Campus Forum on University Accreditation

Wednesday, April 4, 2018
10:00 – 11:30 am
Oregon State University
Horizon Room, Memorial Union
Remotely Via WebEx:
   Meeting number, 929 390 414
   Password, NWCCU04042018
Overview of the Accreditation Process

Susan Capalbo
Senior Vice Provost & Accreditation Liaison Officer
NWCCU Accreditation Process: OSU’s 7-Year Review Cycle

Year One (2011-2012) – Mission and Core Themes
• Standard 1 – *Mission, Core Themes and Expectations*
• Now called Mission and Core Themes - 1.5 Years

Year Three (2013-2014)
• Standard 2 – *Resources and Capacity*
• Update response to Standard 1

Year Seven (2017-2018)
• Standard 3 – *Planning and Implementation*
• Standard 4 – *Effectiveness and Improvement*
• Standard 5 – *Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability*
• Update responses to Standards 1 and 2

OSU’s Year Seven Site Visit is
April 15 – 17, 2019
Alignment with Strategic Plan 4.0 (SP4.0)

Focus on Excellence | SP 3.0 | 2014-2018

**REBRANDING EFFORT**

**VISION 2030**

**ACCREDITATION**
- Appoint Director
- Appoint Steering Committees
- Work on writing of Self-Study
- Draft of Self-Study
- Complete Self-Study Site Visit Decision

**DIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN**
- Appoint Steering Committees
- Work on writing of Self-Study
- Draft of Self-Study
- Complete Self-Study Site Visit Decision

**SP 4.0 Development Timeline**
- Design
- Drafting
- Dialogue
- Launch

SP 4.0 2019-2023
Key Components of the Self-Study Report

Standard 1: Mission, Core Themes and Expectations

Standard 2: Resources and Capacity

Standard 3: Institutional Planning and Implementation

Standard 4: Effectiveness and Improvement

Standard 5: Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation and Sustainability

OSU will be assessed on 114 criteria grouped under 5 standards

http://www.nwccu.org/accreditation/standards-policies/standards/
OSU’s Accreditation Team

Accreditation Steering Committee
• Engage the University community in the accreditation process
• Provide leadership and advice regarding the accreditation process and development of the Evaluation Report
• Review and provide feedback about the self-study evaluation report

Accreditation Sub-Committees
• Gather information, analyze data, and draft first responses to Standards
• Collaborate with members of the other Accreditation committees

Core Theme Committees
• Institutional planning, core theme planning and mission fulfillment
• Interested in participating? Let us know!

Accreditation Project Team
• Ensure details of the self-study are effectively managed and stay on timeline
• Revise, edit, design and produce final drafts of the Evaluation Report
• Provide support to members of all of the committees
Welcome!

Dr. Marlene Moore
Interim President of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCCU)
National Trends Related to Accreditation

Dr. Marlene Moore
Interim President of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)
Politicization of Higher Education – our Climate

Call for More Federal Oversight
The Education Department needs to better monitor colleges’ finances to prevent another costly fiasco like the 2014 collapse of Corinthian Colleges, says the agency’s Office of Inspector General.

Department of Education nudges college accreditors to get tougher

Does Higher Education Accreditation Need Fixing?
Posted to Education April 27, 2017 by Leo Doran
Some Accountability Issues and Actions Taken in Higher Education

• Heightened Cash Monitoring (2 levels) of institutions; unexpected closures
• Increased oversight of statewide authorization of reciprocity agreements (SARA): Distance Education and crossing state borders
• Consumer protection emphases
• Increased communication among accrediting agencies
(5) the standards for accreditation of the agency or association assess the institution’s—(A) success with respect to student achievement in relation to the institution’s mission, including, as appropriate, consideration of course completion, State licensing examinations, and job placement rates; (B) curricula; (C) faculty; (D) facilities, equipment, and supplies; (E) fiscal and administrative capacity as appropriate to the specified scale of operations; (F) student support services; (G) recruiting and admissions practices, academic calendars, catalogs, publications, grading and advertising; (H) measures of program length and the objectives of the degrees or credentials offered; (I) record of student complaints received by, or available to, the agency or association; and (J) record of compliance with its program responsibilities under title IV of this Act based on the most recent student loan default rate data provided by the Secretary, the results of financial or compliance audits, program reviews, and any such other information as the Secretary may provide to the agency or association;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Item</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures clarifying ownership, copyright, control, compensation,</td>
<td>2.A.24</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and revenue derived from the creation and production of intellectual property</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures related to contractual agreements with external entities</td>
<td>2.A.26</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic freedom policies/procedures</td>
<td>2.A.27 &amp; 2.A.28</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures prohibiting plagiarism by faculty and staff</td>
<td>2.A.29</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures that articulate the oversight and management of financial</td>
<td>2.A.30</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources including planning and monitoring of operating and capital budgets,</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserves, investments, fundraising, cash management, debt management, transfers</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and borrowing between funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel hiring policy/procedures</td>
<td>2.B.1</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator/staff evaluation policies/procedures</td>
<td>2.B.2</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee professional development policies/procedures</td>
<td>2.B.3</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic organizational chart</td>
<td>2.B.4</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty workload policies/procedures</td>
<td>2.B.5 &amp; 2.B.6</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning outcomes for all courses, programs, and degrees</strong></td>
<td>2.C.1 &amp; 2.C.2</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures that define the awarding of credit and degrees</td>
<td>2.C.3</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission and graduation requirements for degree programs</td>
<td>2.C.4</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures explaining the faculty role in revising curriculum,</td>
<td>2.C.5</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selecting faculty, and assessing achievement of student learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures that explains faculty/library partnership for assuring</td>
<td>2.C.6</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library and information resources are integrated into the learning process</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies/procedures for approval of experiential learning</td>
<td>2.C.7</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of credit acceptance policies/procedures</td>
<td>2.C.8</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of general education program</strong></td>
<td>2.C.9</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessable learning outcomes for all general education components of</strong></td>
<td>2.C.10</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baccalaureate and transfer degree programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessable learning outcomes for related instruction</td>
<td>2.C.11</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessable learning outcomes for graduate program</strong></td>
<td>2.C.12</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate admission, retention, and transfer of credit policies/procedures</td>
<td>2.C.13</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment of Student Achievement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th>Standard 3</th>
<th>Standard 4</th>
<th>Standard 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission &amp; Core Themes</td>
<td>Resources &amp; Capacity</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>Assessment &amp; Improvement</td>
<td>Mission Fulfillment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intended Inputs**
- Faculty
- Staff
- Facilities
- Equipment
- Budget
- Planning/Process Policies

