Focused Visit Report

After the team reaches a consensus, the team chair completes this form to summarize and document the team's view. Notes and evidence should be essential and concise. **Note:** If the visit involved more than five areas of focus, please contact the institution's HLC staff liaison for an expanded version of this form.

Submit the completed draft report to the institution's HLC staff liaison. When the report is final, submit it as a single PDF file at hlcommission.org/upload. Select "Final Reports" from the list of submission options to ensure the report is sent to the correct HLC staff member.

Institution: Minot State University

City, State: Minot, ND

Visit Date: 10/05 - 10/06/2020

Names of Peer Reviewers (List the names, titles and affiliations of each peer reviewer. The team chair should note that designation in parenthesis.)

Dr. Christine E. Austin, Dir. Of Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness, Arkansas Tech University

Mr. Wesley Tschetter, Vice President of Finance and Business/CFO-Emeritus, South Dakota State University

Ms. Judith Siminoe, Special Advisor to the President, St. Cloud State University, (Chair)

Part A: Context and Nature of Visit

1. **Purpose of the Visit** (Provide the visit description from the Evaluation Summary Sheet.)

The Board reaffirmed the accreditation of the institution and assigned interim monitoring. The institution meets Core Components 2.A, 3.A, 4.B, and 5.C with concerns. The institution is required to host a focused visit no later than June 30, 2020.

2. **Accreditation Status**

☒   Accredited

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 1

☐ Accredited—On Notice

☐ Accredited—On Probation

3. Organizational Context

Minot State prepared and participated in its ten year reaffirmation review in October of 2017. The team recommended the university be placed on probation having determined four Components were not met. In March of 2018 Minot State presented its response in person to the IAC and the IAC modified the recommendation on each of the four Components from "not met," to "met with concerns."

The HLC Board on June 28, 2018 considered all of the materials that had been submitted and reaffirmed Minot State's accreditation with interim monitoring of Core Components 2.A, 3.A, 4.B and 5.C which were met with concerns.

4. Unique Aspects of Visit

This focused visit was originally scheduled for spring of 2020 but the national health emergency of the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a delay of the visit. The institution is operating in modalities and operational requirements that comply with state and federal recommendations that protect the health and safety of students, faculty and staff. The Team Chair attended this visit in person with other team members engaging through the use of Microsoft Teams.

5. Interactions With Institutional Constituencies and Materials Reviewed. List the titles or positions, but not names, of individuals with whom the team interacted during the review and the principal documents, materials and web pages reviewed.

The Visiting Team Interacted with these Constituents:
President
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Vice President for Student Affairs
Vice President for Administration and Finance
Vice President for Advancement
Director of Athletics
Assistant Vice President for Business Services/Controller
Director of Academic Assessment
Assistant Professor, Communication Sciences and Disorders
Director Enrollment Services
Assistant Professor, Geography
Director Academic Support Center
Director Residence Life
Director Looyenga Leadership Center
Student
Director Honors Program
Professor, History
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Associate Vice President, Graduate, Online, Distance and Continuing Education
Director Institutional Research

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 2

Director Marketing
Director University Communications
Education Program Coordinator
Assistant Professor, Accounting
Professor, Business Information Technology
Associate Professor, Teacher Education
Professor, Music
Instructor, Computer Science
Registrar
Instructor, Nursing
Professor, Teacher Education
Associate Professor and Chair of Academic Assessment Committee, History
Assistant Professor, Mathematics Education
Professor, Business Information Technology
Assistant Professor, Communication Sciences and Disorders
Assistant Professor and Chair of General Education Committee, Psychology
Professor, Business Information Technology
Associate Professor, Foreign Languages

The Visiting Team Reviewed These Materials and Websites:

Reaffirmation Review Report Visiting Team 2017
Institutional Response
Report of the IAC
Action Letter from the President of HLC July 2018
January 20 2019 Progress on HLC Action Items
February 2020 Focused Visit Report
Simple Syllabus Template
Numerous syllabi
Documents linked and referenced in the Reports including, but not limited to, newly revised
Policies and Minutes of Faculty Senate, Planning and Budget Council and other university committees
Correspondence between Director of Academic Assessment and other university faculty and staff
Yearly Program Assessment Template
Documents posted on, or linked to, Minot State Accreditation 2020 site. These documents, examples, minutes, policies, budget requests and recommendations, institutional websites and correspondence are either referenced in the reports or are updated documents generated as part of the institution's work to document its processes.

