

Accreditation, how we all contribute!

Common Hour
Wednesday, April 13th, 2016

A few terms

MSCHE – Middle States Commission on Higher Education

PRR – Periodic Review Report

ALO – Accreditation Liaison Officer



Accreditation cycle

Currently: Ten year cycle. Periodic Review report at five years

New format: Eight year cycle. Annual reports.



MSCHE Request for Follow-up

“To accept the Periodic Review Report and to reaffirm accreditation. To request a monitoring report, due April 1, 2016, documenting the further implementation of an organized and sustained process for the assessment of institutional effectiveness and the achievement of institutional and program level student learning outcomes in all academic programs with evidence that assessment results are used to inform decision making and to improve teaching and learning (Standards 7 and 14). The next evaluation visit is scheduled for 2018-2019.”



Monitoring reports



Monitoring reports

When an institution undergoes any type of accreditation review, the Commission will request a monitoring report because it has concerns about ongoing compliance with one or more of the requirements of affiliation or standards for accreditation. The Commission may also direct a small team visit following the submission of a monitoring report. In such cases, requests for monitoring reports are compatible with the reaffirmation of accreditation.



MSCHE Accreditation Standards

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

MSCHE Accreditation Standards

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.



Recommendations



Recommendations

“In terms of Standards 7 and 14, these readers make the RECOMMENDATION that evidence and analysis must be documented to supplement the narrative regarding student learning and institutional effectiveness.”

Recommendations

“In terms of Standards 7 and 14, these readers make the RECOMMENDATION that evidence and analysis must be documented to supplement the narrative regarding student learning and institutional effectiveness.”

“In terms of Standard 7 and 14, these readers make the RECOMMENDATION that Ursinus College further develop and implement a comprehensive, organized, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning and institutional effectiveness in all units and programs.”



Institutional context for report

At the time we submitted our PRR, there was an insufficient structure for Student Learning assessment and Institutional assessment. It was also noted that the college was not sufficiently documenting evidence and analysis to support assertions of student learning and institutional effectiveness. Since receiving the Reviewer's Response to the PRR and recommendations for improvements from MSCHE, we have worked to strengthen the structure for assessment at the college. Previously, assessment was not integrated into our campus culture, but we have worked diligently to develop assessment processes across our campus and we show our progress and successes in this Monitoring Report.



Standard 7: Assessment of institutional effectiveness



Standard 7: Assessment of institutional effectiveness

MSCHE Recommendation: Further implementation of organized and sustained assessment of institutional effectiveness

- Development of annual report and outcomes assessment initiative for college operations.
- Development of new strategic plan progress reporting structure to include measurable benchmarks and feedback loop
- Inclusion of regular assessment and data sharing sessions at structured meetings (College Council meetings 2014-2015, Department Heads Meetings 2015-2016, Monthly Dean's Meetings, Faculty Salons, Faculty Common Hours)
- Creation of Board of Trustees Strategic Indicator Dashboards (Core, Enrollment Management Committee, Academic Affairs/Student Affairs/Athletics Committee)
- Development of schedule for institutional and departmental specific survey, assessment, research, and data collection
- New Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness with responsibility for assessment, hired December 2014



Standard 14: Student learning assessment

Standard 14: Student learning assessment

MSCHE Recommendation: Achievement of institutional and program level student learning outcomes in all academic programs with evidence that assessment results are used to inform decision making and to improve teaching and learning

- Learning goals and rubrics developed for all core requirements
- All core learning goals assessed
- Cycle of assessment of core put in place
- Information from core assessment disseminated
- New college assessment website developed to further communicate and share processes, tools, and resources
- Outcomes Assessment Committee works with all academic departments and programs on development of learning goals, assessment plans, and documentation of assessment findings and use



Assessment website

What's next?

New standards for MSCHE

Standard I: Mission and Goals

Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience .

Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration



Self study 2018/2019, preparation

- **Spring 2017**, form working groups for each standard
- **Spring 2017 – Spring 2018**, draft chapters, campus review, finalize draft
- **Fall 2018** – Send draft of report to visiting team chair
- **Spring 2019** – final report is due early spring and team visits campus late spring



Resource allocation

Types of academic resources

Curricular reviews or changes

Technological resources or uses

Human talents, assignments, or hires

Space

Pedagogical focuses, strategies, or workshops

Time allocation

Evaluation procedures or priorities

Financial allocations



Allocation of academic resources

College level

President,
VPAA, Deans,
Committees

Department and Program level

Department
Chairs,
Program
Directors

Individual level

Faculty
Members,
Student Affairs
Professionals,
Librarians



College level:
President, VPAA, Deans,
Committees

**Department and
Program level:**
Department Chairs,
Program Directors

Individual level:
Faculty Members,
Student Affairs
Professionals,
Librarians

Curricular
reviews or
changes

Technological
resources or
uses

Human
talents,
assignments,
or hires

Space

Pedagogical
focuses,
strategies, or
workshops

Time
allocation

Evaluation
procedures or
priorities

Financial
allocations



Think about ideas that have emerged from assessment. How have you allocated resources?

Are there ideas you could address through assessment that could lead to better allocation of resources?

