE website using a separate dropbox labeled, “Resubmission of revised departmental files.”

The Committee decided to *not* use the “SS,” “S,” “O,” “OO” scoring approach this year. The checklist and comments below are intended to make the evaluation process a little more transparent. The checklist was derived from the Template Instructions document posted in both [www.nmu.edu/aqip](http://www.nmu.edu/aqip) and the SHARE website. Comments on this page are a brief analysis of strengths and opportunities; detailed comments are embedded within your report that follows. Please take them into account as you undertake revisions. If you have questions, a member of the committee will be happy to meet with you.

*Service Assessment Committee*

Since the Objectives and Means of Assessment were evaluated when the Plan was submitted last year, they were not re-evaluated. However, the committee did re-read them in light of the reported results.

|  |
| --- |
| General Comments: |
| Could you please provide more information on data summary for Obj #3. It seems somewhat incomplete. See comments within.  Other comments should be taken into consideration for next year’s reporting, but if you want to address any questions now you are certainly free to do so. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effective Summary of Data Collected meets the following criteria** | Obj #1  Met? | Obj #2  Met? | Obj #3 Met? |
| Includes a narrative summary that states whether the objective was met. If details are attached in separate file, this should still contain a summary. | Y | Y | Y/N |
| For on-going measured goals, trend data for multiple year data are given, preferably in a row/column format. If the data is complex, lengthy, or in chart format, a separate document (clearly labeled with unit name and title) was submitted | Y/N | Y | N  Incomp. |
| For a measured goal, data is summarized here. If the data is complex, lengthy, or in chart format, submit a separate document (clearly labeled with unit name and title) |
| For a process or product development or a study indicates, item by item, whether the planned steps were accomplished. If not, briefly states why. Submits copy of finished product (URL, report, policy, handbook) or URL to posting on website. |
| For surveys, provide sample size, response rate/size, and distribution of answers for key items. |
| Compares to peer institutions/programs or normed values, when applicable | N? | N | N |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Effective Actions Taken to Improve Program(s) based on data meets the following criteria** | Obj #1  Met? | Obj #2  Met? | Obj #3 Met? |
| States what was learned by analyzing the data. Identifies strengths and areas to improve. | Y | Y | Y |
| Supplies evidence of past or planned use of data analysis to improve or assess whether past intervention was successful. | Y | Y | Y |
| Assesses the collection process (acceptable and to be continued, sample judged too small to be valid and suggests new measures, etc.) or the steps taken to complete the task (should plans be more detailed in the future, were dates reasonable, etc.?) | N | Y | N |
| Explains how the data are shared within the department and/or between departments. (Too often reports get filed w/o enough exposure, reducing the likelihood of changes, i.e. we work in silos.) | Y/N | Y | Y |
| States process used within the unit to analyze the outcome or data, e.g. unit head, committee, entire unit staff? Was this part of a regularly scheduled meeting or strategic planning discussion? Etc. AQIP is particularly keen to know how decisions are made and shared. | Y | Y | Y |

(Your report and detailed comments begin on the next page)

**Northern Michigan University**

**OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN/REPORT FORM**

**Administrative or Educational Support Unit**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of Department or Unit | | Admissions | | | |
| This document is the | PLAN or X REPORT for July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012 | | | Date Submitted: | 7/1/12 |
| Submitted by (Unit Representative) | | |  | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department or Unit Mission Statement: Was this mission statement revised this year? Yes X No** |
| The Admissions Office is responsible for undergraduate student recruitment, including disseminating information, processing applications for admission to undergraduate programs and hosting potential students. |

