

Summary prepared for the BOT Committee Meeting - Thursday, September 8

1. USDOE delegates oversight to Regional Accrediting Bodies
2. **Higher Learning Commission** (HLC) is assigned responsibility for **19 states** (MI – AZ W.Virg-ND)
  - a. **1000** institutions (public, private, tribal, non-profit, for-profit)
  - b. Institutional Accreditation – Federal Financial Aid
3. Institutional Accreditation is a Peer-Review process
  - a. Peer Corps = **1600** faculty and administrators – our team includes an assessment administrator, a college president, and two faculty members
  - b. Two-step review
    - i. **Federal** Compliance team – off-site desk-review by Peer Team
    - ii. **Assurance** Argument – Peer Visit Team
4. The **Assurance Argument** an **evidence-driven** narrative documenting how the University satisfies each of the Criteria for Accreditation
  - a. **Five Criteria**
    - i. **Mission**
    - ii. **Integrity**: Ethical and Responsible Conduct
    - iii. **Teaching** and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support
    - iv. **Teaching** and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement
    - v. **Resources**, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
  - b. Each Criterion is based on multiple **Core Components**
    - i. Most Core Components have expanded statements of **Expectations**
5. Expectations for the Board
  - a. Know the sections specific to the Board
    - i. **1.A** – Mission
    - ii. **2.A** – Integrity in operations
    - iii. **2.C.1-4** – Decisions in best interest of university
    - iv. **5.B.1** – Knowledgeable oversight
  - b. Be familiar with all five Criteria for Accreditation
6. **The Visit**
  - a. Meetings on Campus Monday and Tuesday – Team and break-out sessions
  - b. **Forums** on specific Criterion, open forums by group or special topic, and called meetings with specific groups like the BOT, Deans, Student Government, etc.
  - c. During the visit, Peer Reviewers validate the claims they read in the Assurance Argument, explore areas where the Assurance Argument did not present **clear and compelling evidence** of compliance
7. **LOOKING AHEAD** to the post-visit report - What is the outcome of the visit
  - a. Peer Reviewers write a narrative addressing how we demonstrated that we met each Core Component and thus each of the Criteria for Accreditation
  - b. Institutions must demonstrate that they have **MET** (by meeting or exceeding each Expectation), or **MET WITH CONCERNS** (demonstrating the nascent characteristics of each Expectation) each component
  - c. **To merit accreditation the institution MUST meet all five Criteria** – alternatively, HLC may continue accreditation applying conditions or sanctions ranging from interim reports, follow-up visits and ultimately withdrawal of accreditation