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From CIHE’s mission statement:

• “Assessment of educational effectiveness”
• To assure that “accredited institutions have clearly defined objectives which meet criteria published by the Commission…”
• ...“that they have the organization, staffing, and resources to accomplish, are accomplishing, and can continue to accomplish these objectives.”
• “In addition, through its process of assessment, the Commission encourages and assists in the improvement, effectiveness, and excellence of affiliated institutions.”
Accreditation is a balance of:

Assuring Quality

Fostering Improvement

Accreditation: A System of Peer Review

- Non-governmental
- Non-profit
- Self-regulatory
- Peer review
Development of Accreditation in the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there enough books in the library?</td>
<td>Are students using the books?</td>
<td>Are students gaining skills of information literacy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the faculty well qualified?</td>
<td>Is there good instructional practice?</td>
<td>Are students achieving the learning outcomes of the program and institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the curriculum appropriate?</td>
<td>Do students get practice and feedback?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Study – Process and Product

**Process**
- Comprehensive and candid self-study of strengths and weaknesses
- Strengthen culture of inquiry
- Reflect together
- Hold institution up to Standards
- Evidence-based
- Plan for the future

**Product**
- The Self-Study document and supporting materials
  - How do we meet the Standards?
  - How well do we meet the Standards?
  - What are our plans for improvement?

Self-Study is:
- Snapshot at a moment in time
- Mission + Standards
- “Lived experience” + DATA
Participation

Who
• Faculty, staff, students (on-campus, off-campus, online)
• Board of Trustees
• Alumni

How
• Committees, surveys, focus groups
• Updates on website, campus newspaper(s), blog
• Drafts on website

Importance of Candor
• To gain real value from process
• To demonstrate institutional strength and integrity
Understanding the Genre: Study + Story

How does the institution
- PRESENT itself to peers?
- DEMONSTRATE that it meets Standards?
- ANALYZE areas for improvement?
- EVALUATE its own effectiveness?
- USE this opportunity to PLAN?
- PARTICIPATE actively in self-regulation?
- ARTICULATE “Measures of Student Success”

evidence, evidence, evidence, evidence, evidence, evidence, evidence

OLD Standards for Accreditation

1. Mission and Purposes
2. Planning and Evaluation
3. Organization and Governance
4. The Academic Program
5. Faculty
6. Students
7. Library and Other Information Resources
8. Physical and Technological Resources
9. Financial Resources
10. Public Disclosure
11. Integrity

Current Standards went into effect January 2006, with midterm revisions effective July 2011. Revision process is almost complete.
NEW (DRAFT) Standards for Accreditation

1. Mission and Purposes
2. Planning and Evaluation
3. Organization and Governance
4. The Academic Program
5. Students
6. Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship
7. Institutional Resources
8. Educational Effectiveness
9. Integrity, Transparency, and Public Disclosure

New Standards are in near-final draft. Discussion of that draft will be one of the main agenda items at the NEASC Annual Meeting later this week.

Responding to the Standards — Proposed Approach

- Writing groups for some standards but not all

1. Mission and Purposes
2. Planning and Evaluation
3. Organization and Governance
4. The Academic Program
5. Students
6. Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship
7. Institutional Resources
8. Educational Effectiveness
9. Integrity, Transparency, and Public Disclosure
Responding to the Standards

Description

Appraisal

Projection

Team Visit (Nov 5–8, 2017)

Who are they?
- 6–10 faculty and administrators, trained by CIHE
- Peer and aspirant institutions
- No conflicts of interest

What do they do?
- 3-day campus visit
- Meetings
- Review evidence on-site
- Open meetings

What are their roles?
- Validate Self-Study
- “Eyes and ears” of the Commission

What do they produce?
- Exit report of principal findings
- Team report
- Confidential recommendation to CIHE
**DRAFT Timeline**

**Based on One-Year Postponement**

**First Steps: Nov 2015 through Jan 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/Task</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review results of 2011 Fifth-Year Report</td>
<td>Nov 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather data for Data First Forms, to support responses to Standards</td>
<td>Dec – Jan 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost appoints Steering Committee</td>
<td>Dec 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Steering Committee appoint chairs (or co-chairs) of Writing Groups</td>
<td>Jan 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop communications plan</td>
<td>Dec 2015 – Feb 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community kickoff meeting</td>
<td>Early Feb 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Later Steps: Spring 2016 and Beyond**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event/Task</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing groups draft responses to Standards</td>
<td>Apr–Sept 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to data requests to support responses to Standards (evidence)</td>
<td>Apr–Sept 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine materials for digital workroom</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee review of drafts</td>
<td>Oct 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement of responses</td>
<td>Nov/Dec 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather materials for Appendices</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIHE review of draft Self-Study (optional)</td>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community review of draft</td>
<td>Jan 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event/Task</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final content revisions</td>
<td>Feb/Mar 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final editing for “one voice”</td>
<td>Apr/May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community review of near-final draft</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations for Team Visit</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Self-Study with Appendices to Team Members and CIHE (6 weeks prior to Visit)</td>
<td>9/15/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather all workroom documents</td>
<td>Sept/Oct 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Visit</td>
<td>11/5 – 11/8/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal review of lessons learned</td>
<td>Nov 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for implementation of projections</td>
<td>Nov 2017 and &gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>