**Expected Outputs**
- Courses
- Programs
- Workshops
- Services
- Research
- Allocations
- Initiatives

**Expected Outcomes**
- Student Learning Value-added
- Integrated and Authentic
- Leads to Enhancements

**Expected Changes (decisions made)**
- Reflection of Effectiveness
- Redefining Sufficiency for Future

---

**The Continuous Improvement Cycle**

- **Theory**
- **Treatment**
- **Measurement**
- **Difference**

**Feedback Loop/Continuous Improvement**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of mission fulfillment</td>
<td>No formal definition of mission fulfillment</td>
<td>Definition of mission fulfillment with meaningful, verifiable, meaningful, verifiable, measurable outcomes</td>
<td>Clear definition of mission fulfillment with meaningful, verifiable, measurable outcomes and clear thresholds defining extent of mission fulfillment</td>
<td>Clear definition of mission fulfillment with meaningful, verifiable, measurable outcomes with clear thresholds defining extent mission fulfillment. Three years’ assessment activities using direct and indirect measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which mission fulfillment is informed by analysis of accomplishment of its core theme objectives</td>
<td>No measure of accomplishment of core theme objectives related to mission fulfillment</td>
<td>Threshold of accomplishment of core theme objectives related to mission fulfillment</td>
<td>Assess accomplishment of core theme objectives related to mission fulfillment and analyze accomplishment of its core theme objectives</td>
<td>Core themes accomplishments are assessed and analyzed to inform extent of mission fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published evidence-based evaluations of quality assessing the extent to which institution is fulfilling its mission</td>
<td>No formal definition of quality or thresholds related to mission fulfillment</td>
<td>Quality is defined in relation to mission fulfillment</td>
<td>Quality is defined in relation to mission fulfillment and thresholds for acceptable levels of quality are established and assessed</td>
<td>Quality is defined in relation to mission fulfillment and thresholds for acceptable levels of quality are established and assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the adequacy of resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations</td>
<td>No formal evaluation of adequacy of resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations</td>
<td>In relation to mission fulfillment, a process for formal evaluation of adequacy of resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations are established</td>
<td>In relation to mission fulfillment, a process for formal evaluation of adequacy of resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations (with thresholds) are established</td>
<td>In relation to mission fulfillment, thresholds for acceptable levels of adequacy of resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations are established and assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full documentation of evaluation of cycle of planning, practices, resource allocation, application of institutional capacity and assessment of results to ensure effectiveness</td>
<td>No formal evaluation of cycle of planning, practices, resource allocation or application of capacity and assessment of results to ensure effectiveness</td>
<td>Developed a process for formal evaluation of cycle of planning, practices, resource allocation or application of capacity and assessment of results to ensure effectiveness</td>
<td>Process for formal evaluation of cycle of planning, practices, resource allocation or application of capacity and assessment results is in place with thresholds of effectiveness established</td>
<td>In relation to mission fulfillment, thresholds are established for the effectiveness of planning practices, resource allocation, and application of institutional capacity. Annually, results of assessment are documented and used to make changes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The table provides a structured comparison of different criteria across different stages of development.*
Student Achievement – Year 7 Evaluation Report

Be prepared to answer these questions:

(1) What are the key challenges of the institution related to the institution’s graduation rate and other data provided?

(2) What is the institution doing to improve graduation rates?

(3) What initiatives appear to be effective in improving graduation rates?

(4) What might accreditors do to assist institutions to improve graduation rates?
Examples of Best Accreditation Practices
Questions and Discussion

JoAnne Bunnage
Director of University Accreditation
Contacts, Support & Resources

Website: leadership.oregonstate.edu/provost/university-accreditation
Susan.Capalbo@oregonstate.edu
JoAnne.Bunnage@oregonstate.edu