**Functions within the University:**

|  |
| --- |
| In addition to being part of NMU’s continuous improvement process, outcomes assessment plays a direct role with the AQIP Systems Portfolio (100-page document submitted every four years). To increase awareness and help gather Portfolio information, **please type “X” for all AQIP categories directly related to your unit’s core mission**. Some functions appear in more than one category. This is a first round collection of this information so do the best you can with the selection; if you want help, ask S. Poindexter. (Note: this section of the form is short-term; it will be deleted once functions have been mapped between units and the Systems Portfolio.)  **🞎** AQIP Category 1: Helping Students Learn documents the curricular and co-curricular processes and student learning support.  **X** AQIP Category 2: Accomplishing Other Distinctive Objectives documents the key non-curricular functions by which NMU serves the region, e.g. community engagement initiatives of students and employees, and department outreach.  **X**AQIP Category 3: Understanding Students’ and Other Stakeholders’ Needs documents how NMU builds relationships with students, alumni and employers and identifies, targets and meets their needs.  **🞎** AQIP Category 4: Valuing People documents NMU personnel recruitment, training, satisfaction, services and programs.  **🞎** AQIP Category 5: Leading and Communicating documents processes that guide NMU in setting directions, making decisions, seeking future opportunities, and communicating decisions and actions.  **X** AQIP Category 6: Supporting Institutional Operations documents student and administrative support services, safety, and facilities.  **🞎** AQIP Category 7: Measuring Effectiveness documents IT systems and institutional research NMU employs to collect, analyze, and distribute, and how departments use them to manage improvement, e.g. use of charts, “cubes,” dashboards.  **🞎** AQIP Category 8: Planning Continuous Improvement documents NMU’s strategic and administrative planning processes.  **X** AQIP Category 9: Building Collaborative Relationships documents how NMU works with external organizations from which we receive students (school systems) or goods and services (vendors and utilities), send our graduates (schools and employers), and support or regulate our programs (agencies).  (A full description of the Portfolio’s categories and its detailed topics are available at [www.nmu.edu/aqip](http://www.nmu.edu/aqip) under the Current Document tab.) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Administrative Objective #1** *(State an ongoing goal by which the unit gauges its overall performance in a key role year after year, i.e. your “bottom line” measure.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** *(Describe the statistic or criteria that measures success in achieving this goal. What is the desired and/or minimum target you expect*? *What method is used to collect the data for the statistic*?) |
| The Admissions Office utilizes a territory management model for new student recruitment, so it is important that our regional configurations (targeted schools/fairs, geographic boundaries, staffing) are effective. We have a process in place to monitor and analyze the effectiveness of our regional model annually and change regional boundaries, personnel assignments or related processes as indicated by the analysis. |  | Success of the region configuration is gauged by several indicators: productivity of high school and community college visits (number of students seen, receptivity of guidance staff); productivity of college fairs and other programs in the region; numbers of students inquiring, applying, completing the application process, and enrolling from the regions. Our databases (Banner, Prospect) for high schools, colleges, agencies and prospective students/applicants are all programmed to trigger regional codes based on zip code and other triggers; staff members are assigned by region. Our process is to review field reports, program/event reports, and ReportNet reports about student activity for trends, regional comparisons to one another and against market conditions, and expected activity. If the activity is meeting expectations, we continue with the same regional configuration for the next recruitment cycle (defined as Sept-August). If activity is not meeting expectations, we adjust the model in a way the data supports. Analysis takes place at several points in the cycle: after 10th day enrollment data is available in late September; in January, looking at application counts and mid-year reports; in May-June, as we evaluate orientation registrations against regional enrollment targets set during the previous November. |
| **Summary of Data Collected** *(Provide trend data and summarize)* |  | **Describe how results were used to improve services** |
| This objective was met: We followed our process to monitor and analyze the effectiveness of our regional model.  Fall 2011 enrollment data was assessed in September-November 2011; Fall 2012 activity (prospects, applications, admissions, orientation reservations) have been tracked weekly since October 1. Follow-up team activity is collected weekly, and input is sought monthly from territory managers regarding trends in their regions. In addition to the regional configurations we’ve held historically, we are tracking changes made to regions in Illinois and Wisconsin during this cycle, as well as to some new market regions (Atlanta, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Tampa, Dallas, Houston, San Diego and San Francisco) with staff submitting activity summaries for each of those endeavors, as well as comprehensive New Market Analysis being conducted in June 2012 in order to make recommendations to the chair of EMN for 2012-2013 activity. Demographic information/trends and data regarding high school class size in U.P. high schools has been collected and analyzed.  