6. **Areas of Focus.** Complete the following A and B sections for each area of focus identified in the visit description on the Evaluation Summary Sheet. Note that each area of focus should correspond with only one Core Component or other HLC requirement.

A1. Statement of Focus:

Institutional assessment of general education for the past four to six years was found to be incomplete and the institution was advised to satisfy the expectation that it operates with

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 3

integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty and staff --it must demonstrate that it can provide relevant documentation that is organized, complete and accessible.

Relevant Core Component or other HLC requirement:

Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A

B1. Statements of Evidence (check one below):

☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention, rather than monitoring, is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that monitoring is required.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

The team will also note its determination as to each applicable Core Component or HLC requirement in Part B.

Evidence:

It is clear that considerable effort has been invested in gathering and analyzing data in ways that it can be made available to reviewers and more importantly, to faculty and staff at Minot State who are engaged in assessing learning. Evidence was provided establishing that all issues raised by the October 2017 visit team and the IAC were explained to the university community along with progress in addressing them. In part the lack of ability to produce documents was due to having adopted a new model of academic leadership. The elimination of the positions of Deans, who had customarily led assessment efforts and maintained records, meant that intentional effort was needed to collect and store documentation in a central location. Minot State created the position of Director of Assessment in 2018 and one important task was to gather past plans and results and make them available to the university community. Considerable effort was made to adopt processes for collecting, analyzing, providing feedback and sharing evidence of improvements made based on results. To accomplish this the university also adopted and revised policies to position itself for ongoing benefit from assessment. Continuous improvement is the ultimate objective and sustainability of the university's commitment to assessment was needed to satisfy the IAC requirement that the culture and benefit of assessment not be dependent on the individuals holding specific staff positions. In fact, with the departure of the Director of Academic Assessment shortly before the delayed visit the team sought confirmation that the university will refill that position to assure the process continues. Assurance of this commitment was provided to the team.

A2. Statement of Focus:

Concerns were identified about a number of issues related to appropriate academic processes leading to a finding of 'met with concerns,' for Core Component 3.A. The institution must provide evidence that:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 4

• the institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education
• the institution has developed, implemented, and is monitoring a plan to assure that course level-outcomes are being met for all programs across all modalities;
• the institution has developed and implemented policies and processes to ensure that the work, contact hours, and assessment practices for all courses taught in a compressed format are equivalent to their non-compressed counterparts;
• copies of all syllabi for any and all courses offered through multiple modes of delivery, demonstrating that the scope and specified learning outcomes and activities for the courses are equivalent across modalities;
• the institution has created and implemented a review process and accountability system to ensure that all syllabi comply with the expectations regarding equivalency across modality and format; and
• the institution has continued the suspension of scheduling two week compressed courses until the aforementioned policies and processes have been fully implemented.

Relevant Core Component or other HLC requirement:

Core Component 3.A

B2. Statements of Evidence (check one below):

☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention, rather than monitoring, is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that monitoring is required.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

The team will also note its determination as to each applicable Core Component or HLC requirement in Part B.

Evidence:

The institution performed **extensive audits on syllabi** using a **multi-point rubric** to determine if all requirements were being met. Review performed after two semesters led to the recommendation that issues identified would be resolved with implementation of **Simple Syllabus software**. As related during discussions with the review team, this process led to reflection by the faculty members involved that resulted in buy-in and understanding of the need for **consistent syllabi and learning outcomes between sections. The improvements were** verified by reviewers. There is ongoing work to refine the process of approval as the university becomes accustomed to the intricacies of the new software, but the software appears to be well-accepted for use in monitoring outcomes and consistency across modalities.

Work was reported to **Faculty Senate and University Chairs** according to minutes on policy and process for examining compressed course equivalency, as well as contact hours. A **Policy for Synchronous Lecture Class Meeting Length** was recommended and approved by Faculty Senate to begin Summer 2020.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 5

As discussed earlier, a new **Simple Syllabus software** allows for collection of all syllabi. A common template has been developed to insure appropriate and uniform content. University compliance in uploading syllabi for approval and comparison appears to have full participation of degree programs. A sample audit of multiple section and different modalities was performed to assure consistency. All is in order.

