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What is accreditation?

- A voluntary process of peer review to ensure that we meet certain standards in providing a high quality education.

- A mechanism for institutional self-reflection and continuous improvement.

- Occurs in a 10 year cycle, with two reporting periods and an on-site visit in Year 10.
### Timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway Cycle</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>Year 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assurance Process</strong></td>
<td>Institution may contribute documents to the Evidence File</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement: The Quality Initiative</td>
<td>Quality Initiative Proposal Filed (window of opportunity to submit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Initiative Proposal Reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Initiative Report Filed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality Initiative Report Reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At your service

- HLC Reaffirmation of Accreditation Steering Committee
- Criterion Teams (Quality Assurance)
  - Barnet, Bayless, Curra, Drefcinski, McCabe, Riedl-Farrey, Mueller, Wilson
- Federal Compliance Team
  - Franklin, Kieckhafer, LaBudda, Marquardt, Mingo, Nevins, Schliesmann, Spohn, Tuescher-Gille
- Quality Initiative Team
  - Barraclough, Klavins, Thrun
- College Liaisons
  - BILSA – Klavins, EMS – Curra, LAE - McCabe
Progress Report

• Criterion Teams have identified the kinds of evidence they’ll need to support the Quality Assurance arguments
  ○ Working on outlines of argument
  ○ Will be requesting more specific information to be used as evidence soon

• Federal Compliance Team working to identify and address issues related to compliance

• Communication
  ○ 27 presentations last year; 20+ scheduled for this fall

• HLC accreditation link on our website
Lessons learned from the HLC Annual Conference

• Greater emphasis on federal compliance
  o Communication with the public
    ▪ Providing data on student achievement - retention and graduation rates, job placement
  o Academic issues
    ▪ Credit hour review
      o Federal definition of “credit hour”
      o Accountability for equivalent student learning in compressed timeline courses
    ▪ Logging and tracking student complaints (not limited to academics) – expected to show 10 years of data and reflective analysis of what we’ve learned
Lessons learned from the HLC Annual Conference

- **Assessment**
  - All aspects of the institution are expected to have processes for assessment and to respond to results of assessment.
  
  - Higher expectations for analysis of data and documentation of interventions
    - Show results and that we’re doing something with/about them
  
  - Past approach has been to let individual programs do their own thing with no oversight of measurability or consistency – no longer acceptable practice.
Assessment at UW - Platteville

- **General Education**
  - Need to show at least two cycles of assessment
  - How we are using the results of assessment to improve student learning?

- **Program-level**
  - Quality Initiative – APC Program Review
  - For all programs with student interactions (not just those reviewed between now and ‘16-’17):
    - What is your assessment plan?
    - How do you collect and analyze your data?
    - How have you used these data to improve student learning?
    - What evidence do you have for success?
Lessons learned from the HLC Annual Conference

- **Re-affirmation trends**
  - In first year of Open Pathway
    - 56% of institutions reviewed had at least one criterion met with concern (UW Superior, UW Parkside)
    - 10% had at least one criterion not met
    - Required interim reporting for institutions reviewed last year:
      - Assessment – 18%
      - Finances – 15%
      - Student enrollment and retention – 13%, expected to increase
      - Planning & institutional effectiveness – 6%
      - Program review – 5%, expected to increase
How can you help?

- Timely responses to requests for information and data

- Communication
  - Our mission is central to how we will be evaluated.
  - Everyone on campus is integral to our reaffirmation of accreditation.
What questions do you have?