As of June 13, 2012, the orientation registration data indicated heaviest declines in Michigan (with the largest portion from the U.P.). Although we have declines in WI, those are not in the regions we reconfigured, where we show modest gains or holding steady. We show gains in IL. Data changes daily; point in time comparison data are available weekly. Final enrollment data will not be available until late September.  Comments:   * -For clarity, please start with one sentence to indicate whether or not the objectives were met, then go into the narrative. * -Since this is an ongoing measure, can you provide actual trend data to compare (ex. # applications, admissions, orientation reservations)? Referencing a summarized spreadsheet, submitted separately, would suffice or providing a composite table (ex. rows/columns with years/territories). We examine data weekly (apps/admits/orientations) with an annual snapshot in late September. We also review field reports, demographic trends, staff assessments of activity within regions, etc., so a summarized spreadsheet would not provide the full basis upon which regional configuration decisions are made. * -Is there any sense of how our trends match other MI schools, or does that question not really apply here? This does not apply. |  | Our region configuration changes in WI and IL (with impact on region “Other” and new market regions) seem to be working. Preliminary analysis supports continuation of that region configuration for the next recruitment cycle. Staff members in those regions are working on plans for targeted outreach within those markets to further impact the enrollment results. We have identified several of our new markets (tested in 2011-12) for which data and staff analysis indicate there is potential for new enrollments with continued activity during 2012-13. Those are being presented to the chair of the Enrollment Management Network (EMN).  Comments:  -Briefly, what kinds of changes were made to the regional configurations? See underlined sentence above. Changes are not being made for the next cycle.  -How are your configuration changes working? Did it bring in more prospects, admission, etc. (Analyze trend data for an ongoing metric) The changes we made previously are working in that we have been able to be more targeted in some markets (WIW, WIS, CHI) and expand our reach to test new markets—without adding staff.  -Though it’s a bit beyond Admissions’ boundary, can you add anything to the last sentence to say what happens to the data after going to the chair? Is there a process by which it gets acted upon, i.e. what’s the next step? Discussion occurs within subcommittees of EMN (FTFT Freshmen Subcommittee; Transfer and Non-Traditional Subcommittee) regarding results, needs, potential new strategies) and then shared with the full EMN.  -In a reflection on this annual *procedure*, is it working well or do you think some tweaks are needed? This procedure is working well. |
| **Administrative Objective #2** *(State a 1-2 year objective intended to improve a unit process, service, or output.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Objective* : Continue with phase 2 of our 2010-11 project to create and implement a process to accurately reflect student status in the Prospect System and Banner as students change from being prospective freshmen to prospective transfer students. Our goal is to reduce the number of incomplete freshman applications and increase the number of transfer prospects and applicants by more accurately capturing student intent.  *Rationale (Why you are setting this objective; mark with “X”)*:  X Effectiveness/quality action Efficiency/cost action  Compliance issue Satisfaction measure X Create baseline  Other (explain):  *Does this objective relate to a Road Map goal? (Refer to last page for the Road Map goals). If yes, type the related Road Map codes here*: |  | *Describe timetable plans to achieve objective*.  a. By August 15, revise and print student contact cards with new fields to collect prospective student “intend to transfer” information.  b. By August 29, revise Access Database and use staff in-service to document and train staff in the process.  c. By August 29, revise inquiry response letters/coding to address “intend to transfer” scenarios based on student data collection.  d. By September 30, run comparison reports of Fall 2011 prospects with intent indicator NOT enrolled and change student type and term in Prospect so reports can capture this group for follow-up by transfer counselors.  e. By January 15, run reports of those prospects coded as “intend to transfer” and summarize staff feedback regarding the process.  f. By January 15, run reports of those applicants coded “09” and send incomplete letter for future term.  g. By April 1, assess effectiveness of steps taken based on numbers of F-to-T applicants who completed process, as well as considering student feedback (collect unsolicited comments from students) regarding communication and staff feedback (survey staff) about ease of process.  h. Adjust for next cycle as indicated by feedback.  *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success?[[1]](#endnote-1) Examples: If the rationale was Efficiency/cost, what is the desired and/or minimum target criteria for savings in time or cost? If the rationale was Satisfaction, what is the measure and what increase is desired*?  Our goal is to reduce the number of incomplete freshman applications and increase the number of transfer prospects and applicants by more accurately capturing student intent and communicating appropriately. Since we track incomplete apps weekly throughout the cycle and can run reports of point-in-time transfer prospects, we will be measuring the change from previous cycles to assess success. |
| **Summary of Data Collected** (*Summarize the evidence)* |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** |