Syllabi Integrity Review policy adopted by Faculty Senate to ensure quality, clarity, consistency, and organization of course syllabi. The process requires syllabus upload and approval through department chairs and the use of a common syllabus format. The institution undertook and documented the process for a **comprehensive review of syllabi** for modality, scope and learning outcome congruency among faculty offerings. Overall finding is that this process has resulted in more consistent syllabi and greater understanding of departmental curriculums as well as buy-in from instructional staff. Common **syllabus template** as well as **syllabus software** will assure this process is sustainable.

Faculty Senate minutes of 10/3/19 contain an approved Moratorium on all compressed courses of less than 8-week duration other than Study Abroad tours. The review schedule for 8-week compressed courses was identified, and 2-week compressed courses have not been offered. Report on comparability made to Faculty Senate was noted in the faculty senate minutes.

A3.	Statement of Focus:

The institution's ability to demonstrate its commitment to the educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning, as required by Core Component 4B, was met with concerns. The institution must provide a detailed assessment plan that includes learning outcomes and standardized assessment practices in co-curricular programming and activities; and

The designation and establishment of a procedure in which all assessment data is reviewed, stored, and made available to constituent groups.

Relevant Core Component or other HLC requirement:

Core Component 4B

B3.	Statements of Evidence (check one below):

☐ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☒ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention, rather than monitoring, is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that monitoring is required.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 6

The team will also note its determination as to each applicable Core Component or HLC requirement in Part B.

Evidence:

The institution has a well-developed plan for annual assessment through a revised template, **Yearly Program Assessment (YPA)** form. Training on use of the YPA. Assessment was noted by several groups interviewed during the Monitoring visit as becoming part of the culture of the institution through the development of a "common language" by which to communicate across committees and departments. Multiple faculty spoke of a transparency in decision-making based on assessment data, but that assessment findings were not yet a big part of budget decisions since financial sustainability is currently the "big driver." Work continues to incorporate assessment results in budget development process.

Minot State University has done a lot of work to create a **co-curricular programming model**. They now have a well-developed process for co-curricular programming and activities, but have only one year of data collection. Offices and programs that relate to **newly developed co-curricular goals** have been identified on an **assessment cycle and appropriate plans for the collection of co-curricular data are now in place**. Since only one year of data collection appears to have taken place, it is not yet possible for the university to demonstrate closing of the loop or to verify the efficacy of the new process.

Co-curricular goals, Leadership, Wellness, Self-awareness, and Career and Professional Development, complement the general education goals and according to the members of the General Education Committee, are meant "to strengthen what was not as prominent in the general education curriculum."

A process exists for review of all assessment data within the university's **SharePoint site**. A new format for collecting yearly assessment **(YPA)** has been created and on the whole is being used by departments/programs although holes in completion are evident. Reviews of yearly program assessment conducted by Director of Assessment are also stored within system and available for review by the whole institution. Significant progress has been made and the institution will be able to demonstrate its commitment to intentionally assess student learning outcomes by sustaining this solid effort.

A4. Statement of Focus:

Concern was expressed by the IAC as to whether the institution engages in systematic and integrated planning because there was no evidence assessment was being used to inform the budget process for ten years prior to the 2017 team visit. The new Strategic Planning and Budget Council had been formed but had not existed long enough to be able to document is implementation.

Two items were specified by IAC in a July 6, 2018, letter to President Steven Shirley as follows:

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 7

1) Documentation of two complete cycles of planning that provides clear evidence that the institution consistently and systematically links its planning, assessment of student learning , and budget prioritization processes; and

2) Evidence that the institution has taken steps to establish an appropriate policy to assure that the process of planning is systemic and sustainable beyond current personnel.

The requirement that the new strategic plan and corresponding budget process should have two complete cycles with clear evidence of linking assessment to budgeting has been met.   The 2017 HLC site team and the IAC decision reported that the institution must take steps to establish an appropriate policy to assure that the process is systematic and sustainable.

