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Program Level Accreditation

- ABET (Originally, "ABET" stood for "the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology." The organization changed its name to simply "ABET" in 2005) – AS(5) and BS(10)
- Accreditation Commission for Education in Nursing (ACEN) – BS and MS
- American Chemical Society (ACS) - BS and MBA
- American Music Therapy Association (AMTA) – BS
- Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC) - Lab Animal Program
- Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) Cert and AS(2)
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) – MS
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation - CAEP (NCATE) – BS and MS
- Hotel Schools of Distinction (HSD) – BS
- Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology (JRCERT) – AS
- National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships (NACEP) – School-based Programs
- National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) – BS
- National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) – BS(2) and BM(2)
- National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) - BA
- Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA) – MPA and MPM
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Institutional Accreditation

The Higher Learning Commission - HLC
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Institutional Accreditation and The University Strategic Alignment Process

**USAP Goal** - Produce recommendations on how to better align university resources based on data and strategic level planning
HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION (HLC)

One of 6 regional accrediting bodies recognized by the federal government to ensure minimum standards for all post secondary education.

Standards range from financial stability to documenting student learning, faculty credentials and strategic planning –

The largest of the six - includes 19 states from Arizona to West Virginia and most points north.
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HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION (HLC)

Four Reasons Why HLC Accreditation Matters (Saginaw Valley State University)

1. **It is a public measure of quality.** It offers a direct statement of institutional effectiveness and continual improvement. Accreditation helps guide students who are considering applying or transferring, and it allows credits to transfer elsewhere. It aids in faculty and staff recruitment, and it signals the strength of our graduates.

2. **It provides transparency to stakeholders and the broader community.** Accreditation is a public, external demonstration of institutional accountability, integrity, and responsibility.

3. **It addresses federal and state demands.** It allows institutions to award federally-backed financial aid. It permits the institution and individual faculty, staff, and students to apply for a range of federal and state grants and programs.

4. **It is of immense internal value.** As a practice centered on ongoing assessment, it can help everyone better understand our rich, multi-faceted institution and can help shape institutional change and improvement.
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HLC Guiding Values

- **Focus on student learning**
- Education as a public purpose
- Education for a diverse, technological, globally connected world
- **A culture of continuous improvement**
- **Evidence-based institutional learning and self-presentation**
- Integrity, transparency, and ethical behavior or practice
- Governance for the well-being of the institution
- **Planning and management of resources to ensure institutional sustainability**
- Mission-centered evaluation
- Accreditation through peer review
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## HLC Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1: Mission and Integrity</td>
<td>Criterion 1: Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2: Preparing for the Future</td>
<td>Criterion 2: Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3: Student Learning and Effective Teaching</td>
<td><strong>Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning:</strong> Quality, Resources, and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4: Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge</td>
<td><strong>Criterion 4: Teaching and Learning:</strong> Evaluation and Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5: Engagement and Service</td>
<td><strong>Criterion 5: Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Criterion Three - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, whenever and however its offerings are delivered.

Core Components
3.A. The institution’s degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

3.B. The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

3.C. The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

3.D. The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

3.E. The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.
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Criterion Four - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

**Core Components**

4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

4.B. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

4.C. The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.
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Criterion Five - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution’s resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Core Components

5.A. The institution’s resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

5.B. The institution’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.
   2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.

5.D. The institution works systematically to improve its performance.
   2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.
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## MAPPING THE Transition OF ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS INTO THE OPEN PATHWAY

This document maps the transition of institutions to the ten-year Open Pathway cycle based on the date of the next reaffirmation of accreditation. The transition of all eligible institutions began in 2022-23. All eligible institutions will have transitioned to the Open Pathway by 2025-2026.