| 2a, b, c. A field was added to our inquiry cards and database so prospective students could indicate and we could collect information regarding a college/university that the student MAY attend prior to coming to NMU. Staff training occurred during in-service (8/11). Reports were created to capture prospective students with this flag and a letter was created and sent to the appropriate population.  2d. We determined that there was not sufficient numbers of prospects to run comparison reports at this point in the process. Prospect reports were run and given to transfer counselor for follow-up. Beginning with the Fall 2012 semester however, as we now have 156 Freshman prospects with the P-NMU flag, we can check to see if they are enrolled at NMU (after 10th day of Fall 2012 semester), and if not, follow-up as prospective transfer students.  2e. Those students who we confirmed intend to transfer were updated to “T” student type, transfer student, within Banner and were coded with 09 decision code (09 = intent to transfer). These students then become incomplete transfer applicants with the missing item CLT (college transcript) added to their checklist.  2f. This step was adjusted mid-stream. In January the ‘09’ report returned 30 names. It was determined that individual follow-up from the transfer counselors was a better fit because these students are also not part of the standard incomplete letter process, and therefore contact by admissions counselors on their incomplete status made sense. As of early June, transfer counselors are following up with 33 students currently in this group as their college semesters have just ended and they are still in the normal incomplete follow-up time frame.  2g. Two students from the January report continued in the admissions funnel with one being admitted for Fall 2012 and one being denied. Overall there has been very little feedback on the entire process. Based on the transfer coordinator’s review of application files and reports, the processing staff is well aware of when to place the 09 on an application based on emails and update forms submitted by counseling staff. He is unsure if counseling staff actually understand the entire process. He has heard informally of email referrals to the transfer counselors as was done under the old system. Feedback needs to be actively pursued.  2h. See “use of results to improve unit services”  *As of May 30 2012 reporting we have identified the following:*  *Prospective students who informed us they may opt to go to a school prior to NMU (Prospect flag P-NMU) prior to enrolling at NMU in 201280= 156.*  *Prospective students who informed us they may opt to go to a school prior to NMU (Prospect flag P-NMU) prior to enrolling at NMU in 201380= 93.*  *Prospective students who informed us they may opt to go to a school prior to NMU (Prospect flag P-NMU) prior to enrolling at NMU in 201480= 14.*  *Prospective students who informed us they may opt to go to a school prior to NMU (Prospect flag P-NMU) prior to enrolling at NMU in 201580= 1.*  *Prospective students who informed us they may opt to go to a school prior to NMU (Prospect flag P-NMU) prior to enrolling at NMU in 201680= 3.*  *Prospective students who informed us they may opt to go to a school prior to NMU (Prospect flag P-NMU) prior to enrolling at NMU in 201780= 1.*  *Admitted students who informed us that were attending a school prior to coming to NMU in 201280=33*  *Admitted students who informed us that were attending a school prior to coming to NMU in 2013 or beyond = 20*  Just a note: a tabular format would be easier to see for the above 8 items. (Okay—did not realize we could submit data outside of this report format.)  Comments:  Is there any sense of peer comparison, i.e. is this something other schools are doing or are we up front here? We are not aware of other schools doing this. |  | Adjustments needed:  The ‘09’ students do not show up on the standard incomplete applicant reports, which makes sense for some tracking reasons, but is cumbersome in that another report must be run. The ‘09’ report needs to be run and distributed to transfer counselors more consistently, similar to our ‘45’ report (45= requesting current transcript). Thinking of these two groups ‘together’ will enable better follow-up practices.  Although a training document was distributed and discussed with the counseling staff during the Fall in-service, and subsequent reminders emailed about the process, it is recommended that further training take place. This process can be cumbersome within the context of all required data tracking and follow-up for staff. Breaking it into two parts may make it clearer for those involved.  Processing staff have caught on well as is evidenced the number or correctly coded P-NMU prospects and 09 F to T admits. However, quality of data is dependent on input from counseling staff.  We have good beginning data to work with and follow-up will continue this summer to make use of this year’s initial data. Data for future terms is already accumulating. Having been through the cycle once will greatly enhance our ability to run routine reports and take action.  Tracking issues we need to finalize:  If a student intends to pursue more than one year at the prior college how do we account for that? Will we be able to track those effectively? Do we have adequate tracking for students who do become enrolled after being ‘09’? Will we be able to identify success?  Comments: Well analyzed and reported. |
| **Administrative Objective #3** *(State a 1-2 year objective intended to improve a unit process, service, or output.)* |  | **Means/Evidence of Assessment for Objective** |