.

Relevant Core Component or other HLC requirement:

Core Component 5.C

B4. Statements of Evidence (check one below):

☒ Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention, rather than monitoring, is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that monitoring is required.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

The team will also note its determination as to each applicable Core Component or HLC requirement in Part B.

Evidence:

Evidence was provided as requested--including the Strategic Planning and Budget Council (SPBC) meeting minutes that the focused visit team had access to. Specific action is recorded in the Council minutes of January 6, 2020, where the Council provided a detail of its processes in its recommendation of FY 2020-21 institutional budget. Tables and a matrix of budget priorities based on supporting data, where available, was presented. The material included academic programs, facilities and institutional support functions such as cyber security. This material was used by the President's staff (the term used for the President's executive leadership team) for final decisions.

The site team favorably found that the leadership of MSU makes operational plans on the basis of its current capacity while anticipating fluctuations from various sources of revenue. For MSU these actions are necessary for the planning process to drive decisions on the budget with tuition revenue predictions a major part of the revenue forecast modeling.

The focused visit team found evidence that the institution has responded to the HLC criteria 5.C.2 Evidence included procedures for budget requests and presentations, meeting minutes,

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 8

assessment data, budget documents, and documentation of changes in curricular offerings. As requested by the IAC action, to ensure sustainability beyond current personnel, the institution has expanded the number of persons in the planning and budget approval process. There are budget workbooks and supporting documents that show the Minot State University annual budget process and timeline. Tables with reference to the Minot State University Strategic Plan are developed with budgetary strategy statements and the resources to support the plan. Evidence was presented that the detailed budget schedule used for 2019-2020 budget shows details of date due, prioritization responsibilities and a formal presentation to President's staff and the Strategic Planning and Budget Council. The Strategic Planning and Budget Council rates budget requests and send recommendations to President's staff by late November or early December. The focused visit team was provided the matrix used to prioritize budget allocations requested from the campus units that have a budget request and learned during the visit that Strategic Planning and Budget Council will now be co-chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Budget request presentations are a mechanism for the Minot State University community to learn about and support priorities and illustrate the ways departments contribute to the initiatives of the Empowering Generations strategic plan.

In reviewing the campus budget cycle, the institution has established due dates for campus entities to outline their requests and for budget presentations. This process is concluded by early January thus giving adequate time to revisit requests, get additional materials, and allow for the President and President's staff to make budget decisions. With a biennial budget cycle, every other year this process is critical to align the resources that the State of North Dakota provides in the state budget via an appropriation that the institution will receive for operating the subsequent two-year cycle.

The state of ND uses a biennial budget process so timelines may be altered in years when the legislature is in session (odd numbered years with the first of two-year biennial budget beginning on July 1 of the odd numbered years) considering the next two-year budget appropriations.

A majority of SPBC members are nominated by respective governance groups and appointed by the President. The institution has taken steps to place membership on the SPBC with university positions that assure continuity in planning and allocation of resources in the budget cycles and shared leadership between academic affairs and financial authority to assure the process is realistic, future-oriented and consistent with the Empowering Generations strategic plan.

A5. Statement of Focus:

Relevant Core Component or other HLC requirement:

B5. Statements of Evidence (check one below):

☐   Evidence demonstrates adequate progress in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that further organizational attention, rather than monitoring, is required in the area of focus.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that monitoring is required.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

The team will also note its determination as to each applicable Core Component or HLC requirement in Part B.

Evidence:

7. **Other Accreditation Issues**. If applicable, list evidence of other accreditation issues, identify the related Core Components or other HLC requirements and note the team's determination as to each applicable Core Component or other HLC requirement in Part B.

NA

Part B: Recommendation and Rationale

Recommendation:

☒ Evidence demonstrates that no monitoring is required.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that monitoring is required.

☐ Evidence demonstrates that HLC sanction is warranted.

Rationale for the Team's Recommendation

As indicated in the sections above Minot State committed to reviewing its past and present practices, adopting policies and processes to assure it could implement, document and sustain its practices related to assessment. Specifically, it was necessary to renew an institutional commitment to assessment, update policies and processes and implement modern tools to assure the practices would be sustainable. This required the engagement of institutional leaders from the faculty and staff as well as the President and President's staff –not only to make these changes but to review assessment data to inform institutional decision-making and measure progress as the university takes steps to deliver on its strategic mission. The team found evidence that the commitment has resulted in actions that position Minot State well to continue to fulfil the criteria for accreditation.

