



Key Insights: A Review of Core Components and the Comprehensive Evaluation



Key Insights: A Review of Core Components and the Comprehensive Evaluation

Barbara J. Johnson, Ph.D.
Vice President for Accreditation Relations


Monday, April 3, 2017



HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Evaluation of Core Components


- All Core Components Evaluated Through Criteria
- Criterion and Core Components Evaluated:
 - Met
 - Met with Concerns
 - Not Met
- Sub-components integrated into review of Core Components



HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Review of Criteria

- Evaluate institution's documents
 - Corroborate on-site
 - Concerned with quality improvement
 - Must note areas of improvement



HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

Met

- Team is able to demonstrate the institution is in compliance with the core component's expectations.
- Teams may take note of any *opportunities for improvement*, but these are not "concerns" if the institution
 - is aware of these opportunities,
 - may have identified them in their documents, and
 - has a reasonable plan or process to implement improvements.



Met with Concerns

- Team identifies an issue that *must be improved* in order to be in full compliance with the core component's expectations.
- Team may also express "concerns" when the institution
 - is not aware of the issues identified,
 - has no plans or processes to implement any improvements, or
 - may not possess the capacity or inclination to improve.

Interim monitoring always assigned.



Not Met

- A team identifies a core component as not met when:
 - Unable to demonstrate the institution is in compliance with the core component's expectations
 - a systemic problem is identified.
- When a Criterion is "not met," the team **must recommend a sanction or withdrawal of accreditation.**
 - **Related Assumed Practices will be noted.**



Criterion Rubric & Recommendation

Core Component	Criterion is...	Team Recommendation
ALL Met	Met	No Monitoring
1+ Met with Concerns	Met with Concerns	Monitoring or Notice (sanction)
1+ Not Met	Not Met	Probation (sanction) or Withdrawal



Monitoring

Interim Report

- Receive specific, important information from the institution
- Track progress in coping with certain changes or challenges
- Receive evidence that plans came to fruition

Focused Visit

- Review specific developments and changes
- Follow up on concerns identified in a previous evaluation process
 - Primarily concerned with determining if institution has resolved previous concerns.
 - Not available to institutions on Open Pathway



Sanction

Placed on Notice

- *At risk* of not meeting at least one of the Criterion
- Institution is placed on the Standard Pathway

Probation

- Does not meet one or more Criterion
- Institution will not remain on a Pathway

Withdrawal

- Does not meet one or more Criterion
- Institution will not remain on a Pathway



Context

- Sept 2014 1st & 2nd Analysis - 109 team reports
- Oct 2015 3rd Analysis - 105 team reports
 - All Open & Standard Pathway (11 = Year 4)
- Oct 2016 4th Analysis - 127 team reports
 - AQIP = 22
 - Open = 55
 - Standard = 50 (32 = Year 4)



Most Cited Core Components (15-16)

Core Component	Institutions with "Met with Concerns" or "Not Met"
4B Assessment/Improvement	31.5%
5A Resource Base	22.0%
4A Program Quality	21.3%
5C Planning	16.5%
3C Faculty	11.0%
4C Persistence/Completion	9.5%
5D Institutional Effectiveness	7.1%



Team Determination for Most Cited Core Components by Year

Core Component	2013 - 14 %	2014 - 15 %	2015 - 16 %
4B	42.5	40.9	31.5
5A	27.7	23.8	22.0
5C	23.1	20.0	16.5
4A	18.5	17.1	21.3
4C	21.2	16.2	9.5
5D	19.4	11.4	7.1
3C	13.8	13.3	11.0



Core Component 4.B

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



Key Insights Core Component 4.B

- Lack of evidence/documentation of data utilization to improve student learning
- Lack of assessment of co-curricular activities
- Absence of comprehensive & systematic assessment process
- Linkage of course objectives to program objectives or institution level assessment
- New assessment plan implemented and need time to evaluate full cycle



Key Insights Core Component 4.B

- Program goals were not clear or measurable
- Assessment of General Education is a concern (i.e., no student learning outcomes)
- Missing linkage of assessment to institutional planning, budgeting, funding priorities
- Faculty Related Concerns
- Reliance on survey data and course evaluation (grades) to document student learning



Core Component 5.A.

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



Key Insights Core Component 5.A

- Financial Sustainability
- Decreasing Enrollment
- Debt Load / Debt Repayment
- Supplemental Draws on Endowment
- Extremely Low Reserves
- Deferred Maintenance
- Declining/Variable CFI
- Staffing Levels
 - Resource Allocation



Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.



Key Insights Core Component 5.C

- No documentation of linkage between program review, strategic plan, assessment, budget and planning processes
- Lack of a campus-wide integrated approach to planning
- Non-existent systematic, continuous integration of strategic plan
- Absence of internal & external stakeholders in strategic plan
- Planning does not consider external influences



Core Component 4.A

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



Key Insights Core Component 4.A

- No systematic engagement schedule of program review
- Too early to evaluate program review process / Not fully implemented
- Data collection, analysis & evidence of improvement for programs missing
- Alumni outcomes not defined and/or tracked

* Institution did not inform HLC of concerns, adverse or unfavorable actions of specialized accreditor



Core Component 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.



Key Insights Core Component 4.C

- Lack of a comprehensive & systematic approach to collect data, analyze & utilize to make improvements
- Absence of analysis & utilization of data
- Goals for student retention, persistence, & completion are not defined
- Data not disaggregated by relevant groups



Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.



Key Insights Core Component 5.D

- Absence of documentation of how data used to make improvements
- Lack of campus-wide institutional performance data
- Plans to enhance operations were non-existent
- Data dissemination
- Baseline and metrics



Core Component 3.C

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



Key Insights Core Component 3.C

- Faculty evaluations not conducted systematically
- # of full-time faculty not adequate to perform non-instructional duties
- Unable to determine faculty qualifications for adjuncts/dual credit faculty
- Faculty are not appropriately qualified (FT, PT, Adjuncts, Dual Credit)
- No review/evaluation of adjuncts
- Faculty development of PT or adjuncts is non-existent



**Additional Core Components
Cited > 5%**

- **3.A** Appropriate degree programs (6.3%)
- **5.B** Governance/Administrative Structures (5.5%)
- **2.A** Integrity in Internal Function (5.5%)



Thank You!

?Questions?