| *Objective*: The Admissions Office must document “validity of high school diploma” for our admitted students prior to enrollment. This is a Federal compliance issue. We have had a “proof of high school graduation” process in place for decades, but we should improve and document the process against “best practice” guidelines provided by professional associations (National Association for College Admission Counseling, American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators).  *Rationale (Why you are setting this objective? Mark with “X”)*:  X Effectiveness/quality action Efficiency/cost action  XCompliance issue Satisfaction measure Create baseline  Other (explain):  *Does this objective relate to a Road Map goal? (Refer to last page for the Road Map goals). If yes, type the related Road Map codes here*: |  | Describe timetable plans to achieve objective.  a. By July 1, review regulations, compliance guidance, and best practice suggestions. Create electronic file on shared network to document policy, resources and our process.  b. By July 25, processing staff will log all final transcripts received as of that date, with ongoing communication to those with transcripts indicating no diploma, and documentation of checking any schools or documents that do not appear valid. Run reports of those noted as “not graduated” and reports of those for whom proof of high school graduation is still not provided. Meet with Financial Aid staff to determine timing of financial aid holds and language of next communication.  c. By August 3, send letters to active admits still needing proof of graduation.  d. On August 15, provide data to Financial Aid so holds can be placed appropriately. Note number of active admits still missing documentation to establish baseline measure and also compare against August 2010 before “holds” process and language was added.  e. By September 15, begin process of comparing enrolled students final documents to requirements, placing holds and notifying students. Note number still missing documents as baseline and comparison to Fall 2010.  f. By Nov. 1, review process with Financial Aid and Registrar’s Office. Make changes in process and documentation as needed.  *Beyond completing the above steps, how will you judge whether the objective was a success*?1  We will know if the objective was a success if the documentation is complete, if the number of newly enrolled students still missing final transcripts in Fall 2011 is less than in Fall 2010, and if the process enabled the Financial Aid Office to ensure compliance with Federal regulations. |
| **Summary of Data Collected (**Summarize the evidence) |  | **Use of Results to Improve Unit Services** |
| 3a. A “Federal Regulations-NMU Policies” file was created on the shared network. File contains documents summarizing Federal regulations and best practices from numerous sources as well as NMU policies and procedures. Documentation was reviewed and updated in May 2012 in anticipation of this process for Fall 2012 admits.  3b c d. Processing staff entered all final high school transcript data and alerted director to cases where there were questions about validity or graduation. Reports were created and run regularly and research and communication to students occurred as appropriate. Admissions and Financial Aid staff agreed to a process for FA holds in August. Process was altered slightly to focus on active admits who had attended or registered for an orientation, as opposed to the much longer list of all active admits. Did you establish baseline data? The number of active admits who have attended/registered for orientation still missing high school transcripts in mid-August will vary every year, but yes, we can track the number.  3e. After10th day reporting, the percentage of enrolled new freshmen still missing the final high school transcript was 1.41%(25) for Fall 2011 as compared to1.95% (33) for Fall 2010. Holds insured no financial aid would be disbursed prior to verification of high school graduation to comply with Federal regulations.  f. was this completed? Preliminary review occurred in fall 2011, but a final review was conducted in July 2012 as a precursor to conducting the process again with August 1 reporting and communication.  Comments:  -Please upload separately the resulting Federal Regulations-NMU Policies document or give a link to it on the network. It becomes part of the Outcomes evidence file. (Done)  -Regarding compliance, is there a minimum threshold that is required? (this relates to the last item in the checklist on cover page) Is it tied to financial aid or any freshman admit?  Perhaps a small explanation or link to the compliance statement would be helpful. The compliance issues is tied to financial aid in terms of the new rule to assure high school completion prior to aid being disbursed, but it is also in line with NMU admission and continued enrollment policies. An interpretation of the Federal policy can be found here: http://www.nacacnet.org/issues-advocacy/LegislativeNews/Documents/FinalRules.pdf |  | We have used these results to improve the following services and processes:  1. Changed our process for adding the “HSTF” final transcript indicator on the application checklist on Banner. This results in two improvements: a) Applicants reviewing the online application status check tool are alerted earlier in the process that a final high school transcript will be needed and can verify when it is received; b) Our reports that filter on HSTF indicator are more accurate, resulting in more accurate communication to admitted students.  2. Streamlined the target group for action by the Financial Aid Office. Historically, a large group of active admits (students admitted who have not notified us to cancel their admission) never respond to our calls to action to register for orientation or notify us they do not plan to enroll at NMU. Using resources to place holds on those students did not make sense, so we concentrated on the sub-group of active admits who had attended or were registered to attend orientation. This resulted in a more manageable process for Financial Aid staff, while still resulting in compliance.  Comments:  You could reflect briefly on the process on completing this objective – was it effective? The process was effective. |
|  |  |  |