Stipulations or Limitations on Future Accreditation Relationships
If recommending a change in the institution's stipulations, state both the old and new stipulation and provide a brief rationale for the recommended change. Check the Institutional Status and Requirement (ISR) Report for the current wording. (Note: After the focused visit, the institution's stipulations should be reviewed in consultation with the institution's HLC staff liaison.)

No change recommended

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 10

Monitoring

The team may call for a follow-up interim report. If the team concurs that a report is necessary, indicate the topic (including the relevant Core Components or other HLC requirements), timeline and expectations for that report. (Note: the team should consider embedding such a report as an emphasis in an upcoming comprehensive evaluation in consultation with the institution's HLC staff liaison.)

NA

The team may call for a follow-up focused visit. If the team concurs that a visit is necessary, indicate the topic (including the relevant Core Components or other HLC requirements), timeline and expectations for that visit. (Note: The team should consider embedding such a visit as an emphasis in an upcoming comprehensive evaluation in consultation with the institution's staff liaison.)

NA

Core Component Determinations

Indicate the team's determination(s) (met, met with concerns, not met) for the applicable Core Components related to the areas of focus or other accreditation issues identified by the team in Part A. If a Core Component was not included in an area of focus, it should be marked as not evaluated.

Number	Title	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met	Not Evaluated
1.A	Core Component 1.A	☐	☐	☐	☒
1.B	Core Component 1.B	☐	☐	☐	☒
1.C	Core Component 1.C	☐	☐	☐	☒
1.D	Core Component 1.D	☐	☐	☐	☒
2.A	Core Component 2.A	☒	☐	☐	☐
2.B	Core Component 2.B	☐	☐	☐	☒
2.C	Core Component 2.C	☐	☐	☐	☒
2.D	Core Component 2.D	☐	☐	☐	☒
2.E	Core Component 2.E	☐	☐	☐	☒
3.A	Core Component 3.A	☒	☐	☐	☐
3.B	Core Component 3.B	☐	☐	☐	☒
3.C	Core Component 3.C	☐	☐	☐	☒

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 11

Number	Title	Met	Met With Concerns	Not Met	Not Evaluated
3.D	Core Component 3.D	☐	☐	☐	☒
3.E	Core Component 3.E	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.A	Core Component 4.A	☐	☐	☐	☒
4.B	Core Component 4.B	☒	☐	☐	☐
4.C	Core Component 4.C	☐	☐	☐	☒
5.A	Core Component 5.A	☐	☐	☐	☒
5.B	Core Component 5.B	☐	☐	☐	☒
5.C	Core Component 5.C	☒	☐	☐	☐
5.D	Core Component 5.D	☐	☐	☐	☒

Other HLC Requirement Determinations

Indicate the team's determination(s) (met or not met) for the HLC requirements related to the areas of focus or other accreditation issues identified by the team in Part A.

The Focused Visit Team has determined that all criteria are met. Organizational attention will be necessary to assure Core Component 4.B is fulfilled and that assessment results inform future co-curricular learning goals.

Audience: Peer Reviewers
Form
Published: 2019 © Higher Learning Commission

Process: Focused Visit
Contact: peerreview@hlcommission.org
Page 12

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE:	Minot State University, ND
TYPE OF REVIEW:	Monitoring Focused Visit
DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:	The Board reaffirmed the accreditation of the institution and assigned interim monitoring. The institution meets Core Components 2.A, 3.A, 4.B, and 5.C with concerns. The institution is required to host a focused visit no later than June 30, 2020.
DATES OF REVIEW:	10/5/2020 - 10/6/2020

☐ No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Public

Recommended Change: no change

Degrees Awarded: Associates, Bachelors, Masters, Specialist

Recommended Change: no change

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2017 - 2018

Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2027 - 2028

Recommended Change: no change

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

The institution is approved at the following program level(s): Associate's, Bachelor's, Master's, Specialist

The institution is not approved at the following program level(s): Doctoral

Recommended Change: no change

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Additional Location:

   Prior HLC approval required.