### Transition map for institutions with PEAQ reaffirmation visits in 2020-21

Institutions with reaffirmations in 2020-21 completed the Pathways transition in fall 2022. The chart applies to those institutions that chose the Open Pathway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>2022-23</th>
<th>2023-24</th>
<th>2024-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathway Cycle</strong></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance Process</strong></td>
<td>Institution may contribute documents to the Evidence File</td>
<td>ASSURANCE REVIEW WAIVED 1</td>
<td>Institution may contribute documents to the Evidence File</td>
<td>ASSURANCE FILING; Federal Compliance Requirements 2</td>
<td>Institution may contribute documents to the Evidence File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement: The Quality Initiative</strong></td>
<td>Quality Initiative Proposal Filed (window of opportunity to submit)</td>
<td>Quality Initiative Proposal Reviewed</td>
<td>Quality Initiative Report Filed</td>
<td>Quality Initiative Report Reviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission Decision Making</strong></td>
<td>ASSURANCE REVIEW WAIVED 1</td>
<td>Action on Comprehensive Evaluation and Reaffirmation of Accreditation 4</td>
<td>Action to Accept Assurance Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Criteria</strong></td>
<td>Effective 1/1/23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>The Commission will continue to review data submitted by affiliated institutions through the Institutional Update, will apply change processes as appropriate to planned institutional developments, and will monitor institutions through reports, visits, and other means as it deems appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Modified schedule during transition years.
2. Assurance Assessment and Evidence File. For comprehensive evaluations, some institutions will also file materials for multi-campus review.
3. Team may require a visit to explore uncertainties in evidence that cannot be resolved at a distance.
4. Action on Year 10 review will also determine the institution's future Pathway eligibility.
Questions & Answers
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Recommendations from Last HLC Site-Visit

USAP Goal - Produce recommendations on how to better align university resources based on data and strategic level planning
• IPFW would benefit from the development of a university wide assessment plan that outlines the basic framework for assessment activities but also provides the flexibility to be adapted to the needs of individualized units. This plan should clearly define roles, responsibilities, and a timeline for activities.

• The relationship between the Director of Assessment and the Assessment Subcommittee needs to be better defined so that the Director can provide greater continuity of activity as members move on and off the Subcommittee.

• Although newly created, the relationship between the Director of General Education and the General Education Subcommittee could also be defined so that the Director can provide greater continuity of activity as members move on and off the Subcommittee.

• The relationship between the Director of Assessment and Director of General Education should be clearly defined or understood to reduce potential conflicts. Prior to the appoint of the Director of General Education, the Assessment Director was working with the General Education Subcommittee to address the issues raised by the Subcommittee in 2008-2009. Who is ultimately responsible for leadership in the assessment of general education?

• The Director of Assessment and Director of General Education meet with individual units to clearly articulate what constitutes assessment and the expectations for assessment.

• IPFW might/should consider sending a group of key individuals to participate in the HLC Assessment Academy.
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Distance Education

The 2007, the vice chancellor for academic affairs created a task force to develop guidelines for the administration of distance education with specific emphasis on the role of online courses in the university’s future. One recommendation of that task force was that “Department chairs develop a system for evaluating their online courses comparable to the one they use for evaluating face to face classes, including some items that are particularly relevant to online courses.” This does not seem to have been done consistently. Faculty members report that the same evaluation is used in both face-to-face and online classes. A low percentage of online evaluations are returned. Faculty also note that chairs do not visit their online classes or vet the online classes for quality. The Center for Enhancement of Learning and Teaching (CELT) has a thorough process to ensure quality in new courses, but that does not apply to all online classes. The chairs might benefit from professional development in the area of evaluating online classes offered by CELT.
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Graduate Education

Given the growth in enrollment and development of new programs (six new master's programs) since the last visit, coupled with the potential for growth in the future and the ongoing complexity of the relationship between IPFW and both Indiana University and Purdue University, **the team recommends that IPFW evaluate its infrastructure support for graduate education and consider adding a stand-alone administrative position (e.g., Dean, School of Graduate Studies) responsible for the oversight and leadership of the all aspects of graduate education at IPFW.** This recommendation is in no way intended to imply anything about the present performance or leadership of the program director but reflects only the recognition of the growth in graduate education both in enrollments and expansion of offerings.

**As IPFW further expands graduate education and looks particularly to doctoral programs, consideration should also be given to differentiating the faculty load requirements between graduate and undergraduate programs and/or course instruction.** From interviews with program directors, department chairs, faculty, and the Director of Graduate Studies, it appears that faculty load varies among departments. The team recommends that a University-wide policy be explored regarding faculty load that considers instruction of graduate-level courses, advisement of graduate students, and supervision of graduate student research. The policy would allow for flexibility at the program level but provide a framework to further develop a graduate culture within the institution by providing a clearer distinction between undergraduate and graduate programs by rewarding teaching, research and scholarship of faculty and graduate students.
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Records

In a review of records, the team noted that in some cases information that should be available in a file was not conveniently located. **The institution is encouraged to review files for convenient location and completeness of records.**
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