Many service units already use an evaluative measure and this approach is now more common in assessment theory– not everything we try works out the way as hoped and creating a target and/or success/bail out threshold is appropriate. In cases where this is a new approach for a unit, in the 2011-12 Plan consider how you *might* measure the added value of an objective; however, it is not yet a requirement. The OA committee will provide suggestions in its feedback for this year. During the year, dialogues, additional resources, one-on-one meetings and/or seminars will be held to evolve our OA process.

**Road Map Codes to Tie to Unit Objectives**

Some unit objectives may address specific operational issues. Other unit objectives are strategic initiatives that align with goals in the University strategic plan - Road Map to 2015. These latter unit objectives are potential AQIP Action Projects – giving a little more recognition to unit efforts. Listed below are Road Map categories and goals, preceded with a code. Use these codes when describing Objectives #2 and #3. (Note: Even if your objective is not an exactly itemized as a Road Map priority, still use the code if it applies to that goal.) The full Road Map is at [www.nmu.edu/roadmap2015](http://www.nmu.edu/roadmap2015).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Road Map to 2015 Goals*** | |
| ***Code*** | ***Innovation Goals*** |
| **I-1** | Balance successful programs with new offerings |
| **I-2** | Professional development program that rewards innovation and collaboration |
| **I-3** | A growing portfolio of corporate collaborations that exploit NMU’s technical expertise, enhance academic programs and facilitate global engagement for students and faculty both on campus and abroad |
| **I-4** | Develop the financial resources to support innovation and student success |
|  | ***Meaningful Lives Goals*** |
| **ML-1** | A Liberal Studies Program that provides students with the abilities and knowledge necessary for lifelong learning and effective citizenship in a challenging and rapidly changing world |
| **ML-2** | Develop a new academic advising system that integrates the advising assets of academic departments and student services to contribute to a new, effective retention management network—similar to our enrollment management network |
| **ML-3** | Integrate the highest possible level of information technology skills and competencies throughout the university |
|  | ***Campus Attributes Goals*** |
| **CA-1** | Utilize the Campus Master Plan and related initiatives to continue to build and develop a greener and more learner-centered campus |
| **CA-2** | Enhance processes throughout campus operations to guide the use of resources and inform resource allocation |
| **CA-3** | Enhance the portfolio of academic programs, research and other activities that leverage the university’s location |
| **CA-4** | Be a model community for sustainable education and practices |
|  | ***Community Engagement Goals*** |
| **CE-1** | Include all units of the campus in the process of community engagement for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity. |
| **CE-2** | Increase faculty, staff and student involvement in the Superior Edge program, academic service learning and other community engagement and leadership development initiatives. |
| **CE-3** | Put into action a commitment to be an inclusive community where differences are recognized as assets of the institution, respected attributes of the person and a valuable part of the university experience |
| **CE-4** | Increase collaboration with local communities, schools, governments, development groups and other partners to enhance community and economic development in the Upper Peninsula. |

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)