Recommended Change: no change

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:

   Approved for distance education courses and programs. The institution has not been approved
   for correspondence education.

Recommended Change: no change

Accreditation Events

Accreditation Pathway   Standard Pathway

Recommended Change: no change

Upcoming Events

Comprehensive Evaluation: 2027 - 2028

Recommended Change: no change

Comprehensive Evaluation: 04/11/2022

   Year 4 Comprehensive. The institution was granted an extension to comply with HLC's faculty
   qualification requirement (Assumed Practice B.2.a) solely as applied to its dual credit faculty until
   September 1, 2023. HLC will suspend review of the institution's compliance with its faculty
   qualification requirement solely as applied to dual credit faculty until the first evaluation occurring on
   or after September 1, 2023 at which time the institution's compliance will be specifically examined.

Recommended Change: no change

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change: no change

Institutional Data

Educational Programs		**Recommended Change:**
Undergraduate		
Certificate	15	

HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Associate Degrees	1	_____
Baccalaureate Degrees	59	_____
Graduate		
Master's Degrees	8	_____
Specialist Degrees	1	_____
Doctoral Degrees	0	_____

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

None

Recommended Change: no change

Additional Locations

Bismarck, 1500 Edwards Ave. PO Box 5587, Bismarck, ND, 58506-5587 - Active

MSU at Minot Air Force Base, Francis X. Deignan Building (Education Center) 210 Missile Avenue, Minot AFB, ND, 58704 - Active

North Dakota State University, HDFS Dept., EML Hall 283, Fargo, ND, 58102 - Active

Recommended Change: no change

Correspondence Education

None

Recommended Change: no change

Distance Delivery

11.0801 - Web Page, Digital/Multimedia and Information Resources Design, Certificate, Web Development

13.1001 - Special Education and Teaching, General, Master, Master of Science in Special Education with emphasis in Developmental Disabilities/Autism Spectrum

13.1009 - Education/Teaching of Individuals with Vision Impairments Including Blindness, Associate, A.S. Developmental Disabilities Emphasis

13.1099 - Special Education and Teaching, Other, Certificate, Certificate of Completion in Developmental Disabilities

24.0102 - General Studies, Bachelor, B.G.S. General Studies

51.3801 - Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse, Bachelor, BSN RN to BSN

52.0201 - Business Administration and Management, General, Bachelor, B.S. Management

52.0201 - Business Administration and Management, General, Master, MS Management

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

52.0299 - Business Administration, Management and Operations, Other, Bachelor, B.A.S. Bachelor of Management

52.0407 - Business/Office Automation/Technology/Data Entry, Certificate, Certificate in Application Software Specialist

52.1101 - International Business/Trade/Commerce, Bachelor, BS International Business

52.1201 - Management Information Systems, General, Bachelor, B.S. Management Information Systems

52.1201 - Management Information Systems, General, Master, MS Information Systems

52.1299 - Management Information Systems and Services, Other, Bachelor, B.A.S. Business Info Technology

52.1299 - Management Information Systems and Services, Other, Certificate, Certificate (grad) in Knowledge Management

52.1401 - Marketing/Marketing Management, General, Bachelor, BS Marketing

Contractual Arrangements

51.0907 Medical Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiation Therapist - Bachelor - - St. Alexius Medical Center

51.0911 Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiographer - Bachelor - - Mayo Clinic - Mayo Health School of Sciences

51.0911 Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiographer - Bachelor - - Sanford Health (Previously MedCenter One)

51.0911 Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiographer - Bachelor - - Minneapolis VA Health Care System

51.0911 Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiographer - Bachelor - - Rapid City Regional Hospital

51.0911 Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiographer - Bachelor - - Trinity School of Radiologic Technology

51.0911 Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiographer - Bachelor - - Avera McKennan

None

Recommended Change: no change

Consortial Arrangements

11.1003 - Computer and Information Systems Security/Information Assurance - Post-Baccalaureate Certificate - Cyber Security - Three institutions in the North Dakota University System

52.1201 - Management Information Systems, General - Associate - Information Technology - Northern Information Technology Consortium

Recommended Change: no change